



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Lynn Hill
lynn.hill@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7700

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 28 February 2012

COUNCIL

Meeting held on Monday 20 February 2012

Attached are the public and Councillor oral questions and answers.

- 5 **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHERE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.** (Pages 3 - 4)
- 6 **ORAL QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL WHERE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.** (Pages 5 - 14)
- 7 **WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL** (Pages 15 - 26)

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

20th FEBRUARY 2012

ORAL QUESTION BY A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC

From Alma Haq, Chair of the Central Beckenham Residents' Association, of the Leader of the Council

TOWN CENTRE IMPROVEMENTS

In the last 5 financial years from April 2006 to March 2011, what has been the Council's total spending (including TfL and Section 106 funds spent) in terms of (i) capital works, and (ii) revenue, on town centre improvements in each of the 3 main towns in the Borough:

- (a) Bromley Town Centre;
- (b) Orpington Town Centre; and
- (c) Beckenham Town Centre?

Reply:

Councillor Carr gave the following information:

| Town Centre Improvement - April 2006 to March 2011 | | | |
|---|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | Bromley | Orpington | Beckenham |
| | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| Revenue | 218 | 7 | 0 |
| Capital (incl TfL & S106) | 2,084 | 4,145 | 220 |
| Total spend | 2,302 | 4,152 | 220 |

So far as revenue costs were concerned whilst no spend was shown for Beckenham Town Centre it did not take into account staff costs and the benefits the Town Centre Managers bought to those areas. The Leader offered to pass on these details after the meeting.

Supplementary Question:

Ms Haq stated that as a resident of Beckenham and a representative of the Residents Association why was so little being spent on Beckenham and would like to be reassured that Bromley was committed to spending on Beckenham and in particular the Town Centre.

Reply:

Councillor Carr responded that Bromley Council was totally committed to Beckenham Town Centre and invited Ms Haq and her resident's association members to stay for the rest of the meeting as she may hear things that would please her Committee. He emphasised that the Council was committed to Beckenham and had submitted substantial bids in the past for funding. There were also a list of priorities in the Building a Better Bromley agenda around vibrant/thriving Town Centres. Beckenham along with Orpington, Bromley Town Centre, West Wickham and all the others were high priorities for this administration at the moment.

MEETING

20th FEBRUARY 2012

ORAL QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Councillor Michael Tickner of the Chairman of the General Purposes and Licensing Committee

What are the total legal costs incurred by the London Borough of Bromley since 2008 in prosecuting Mr Christopher Stephens for benefit fraud?

What was the outcome of this prosecution?

Reply:

Councillor Owen gave the figure of £2,149.14 and reported that Mr Stephens had pleaded guilty on the 6th June 2011 and was sentenced to 40 hours unpaid work over 12 months plus £500 costs.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Tickner questioned whether these prosecutions were always good value for money and asked whether a report on excessive legal fees could go to the Audit Sub-Committee for them to consider the outcome of such prosecutions and see whether it was commensurate to the cost to the council tax payer.

Reply:

The Chairman replied that he was happy for this to be looked at and referred to a recent Court case in the news when £8.5m was spent on deciding whether a gift was a 'bung' and taxable. He considered that when it came to tax and value for money there were a lot of questions that needed to be answered.

2. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Leader of the Council

What response has been received 2012 from Transport for London, following the Town Centre Working Party meeting on January 31st, regarding the Atkins consultancy proposals for improving West Wickham High Street produced in 2006?

Reply:

Councillor Carr advised that West Wickham High Street was a Transport for London Route Network (TLRN) road (A232) and was the subject of a TfL-funded improvement study some years ago. However, no funds were ever allocated for implementation. The Council was currently lobbying TfL to

develop an improvement programme to bring the public realm in West Wickham High Street up to the same standard that the Council was seeking to promote in Orpington, Bromley North Village, Beckenham and other town centres. Initial contact had been made with TfL officers responsible for capital schemes on TLRN routes to explore options and the results of these discussions would be reported back to the Working Party and the Renewal & Recreation PDS Committee.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Bennett asked whether the Leader was aware that TfL put a figure of about £3m on the Atkins proposal back in 2006 but had not committed to any expenditure. West Wickham was counted as the 4th largest Town Centre in the Borough and the plans that were put forward by TfL were very much welcomed by local councillors at the time. He asked for assurance that when Beckenham and West Wickham Town Centre Working Party had finished dealing with the urgent matters to do with Beckenham that it would move on to look at ways to lobby TfL for more money for West Wickham.

Reply:

Councillor Carr responded that definitely yes that would happen. As he had already indicated in his answer to the public questioner Town Centres were extremely important to the administration.

3. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Community Services

How many day centres for the elderly are being closed as a result of a reduction of £500,000 in the budget?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder reiterated that there were no proposals for changes to the budget for Day Centres this coming year. The implications of the proposed reduction in the budget for day opportunities for older people was currently the subject of discussions with day centre providers and representatives of older people in the community and day centre service users. The result of the consultations and detailed proposals for day opportunities for older people would be reported back to the Adult and Community Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee before any final decisions were made about the service from 2013 onwards.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Fookes asked why the Council was undermining Day Centres and reducing their subsidy.

Reply:

Councillor Evans stated that the Council was not undermining providers of Day Opportunities for older people but was doing its best to ensure that the opportunities for elderly people through Day Centres were improved. The Department was working very hard with all the providers not just to give them further opportunity for local authority nominations but also to help them improve their way of doing business and their business cases for getting more fee paying clients. He emphasised that Day opportunities were very important.

4. From Councillor Tony Owen of the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

How is the refurbishment of the North block progressing?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder advised that the refurbishment of the North Block was progressing well. Completion of the works was currently scheduled for 27th April 2012.

The installation of the windows was substantially complete. Works to the staircase were well underway. Plastering works were complete and internal decorations were also progressing well.

Electrical and Mechanical 1st fix works were substantially complete. New ceilings and the installation of new lighting into the grid were complete and flooring work had commenced.

External decorations were substantially complete and all scaffolding would be struck by 23rd February.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Owen asked whether it was true that when the windows had been put in the North Block the Sub-Contractor had subsequently alleged he had not been paid and started to take them out again. He also asked if the Portfolio Holder was happy with the arrangements between the Contractor and Sub-Contractor and whether this situation might happen again.

Reply:

Councillor Morgan confirmed that it was true that the Sub-Contractor had alleged that he had not been paid and started to remove the windows. The Police were called and he was prevented from leaving the site. Arrangements were made for him to be paid and the windows were put back in at no cost to the Council and he was satisfied everything was now on schedule.

5. From Councillor Douglas Auld of the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

Can the Portfolio Holder confirm that recent advice received from Bromley Police Station indicates that the numbers of Police Community Safety Officers (PCSOs) is in the near future to be reduced from approximately 120 to 65.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder advised that he could not give exact numbers as the Police had not given him the information. However he understood that by the end of this month Bromley would have 50% less PCSOs than it should have. In rough figures that would be 60 instead of 120 because 60 PCSOs had been recruited and accepted as fulltime Police Officers which was something to be proud of but at the same time such a large number leaving meant Bromley suffered as a result. Councillor Stevens had been told that Bromley might get just 5 replacements at the moment. A recruitment process was about to start and the remaining 55 places would eventually be filled over the next few months. The Portfolio Holder advised that he had asked Bromley's London Assembly member James Cleverly to confirm what was happening and to come back with more relevant information in the next few weeks. As soon as Councillor Stevens was informed he would let the member know the exact numbers.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Auld considered that it was important that the Police kept to the assurances given regarding the future level of PCSO numbers in the Borough.

Reply:

Councillor Stevens responded that action had already been taken as he was at City Hall that morning and had met with Kit Malthouse (Deputy Mayor, Policing) and the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police and they were very aware of our concerns as was Mr Cleverly. They had promised to look at our situation as quickly as possible and accepted that we had been unfairly hit as such a large number of PCSOs had been taken away as Police Officers. The Leader and the Portfolio Holder would continue to press for action particularly as it was understood that there were 180 PCSOs around the Met which would be made available to go back to Boroughs. Bromley residents should rightfully get a fairer allocation as 5 was not acceptable.

Councillor Stevens also apologised to the Labour Group as he considered that the written responses to their questions were completely unacceptable and he would be chasing this up to get proper answers for members.

6. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

What is the status of the proposal to extend the Bakerloo Line from the Elephant and Castle using the Hayes Line?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder replied that the extension of the Bakerloo Line to Hayes using existing national rail infrastructure was one of a range of options being considered by Transport for London for possible rail or light rail investment in south-east London. The proposal was in its early stages and no conclusions had yet been reached regarding its viability or otherwise.

Following a presentation to Members by a TfL official on 18th January, the Environment PDS Committee resolved, among other matters, that the extension of the Bakerloo line to Hayes was to be resisted by the Council unless direct connections to Charing Cross/Cannon Street and London Bridge could be maintained.

