



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Lynn Hill  
[lynn.hill@bromley.gov.uk](mailto:lynn.hill@bromley.gov.uk)

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7700

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 08 March 2013

## COUNCIL

**Attached are the public and Councillor questions and answers from the meeting of the Council on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2013**

- 4 QUESTION BY A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC (Pages 3 - 4)**
- 6 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS (Pages 5 - 14)**
- 7 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Pages 15 - 26)**

*Copies of the documents referred to above can be obtained from*  
[www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings](http://www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings)

This page is left intentionally blank

## COUNCIL MEETING

27<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2013

### ORAL QUESTION FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC

**From Mr Martin Curry of Councillor Colin Smith, Portfolio Holder for the Environment**

*(Mr Curry had originally addressed his question to the Leader of the Council who had asked the Portfolio Holder responsible for the service to respond on his behalf.)*

#### **Question - Public Toilets - The Walnuts**

In view of the number of complaints posted on FixMyStreet about the condition of the Male and Female public toilets next to Orpington Library, will the Leader take action to ensure that these facilities are brought up to a decent standard?

#### **Reply:**

The Portfolio Holder replied that until further notice, these toilets would continue to be cleaned to a good standard four times a day, including at weekends. The road sweeper would also call in every day when passing to remove any paper etc from the floor as well.

It was to be hoped, that following on from the excellent news that the Orpington BID project had proved successful, additional measures might also prove possible locally, to help arrest and deter the disgusting feral behaviour of the small subset of visitors to Orpington Town Centre who sully these amenities from time to time, but that question remained ongoing at present.

#### **Supplementary Question:**

Mr Curry stated that given the good news about the BID and the proposal for the toilets to be taken over at some point by the business organisation – there was still quite a lot of structural work that needed to be dealt with. He mentioned accumulated dust on the grilles, missing grilles that needed to be replaced, the health and safety problem of a broken drain cover and the replacement of tiles in the gents. He recognised that the cleaning had improved. However, he asked if the structural problems could be addressed with in terms of safety and hygiene before they were handed over.

#### **Reply:**

Councillor Smith responded that if there were health and safety issues involved he asked Mr Curry to advise the Department and they would be dealt

with immediately. So far as any general upgrade to the toilets was concerned there were no plans to do that at this time.

-----

## COUNCIL MEETING

27th FEBRUARY 2013

### ORAL QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

#### 1. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Leader of the Council

What is the latest position with Old Flo?

#### Reply:

The Council has asserted its claim to ownership of Old Flo in correspondence with Tower Hamlets and officers are investigating the history of the statue including the statutory background to the transfer of assets from the LCC and GLC with a view to pursuing the matter further as and when appropriate.

#### Supplementary Question:

Cllr Fookes asked when Members would be informed of what was going on and thought it was symptomatic of this Council in terms of lack of transparency when the first Members heard about the situation was through a television interview.

#### Reply:

The Leader did not agree and said that it was our belief that Old Flo was left to the people of London and we were simply trying to stand up for the people of London and not allow it to be sold off in a cheap way by Tower Hamlets. He felt rather than be criticised the Council's stance should be applauded.

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

If he will make a statement about the relative funding for Bromley in comparison with other London Boroughs for 2013-4 and if he will publish in table format the information he has for each London Borough for 2013-4 financial year for;

- i) The grant provided by central government;
- ii) The average grant per head of population;
- iii) The proposed council tax in Band D.

#### Reply:

The Leader commented that this question went to the heart of the situation as to why Bromley had been lobbying the Government so hard for so long. He stated that this Borough had been significantly underfunded for far too long. It received a headline figure of £264.24p per head of population against an outer London average of £439.62. In crude terms if Bromley were to receive

that same amount per head of population it would be in receipt of an additional £56m worth of Government grant. Going one step further if Bromley were compared to the so called outer London Borough of Newham and received the same amount of funding per head of population then it would be in receipt of an additional staggering £159m of direct government grant. Councillor Carr advised that the tabulated information requested by Councillor Bennett had been circulated around the Chamber (Appendix 1).

**Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Bennett was grateful for the information and hoped that it would be circulated widely including to the Local Government site on Conservative Home that did not appear to understand the funding of local government. He asked the Leader to comment on why the only London Borough that received less than Bromley by about £10 per head of population, which was Richmond, charged £250 a year more in Council Tax.

**Reply:**

Councillor Carr thanked Councillor Bennett for his observation. He commented that it was something this Council was very conscious of and served to highlight the quirkiness and unfairness of the current system. Members would be aware of the changes to the way the Council would be funded in the future which the Leader would enlarge on later in the meeting. However, Councillor Carr felt it did serve to show that Bromley had led the way in efficiency and the way it delivers its services for it to be able to deliver high quality services at a Council Tax level D of some £200 below Richmond.