The Portfolio Holder also took the opportunity to confirm that both TfL and the Mayor's Office had again been briefed at very senior level within the past few weeks that whilst we were also supportive of a possible Tramlink extension to Crystal Palace, this administration's priority remained to see the DLR, or less favourably, but still possibly, the Bakerloo line, extended through to at least Bromley North and ideally Bromley South, to facilitate direct access to Canary Wharf and Docklands via Lewisham to better match both our own residents' needs, as well as those of travellers from deeper Kent.

Such measures, were they to prove possible, would also serve as a much wider strategic regional investment by helping to markedly reduce overcrowding on the tube network in general, and the Jubilee line in particular, currently being aggravated as it was by travellers from South East London and Kent having to then further commute between their respective over-ground Stations to reach their places of employment in the City of London and Docklands.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Bennett commented that he was sure no one would object to the Bakerloo line being extended to Lewisham or Bromley North. However he was certain residents of West Wickham in his Ward and those residents living by the Hayes line would be very upset if the current very good train service to Cannon Street/Waterloo East, Charing Cross and London Bridge was replaced by smaller tube trains going at a slower pace, through more stations to get to an objective that was already served by going out of Charing Cross Station across to the Bakerloo line. Whilst grateful for the reassurances Councillor Bennett felt that there was no point in replacing a train service with one that was much inferior.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder replied that he was in complete agreement with Councillor Bennett's views as he certainly did not want duplication but rather new and fresh investment. That was why he felt Bromley North was what the Council should continue to push for.

7. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Community Services

Why does it take this authority up to six weeks to assess people who are being decanted from housing association properties for alternative accommodation?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder commented that the question had officers searching trying to find out the main point and hoped the response was right as it appeared to relate to a specific case. Where a housing tenant needed to be moved from an existing housing association property for refurbishment purposes the duty remained with the housing association to assist their tenant with alternative accommodation. The housing association may approach the council for assistance in identifying properties if they were unable to find suitable temporary accommodation.

In this particular case the tenant wished to remain in the locality and had identified a property owned by another Housing Association. The Housing Team were unaware of any approach by the Housing Association in this case. In order to be considered for the property a reassessment of their case was required. Since re-opening the housing register in mid December the assessment process was currently taking between 4 – 6 weeks. This was largely due to the number of people reapplying. The introduction of auto-banding and the new allocation policy meant that from mid March the assessment completion would be halved to between 2 – 3 weeks.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Fookes felt that the situation might have been let down by the particular Housing Association on this occasion. However he did consider that 4 -6 weeks was unacceptable and despite the Council having excellent officers asserted that the reality was that it was due to inadequate staffing levels, particularly as the numbers of homeless people had doubled during the past year with 8000 people on the register.

Reply:

Councillor Evans responded that in respect of the homelessness situation the officers were doing an excellent job under difficult circumstances. The number of homeless people in the Borough was increasing but the

department was working very well in coping with this and looking at all sorts of different strategies to deal with the problem.

8. From Councillor Tony Owen of the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

How much did it cost to put in new paving slabs outside the new Orpington library and why was it done?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder advised that the new paving slabs outside the new Orpington Library cost £8,420. They were installed because the previous surface (uneven cobbles) was proving to be a hazard to pedestrians. At least four accidents had been reported and one incident was now the subject of an insurance claim.

The new paving slabs removed the tripping hazard whilst performing the function (by the change of surface finish and contrasting colour) of warning pedestrians of their proximity to the glazed frontage of the library building.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Owen commented that there had with problems with the windows here (Civic Centre North Block) and now the new Orpington Library without air conditioning and this costly new paving. He considered that the Council should be employing experts to give sensible advice to ensure the Council's contracts were properly executed. He asked the Portfolio Holder whether the right people were being used to manage capital works.

Reply:

Councillor Morgan responded that he suspected that the contract had gone to tender and the best people had been used. However he would look at this issue, as it was the first time it had come to his notice, to see whether it held up in terms of value for money and assessment.

9. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Chairman of the Development Control Committee

What proposals he has to ensure that developments under the Bromley Town Centre master plan are architecturally and aesthetically pleasing and enhance the public realm?

Reply:

The Chairman replied that developments would be expected to comply with the design policies of the Unitary Development Plan and Area Action Plan, in particular the Key Design Principles for each Opportunity Site set out in Appendix 5 of the Area Action Plan. Where appropriate, there would be

negotiations with promoters of schemes regarding off-site improvements to the public realm of the Town Centre, and in any event developments should provide the same quality of design and materials as the improvements being planned for Bromley North Village and elsewhere in the Town Centre. Also consideration would be given on a case by case basis to the design of proposals being reviewed by the Design Council – CABE and/or The Architecture Panel.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Bennett asked whether the Chairman would agree that looking at Bromley High Street at this time there were some very fine buildings but in between there was a mix of buildings put up in the 1960s and 70s which were not attractive. This was now a golden opportunity to ensure that anything that was newly built would cohere with the best architecture in the High Street and was sympathetic in style. Councillor Bennett did not want what they had in Croydon which he felt was a monument to the worst of the 1970s. He asked for assurance that every building put forward to Development Control Committee and its Sub-Committees would be judged on aesthetic grounds and not just on design.

Reply:

Councillor Dean stated that he could give that assurance – design and aesthetic appearance had always been a consideration by the Development Control Committee and would continue to be the case as the Area Action Plan was introduced in Bromley.

10. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

What is he doing to assist the One O’Clock Club in Crystal Palace and the Orpington Gateway Club as a result of the council budget reduction to Bromley Mytime?

Reply:

Councillor Morgan responded that Council Officers from Renewal and Recreation had been meeting with Mytime staff over the last 18 months to assist Mytime in their development of new business arrangements that would potentially see the continuation of activities for children at the One O’Clock Club and for adults at the Orpington Gateway Club. The service at Crystal Palace was going to be tendered to try and identify a suitable operator to run such a service. Council Officers would continue to provide such support and advice throughout this process.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Fookes said that it was all very well putting capital into the Pavilion Leisure Centre in Bromley but he considered that the reality was that because

of budget cuts these clubs now faced very difficult situations. For example the Orpington Gateway Club was now being expected to pay a 600% increase in their rent as well as being asked to move their weekly club night from a Friday to a Monday. He asked whether that was acceptable.

Reply:

Councillor Morgan replied that both Mytime and the Council valued the work done by the Gateway Club and were making every effort to see that they were satisfactorily accommodated. The reason that Mytime were doing this was to improve their business and what they could do with Crofton Halls. Friday evening was a prime night for their general lettings and the level of income from the Gateway Club did not meet that. However, discussions were ongoing and there was a meeting this Tuesday between Mytime and the Chairman of the Gateway Club, together with Councillor Evans and others at which it was hoped progress would be made.

11. From Councillor Tony Owen of the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Since the beginning of December, how many times (for each week) have requests to reset passwords been received?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder reported the number of password resets by week during the period requested as follows:

| Week Commencing | Volume |
|-----------------|--------|
| 28/11/2011 | 13 |
| 05/12/2011 | 13 |
| 12/12/2011 | 13 |
| 19/12/2011 | 10 |
| 26/12/2011 | 5 |
| 02/01/2012 | 28 |
| 09/01/2012 | 26 |
| 16/01/2012 | 9 |
| 23/01/2012 | 18 |
| 30/01/2012 | 11 |
| 06/02/2012 | 8 |

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Owen advised that he had been told by the Internal Engineer that he spent half of his time resetting passwords. He therefore wanted to know whether the Portfolio Holder believed the arrangements were for dealing with a 'real risk' and whether he could take a look at how much wasted staff time there was in over providing encryption arrangements for passwords.

Reply:

Councillor Arthur responded that the roll out of Quest, the automated password re-set system, had improved things dramatically since that time. All staff were encouraged by the Capita Help Desk to change passwords and use the new automated system. He anticipated that the investment of £10,500 for the system would prove good value for money and he suspected that when the Councillor spoke to individuals he would find that the system had greatly improved. If that should not prove to be the case then he asked Councillor Owen to let him know so that he could investigate matters further.

COUNCIL MEETING

20th FEBRUARY 2012

WRITTEN QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

- 1. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder for Resources (was addressed to the Environment Portfolio Holder but by agreement with both now changed to Resources Portfolio Holder)**

Who is responsible for the repair and maintenance of the sewer in Rays Road, West Wickham and what steps are being taken to ensure that it is in good repair and that the repeated flooding affecting users of the downside entrance to West Wickham station is ended?

Reply:

Under the terms of the lease between the Greater London Council (now this Council) and the tenant of the Build Centre, the tenant is responsible for the maintenance of Rays Road, including the surface water drainage. The Valuation and Estates Division has frequently reminded the tenant of its responsibilities and the tenant has agreed to a monthly regime of road sweeping and gulley clearance. Also, following a CCTV survey last year which identified that two pipes had collapsed, the tenant undertook some repair work to the drains and cleared out the soakaway pits. The situation is being monitored and only time will tell if this work has had a significant impact in reducing flooding or the time taken for the flood water to recede. The tenant's responsibility is limited to repairs and any improvements to the drainage system, if required, would have to be undertaken by the Council as landlord, should it choose to do so.

- 2. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Leader of the Council**

What assistance is available from the Council to local groups who are organising events to celebrate Her Majesty the Queen's Diamond Jubilee?