**Further Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Getgood asked whether the Leader would agree to recognise the great differences between some of these Boroughs in terms of the needs they had to meet and give some credit to Richmond in putting services before ideology.

**Reply:**

Councillor Carr responded that he considered Bromley was able to do both. There were ways to increase revenue and an increase in Council Tax was one of these. However, again as last year this administration had sought to find and identify many different ways of not just reducing the costs per head but also increasing the revenue which he would speak about later on in the meeting. The Leader advised that last week he had been able to raise these very issues with Mr Pickles, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. Councillor Carr said that he was not inferring that Bromley had the same level of needs as somewhere like Tower Hamlets, Lambeth or Lewisham but the demographics of the Borough had been ignored for too long. Bromley had an aging population with more people living into old age and the consequent increases in dementia cases as well as those with physical and learning disabilities and increases in the numbers of young

children who were statemented. Also as the largest London Borough geographically there were the inherent costs of maintenance in respect of roads and pathways which had for too long been ignored and he felt it was time the government of whatever persuasion recognised these facts.

**3. From Councillor Katherine Bance MBE of the Portfolio Holder for Education (*in the absence of Councillor Wells, the Executive Assistant for Education responded*)**

With so many services now provided by Contractors in Bromley, particularly in education, how does the Council intend to manage the risks and monitor the impacts and where failing to deliver how will contracts be renegotiated?

**Reply:**

Councillor Tunnicliffe advised that where a school buys a service from a contractor, it was for the school to monitor the contract and ensure compliance.

Where the Education Service was buying the services of a contractor, then responsibility lay with the Council and ultimately the Councillors. Any failure to comply with a contract let by LBB in Education was subject to the conditions set out in the contract and could ultimately be enforced by the courts and the contract could be terminated if not complied with.

**Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Bance felt that this might work very well for road sweeping and bins but questioned whether what was in place was good enough and fast enough for dealing with special educational needs children. She considered they needed immediate intervention once a service was found below standard.

**Reply:**

Councillor Tunnicliffe responded that with regard to special needs the Education Division would be commissioning packages of school improvement support delivered by School Improvement Officers.

Any Bromley school that was categorised as a high priority because it was under-performing, whether that was in special educational needs or not, would be allocated one of those School Improvement Officers (SIO) who would be responsible for driving forward the school's action plan of improvement.

The impact of this work would be monitored by the Assistant Director Education through:

- regular 'challenge' meetings between the local authority, the school and the SIO;

- school performance data analysis by the local authority's research and statistics team;
- local authority termly scrutiny meetings with SIOs; and
- feedback from Ofsted monitoring reports on the school.

**4. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Chairman of the Development Control Committee**

What was the cost to the council of dealing with the application to register land to the rear of 86 to 94 High Street, Beckenham as a town green?

**Reply:**

The Chairman replied that the cost of the barrister for all of the work involved in the application to register land to the rear of High Street, Beckenham as a Town Green including a pre inquiry site visit, pre inquiry consideration including directions for the parties, chairing the inquiry and preparing her report amounted to £8855. There was also an additional cost in terms of officer time and for the provision of accommodation for the inquiry but this was dealt with within existing budgets.

**Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Fookes responded that given the cost of The Glades redevelopment where an amount of £40,000 was referred to he thought the amount just given was remarkably low. However, he questioned whether in reality that money and other money spent on Town Greens would be better spent elsewhere by the Council.

**Reply:**

Councillor Dean explained that the Council was the statutory authority for Commons and Town and Village Greens and had to meet the costs of discharging this responsibility. A resident had a statutory right to apply for land in the Borough to be registered as a Town Green if they considered the legal test for registration had been met. In cases such as this where there were disputed factual matters it was acknowledged good practice to convene a non statutory public inquiry. All parties through the inquiry were given a full opportunity to make their case and Members had the benefit of the Barrister's findings on the factual matters. Members also had specialist advice as to the application of these findings to the law relating to Town Greens. The Council by convening the inquiry determined the application in a transparent way that was fair to the parties and in accordance with its legal responsibilities. In short Councillor Dean considered the Council was acting in favour of local residents.



**5. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder for Resources**

Whether in advance of the move to the use of tablets by all members from 2014, he will authorise tablets for those members willing to switch over immediately?

**Reply:**

**The Portfolio Holder replied that the New Technology Working Group was currently looking at the use of tablets, and he awaited their conclusions with interest, but he agreed that he would welcome other Members using this technology.**

**Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Bennett commented that he noticed that the Portfolio Holder was using a tablet as were Councillors Fortune and Reddin. He asked whether it was time that those Members who were keen to stop having enormous amounts of paper delivered to their homes by van could move over quickly to using tablets. He also felt that any objections made about security by some Officers should be overcome as quickly as possible so it could happen.