Reply:

An easy to read guide has been prepared for the Diamond Jubilee for local people which explains how to organise community events including Street Parties and this is available via the Councils web site. The guide refers those interested in staging community events to the Licensing Team who are able to provide advice on the requirements that need to be met when considering a community event. In addition, officers from ESD have met with a number of community groups who have expressed an interest in holding events in the boroughs parks and open spaces.

3. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People

If he will give in table format the percentage of free meal pupils in Bromley secondary schools who gained 5 A*-C grades, including English and maths for each year since 2005 by ethnic group.

Reply:

A table is attached as Appendix 1 which presents the data indicating the percentage of pupils who are eligible for free school meals in Bromley schools who gained 5 A*-C grades including English and Maths by ethnic group, from 2006 to 2011. The data was not previously available in this format.

4. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

What is happening at each individual school where funding for a crossing patrol has been withdrawn? Please list them.

Reply:

Please see attached Appendix 2.

5. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Is he aware that Lewisham under their new waste contract will be able to recycle crisp packets and tetra pak cartons, when will Bromley be doing the same?

Reply:

Indeed I am.

Lewisham have recently entered an agreement with a relatively new MRF. The process at this MRF includes the separation of tetra-paks, which has enabled Lewisham to include them in their co-mingled kerbside collection scheme.

The MRF which Bromley uses does not separate out Tetra-paks. This is largely because the environmental and financial benefits of doing so are still unproven with many in the waste and recycling industry continuing to believe that it is no less environmentally friendly to consign tetra-paks to heat to energy recycling technology instead.

Bromley has 5 bring sites for Tetra-paks. They are collected by a company called Recresco on behalf of Tetra-pak, and taken to a plant at Kirkby in Ashfield, where they are baled and then sent on to Italy.

A facility in Italy breaks down the complex mix of materials used to make cartons rigid and waterproof (up to 7 layers of paper, aluminium and plastic). Approximately 75% of this is paper fibre, which is recycled. The remaining 25% is used to make a range of consumables.

This is an expensive process which itself uses energy, hence why all local authorities are limited to only 5 sites by Tetra-Pak, who subsidise and operate the service.

A recent study (commissioned by Tetra-Pak) also suggests that the environmental benefit of incinerating tetra-paks (which generates heat and electricity) was equally as beneficial as its recycling process.

Lewisham's decision, which I respect and in no way criticise, may well have been influenced by their low household recycling rate, which as the table below demonstrates, was London's second lowest in the final quarter of 2010/11.

LONDON AUTHORITY RECYCLING RATES JANUARY – MARCH 2011

| Authority | Recycling Rate |
|---|----------------|
| Bromley LB | 49.76% |
| Bexley LB | 48.50% |
| Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames | 45.35% |
| Harrow LB | 44.13% |
| Richmond upon Thames LB | 42.89% |
| Hillingdon LB | 42.54% |
| Ealing LB | 40.85% |
| City of London | 40.29% |
| West London Waste Authority | 38.28% |
| Merton LB | 36.48% |
| Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea | 34.49% |
| Brent LB | 34.22% |
| Greenwich LB | 34.04% |
| Sutton LB | 33.22% |
| Islington LB | 33.08% |
| Camden LB | 32.99% |
| Wandsworth LB | 32.74% |
| Hounslow LB | 32.61% |
| Western Riverside Waste Authority | 30.15% |
| Enfield LB | 29.64% |
| Croydon LB | 29.28% |
| Barnet LB | 29.01% |
| Lambeth LB | 28.57% |
| Havering LB | 28.43% |
| Southwark LB | 28.26% |
| Hammersmith and Fulham LB | 27.90% |
| North London Waste Authority | 27.49% |
| Haringey LB | 26.53% |
| Barking and Dagenham LB | 26.04% |

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Westminster City Council | 25.65% |
| Tower Hamlets LB | 25.13% |
| Hackney LB | 24.60% |
| East London Waste Authority | 24.60% |
| Waltham Forest LB | 23.90% |
| Redbridge LB | 23.43% |
| Lewisham LB | 19.60% |
| Newham LB | 17.83% |

With regard to crisp packets, different manufacturers use different types of packets (although they are all a mixture of plastic and aluminium foil). Combined with the difficulty of extracting this material at a MRF, the extremely low weight and intrinsic value of the material in question means that any possible financial benefit derived from doing so would be minimal.

We could consider recycling crisp packets moving to the future, but it would only really serve PR purposes.

I personally prefer for us to concentrate on substantive initiatives which divert substantial amounts of waste from landfill.

For example, we have introduced containers at Waldo for mattresses in the last few months, which have already diverted 15 tonnes of mattresses for recycling which would otherwise have gone to landfill.

6. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

Will the 18 PCSO members of the Safer Transport Team in Orpington who are leaving today to become police officers be replaced?

Reply:

The Safer Transport Command has seen an increase in police officers across the Metropolitan Police. There has been a reduction in Police Community Support Officer numbers across the Metropolitan Police although there have been additional PCSO posts created on the revised Roads Policing Unit. Although Bromley did lose a small number of PCSOs, there has been a growth of police constables which has balanced this out.

The Metropolitan Police Service is due to run a PCSO recruitment process imminently. The Safer Transport Command are currently looking across their portfolio to identify whether there is any scope for movement to fill the current vacancies, which includes Bromley.

7. From Councillor Katherine Bance of the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Please advise when the latest Combined Air Quality Updating and Screening Assessment and the 2010 Progress Report will be published on the Bromley website; and

What comparisons will be available, will this include both local and national comparisons?

Reply:

No date has been set for publishing the recently completed draft report on the website. I am however advised by the lead Council Officer tasked with servicing this workstream that he will shortly be forwarding to you the latest data.

They further advise it compares the monitoring results with air quality objectives for both nitrogen dioxide and PM10 and shows a general downward trend for both from 2007-2009 data sets.

8. From Councillor Katherine Bance of the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

What are the latest HMPS police officer numbers for Bromley? What were they 6 months ago, 12 months ago and in April 2008?

Reply:

The target strength for police officer numbers in Bromley and the actual number currently in place only varies by 2.6 officers. Bromley Borough is due to have probationer police constables posted to the Police during this year. The only variation over the course of the last 6/12 months was the reduction of Safer Neighbourhood Team Sergeants (which was mirrored across the Metropolitan Police Service) and a very small number of officers performing a training role, the function of which became centralised.

9. From Councillor Katherine Bance of the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

What is the current complement for each of the ward based Safer Neighbourhood Teams in Bromley? What is the figure for the full complement for each of those ward based teams?

Reply:

Bromley Safer Neighbourhood Teams are up to strength on Sergeants and there are a small number of vacancies for Police Community Support Officers. The Metropolitan Police Service is currently preparing a recruitment process for PCSOs.

10. From Councillor John Getgood of the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

Following the council's failure to secure the former Edginton's site in Green Lane, what plans has he for the promised new Public Library for Penge.

Reply:

Unfortunately despite the Council having spent some time in discussion with the owner of the former furniture store in Green Lane, both parties were unable to reach agreement on an agreed valuation and the owner subsequently entered an alternative rental agreement which effectively meant that the building would be unsuitable for a future library. Officers continue to monitor the availability of retail units in the area, but at this point in time no suitable units have been indentified.

11. From Councillor John Getgood of the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People

How many students have been temporarily and permanently excluded from Bromley secondary schools so far this academic year and how does that compare with last year? How many of these excluded students have been placed in another school and how does that compare with last year?

What are the financial implications for the schools' and departmental budgets?

Reply:

Attached at Appendix 3 is a table showing permanent exclusions for Autumn term 2010 to Spring half-term 2011 and Autumn term 2011 to Spring half-term 2012.

Attached at Appendix 4 is a table showing fixed term exclusions for the school year 2010-2011 and for Autumn term 2011 to Spring half-term 2012.

Financial Implications

School are required to repay the Age Weighted Pupil Unit (AWPU) funding to the LA calculated from the "relevant" date i.e. the sixth school day following the head teacher's decision to permanently exclude the pupil, to the end of the financial year. Agreements have been put in place to ensure that this procedure will be replicated by academies.

12. From Councillor Fawthrop of the Chairman of the Development Control Committee (to be asked at every Council Meeting)

What pre-application meetings have taken place since the last full Council Meeting between Council Officers and potential planning applicants? Can these be listed as follows:-

The name of the potential applicant, the site address being considered.

Reply:

There have been 9 major pre-application meetings between 20th October 2011 and 15th February 2012. These were also 14 non-householder and nil householder enquiries.

As you are aware details of individual applicants and sites at present is exempt information and not disclosable in response to a Council Question.

**Percentage of Pupils Eligible for FSM
achieving 5 A*-C grades, including English and mathematics
by Ethnic Group 2006-2011**

APPENDIX 1

| | 2006 | 2006 | 2007 | 2007 | 2008 | 2008 | 2009 | 2009 | 2010 | 2010 | 2011 | 2011 |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Ethnic Group | Total Number in Group | % Achieving | Total Number in Group | % Achieving | Total Number in Group | % Achieving | Total Number in Group | % Achieving | Total Number in Group | % Achieving | Total Number in Group | % Achieving |
| Bangladeshi | 3 | 33% | 2 | 100% | 1 | 100% | 6 | 83% | 7 | 43% | 4 | 100% |
| Indian | 1 | 100% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 100% | 0 | | 1 | 0% | 1 | 100% |
| Pakistani | 1 | 0% | 3 | 67% | 0 | | 3 | 0% | 0 | | 1 | 100% |
| Any Other Asian Background | 2 | 50% | 3 | 67% | 1 | 100% | 3 | 100% | 4 | 100% | 8 | 88% |
| Black African | 12 | 33% | 18 | 33% | 18 | 39% | 10 | 50% | 19 | 37% | 18 | 50% |
| Black Caribbean | 10 | 20% | 11 | 27% | 6 | 67% | 14 | 43% | 14 | 29% | 13 | 23% |
| Any Other Black Background | 5 | 40% | 7 | 14% | 8 | 75% | 8 | 50% | 2 | 0% | 10 | 60% |
| Mixed White and Asian | 2 | 50% | 3 | 67% | 2 | 50% | 1 | 0% | 5 | 80% | 4 | 0% |
| Mixed White and Black African | 1 | 0% | 1 | 100% | 2 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 0 | | 5 | 40% |
| Mixed White and Black Caribbean | 7 | 43% | 8 | 50% | 8 | 38% | 16 | 38% | 15 | 27% | 14 | 50% |
| Any Other Mixed Background | 3 | 33% | 6 | 50% | 12 | 33% | 10 | 50% | 10 | 40% | 13 | 54% |
| White British | 236 | 25% | 227 | 26% | 232 | 28% | 213 | 31% | 200 | 30% | 209 | 41% |
| White Irish | 1 | 0% | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 4 | 25% | 4 | 50% |
| Any Other White Background | 15 | 20% | 8 | 25% | 3 | 67% | 13 | 31% | 7 | 14% | 12 | 50% |
| Chinese | 0 | | 3 | 67% | 1 | 100% | 1 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 0 | |
| Gypsy/Roma | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 7 | 43% | 2 | 0% | 4 | 0% |
| Traveller of Irish Heritage | | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | 0% |
| Any Other Ethnic Group | 4 | 50% | 10 | 30% | 8 | 38% | 6 | 33% | 14 | 36% | 9 | 33% |
| Refused | 10 | 30% | 4 | 25% | 9 | 56% | 9 | 33% | 6 | 33% | 10 | 30% |
| Not Obtained | 5 | 40% | 3 | 67% | 5 | 0% | 3 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 100% |

Appendix 2

Reply to Question 4 – School Crossing Patrols

The current situation is as follows:

| School | Measures |
|--|--|
| Alexandra Infant | |
| Alexandra Junior | |
| Bickley Park | NO FURTHER ACTION. |
| Biggin Hill Primary | |
| Bishop Challoner | |
| Blenheim | NO FURTHER ACTION. |
| Burnt Ash | The proposal supported by Officers is to widen the refuge in Southover near the junction with Rangefield Road, remove footway parking for 10-15m on the north side of Southover and add coloured road surface at the refuge, to highlight to drivers that pedestrians may be crossing here. Also, to introduce SLOW road markings. |
| Churchfields | |
| Crofton Infant - <i>Towncourt Lane/Crofton Lane</i> | |
| Crofton Junior - <i>Towncourt Lane/Jersey Dr</i> | |
| Darrick Wood Junior | |
| Farnborough | |
| Gray's Farm | NO FURTHER ACTION. Pedestrian crossing already in place. |
| Green Street Green | |
| Hayes Primary | |
| Hawes Down Infant | NO FURTHER ACTION. |
| Hawes Down Junior | |
| Highfield Infant/Junior - <i>Hayes Lane site</i> | Add coloured road surface at the crossing points (both refuges) in Hayes Lane by the junction with Brabourne Rise, to highlight to drivers that pedestrians may be crossing here. Also, introduce school-time-only electronic warning signs of children crossing. |
| Highfield Infant/Junior - <i>South Hill Road site</i> | |
| Leesons Primary - <i>Chipperfield Road site</i> | NO FURTHER ACTION. Yellow backed school signs have been installed |
| Leesons Primary - <i>Leesons Hill site</i> | Create a new path away from the vehicle crossover (currently used by the Patrol) and install coloured road surfacing across Leesons Hill, to highlight to drivers that pedestrians may be crossing here |
| Marian Vian | |
| Midfield Primary | |
| Mottingham Primary | Introduce a staggered zebra crossing in Dunkery Road, near the junction with Ravensworth Road, utilising the existing refuge. |
| Oak Lodge | |
| Oaklands Primary | |
| Parish Primary | |
| Perry Hall | |
| Poverest | |
| Princes Plain | Introduce coloured road surfacing at the location where children cross, to highlight this to drivers. |
| Raglan | |
| Red Hill | NO FURTHER ACTION Zebra crossing already in place |
| Royston | |
| Scotts Park | |
| Southborough | Add coloured road surface at the crossing point, to highlight to drivers that pedestrians may be crossing here. |
| St Christopher's | |
| St James | NO FURTHER ACTION. Zebra crossing already in place. |
| St George's CE Primary - <i>TYNLEY RD/NIGHTINGALE LANE SITE</i> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| St George's CE Primary - TYLNEY ROAD/CANON ROAD | NO FURTHER ACTION. |
| St Mark's CE Primary - QUEEN ANNE AVE SITE: | |
| St Mark's CE Primary - WESTMORELAND RD SITE: | |
| St Mary's RC Primary | Consideration being given to introduction of coloured road surface at both refuges in Foxgrove Rd either side of the junction with Westgate Rd, to highlight to drivers that pedestrians may be crossing here, and replacing the current guardrail with visirail through which children can be seen. |
| St Philomena's RC Primary | NO FURTHER ACTION. Zebra crossing already installed. |
| Stewart Fleming – The Pioneer Academy | |
| Tubbenden Primary | |
| Unicorn | |
| Valley Primary | |
| Warren Road Primary | |
| Worsley Bridge | New mini-roundabout and zebra crossing proposed. |

Key:

| | |
|--|--|
| | = Schools with current SCP that <u>are</u> buying in SCP |
| | = Schools with current SCP that <u>are not</u> buying in SCP |

This chart is subject to change should further expressions of interest be received from those schools currently opting out.

Reply to Question 11 - APPENDIX 3 – PERMANENT EXCLUSIONS

PERMANENT EXCLUSIONS: AUTUMN TERM 2010 TO SPRING HALF-TERM 2011 AND AUTUMN TERM 2011 TO SPRING HALF-TERM 2012

| School | AUTUMN | | SPRING | | TOTALS | |
|--------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| | 10 11 | 11 12 | 10 11 | 11 12 | 10 11 | 11 12 |
| Beaverwood | | | | | | |
| Bishop Justus | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Bullers Wood | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Harris, Bromley | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Charles Darwin | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| Coopers | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Darrick Wood | | | | | | |
| Hayes | | | | | | |
| Harris, Beckenham | 2 | 7 | 2 | | 4 | 7 |
| Kemnal Technology | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Langley Park Boys | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Langley Park Girls | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Newstead Wood | | | | | | |
| St Olaves | | | | | | |
| The Priory | 3 | 5 | | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| Ravenswood | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Ravensbourne | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| | | | | | 16 | 37 |

** Please note the figure in the Spring term columns are all over the same period (only up to February half term to ensure a fair comparison

APPENDIX 4 – FIXED TERM EXCLUSIONS

| FTE 2010/2011 (Whole school year) | |
|--|------------|
| | Total |
| Beaverwood School for Girls | 21 |
| Bishop Justus Church of England School | 17 |
| Bullers Wood School | 17 |
| Harris, Bromley | 32 |
| Charles Darwin School | 36 |
| Coopers Technology College | 61 |
| Darrick Wood School | 5 |
| Hayes School | 29 |
| Harris, Beckenham | 90 |
| Kemnal Technology College | 45 |
| Langley Park School for Boys | 15 |
| Langley Park School for Girls | 14 |
| Ravens Wood School | 14 |
| St Olave's Grammar School | 4 |
| The Priory School | 0 |
| The Ravensbourne School | 36 |
| TOTAL | 436 |

| FTE's 2011 2012 (Autumn to Spring half-term) | |
|--|------------|
| | Total |
| Beaverwood School for Girls | 8 |
| Bishop Justus Church of England School | 0 |
| Bullers Wood School | 21 |
| Harris Bromley (Cator) | 0 |
| Charles Darwin School | 54 |
| Coopers Technology College | 0 |
| Darrick Wood School | 1 |
| Hayes School | 19 |
| Harris Beckenham (Kelsey) | 0 |
| Kemnal Technology College | 23 |
| Langley Park School for Boys | 16 |
| Langley Park School for Girls | 0 |
| Ravens Wood School | 13 |
| St Olave's Grammar School | 0 |
| The Priory School | 0 |
| The Ravensbourne School | 0 |
| TOTAL | 155 |