**Reply:**

Councillor Arthur agreed that efforts should be made to press ahead. He commented that the new technology was working well in the Committee rooms and the Chamber which showed that this was being taken seriously. The Portfolio Holder advised that part of the pilot scheme now being operated was to determine which would be the most appropriate tablet to be used.

**Further Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Papworth welcomed the New Technology Working Party's proposals and asked the Portfolio Holder whether he would acknowledge that some of the holdup was due to certain Members being reluctant to change and also that the savings resulting from this only occurred if all Members embraced it. If half a dozen Councillors continued to want papers delivered to their homes then there still would be the need to employ the staff to do it. Councillor Papworth asked what was going to be done to ensure that all Members came up to speed and embraced the new technology.

**Reply:**

The Portfolio Holder advised that he was well aware that some Members needed help to embrace the new technology. It had already been agreed that as from 2014 the new Council Members would be equipped with this new technology and would move away from using so much paper. There was

progress and he took the point that some Members felt it could be accelerated but it would be coming in a year's time universally across the Council.

**Further supplementary question:**

Councillor Fawthrop commented that he thought that Councillor Bennett's question and the answers given implied that this was a growth item which he would like confirmed.

**6. From Councillor Katherine Bance of the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation**

The former Penge Urban District Town Hall building is of historic value and interest in Penge can the portfolio holder give an assurance that it will not be demolished.

**Reply:**

The Portfolio Holder stated that as was agreed at the last Executive meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup> February 2013, officers would be bringing a further report back to a future meeting of the Executive setting out the disposal strategy for Anerley Town Hall. Officers were currently exploring a number of options which did not include demolition and these discussions were currently on going. The outcome of a consultants report due at the end of February would further inform those discussions and flowing from this, officers would prepare a further report to submit to Members.

**Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Bance asked if the Portfolio Holder could confirm whether as part of those options consideration could be given to transferring the building to a voluntary not for profit making organisation so that it remained a community asset.

**Reply:**

Councillor Morgan responded that this was something being looked at.

**Further Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Papworth asked if the pH could confirm that there were 3 priorities for Anerley Town Hall – i) preserving the locally listed building; ii) preserving the use of the Public Halls and iii) preserving some form of Library service.

**Reply:**

The Portfolio Holder said he agreed but that in respect of the first option we had to sure that it was economically viable.

**7. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Chairman of the General Purposes and Licensing Committee**

What was the cost to taxpayers of writing to all residents who have a postal vote to confirm that they still need it?

**Reply:**

The Chairman commented that there might be a jinx over Councillor Fookes' questions of him and referred to outcome of the last one in July 2006. In response to tonight's question Councillor Owen stated that the Council had certainly not written to all residents who had a postal vote in the Borough.

**Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Fookes stated that he had received a letter and knew of others who had also and that this had come from other Boroughs. He wondered about the cost of such an exercise in the current situation which he thought was a waste of taxpayers' money.

The Mayor queried whether this was a question and considered it more of a statement. On being asked by Councillor Fookes as to whether he felt Councillor Owens initial response had been a proper answer the Mayor considered that it had been.

**8. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Chairman of the General Purposes and Licensing Committee**

With the exception of union representatives acting in their union capacity; what is the written policy regarding members of staff expressing orally or in writing their personal political opinions whilst working in their capacity as a member of staff and what sanctions are available to deal with such incidents?

**Reply:**

The Chairman said that he understood this question had arisen because a Council employee had appeared on YouTube and made certain comments which local taxpayers had taken objection to. He considered it was a general warning to Members and Officers about the use of social media and what it could lead to. Councillor Owen advised that there was no written policy relating to this but he draw attention to Appendix 2 of the Disciplinary Procedure which listed the type of misconduct warranting formal disciplinary action. There were a number of items under the 'gross misconduct' heading of which included a serious act of insubordination but cautioned that each case would be dealt with on its merits.

Councillor Owen then referred to 2 interesting cases one was Redfern v Circo which went to the European Court; the second was Smith v Trafford Housing

Trust and outlined what they involved and felt this supported the reasons for being cautious about writing very specific procedures in such cases.

**Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Bennett replied that he was aware of both those cases and did not consider they related to the issues behind his question. He asked if the Chairman would agree that in the forthcoming Communications Policy that was currently under preparation there should be included a section advising staff that they should not when they were engaged on Council business and using the Council name indulge in their own personal political opinions which may be contrary to the policies of the Council.

**Reply:**

Councillor Owen advised that he had discussed this with the Assistant Chief Executive for Human Resources, Mr Obazuaye, and they were happy to look at this and decide whether something should be put in writing but again stressed the need for caution.

Bromley's allocation from the local government finance settlement was £84,130k providing funding of £264.25 per head of population. This is the 2nd lowest level of Government funding per head in London and compares to an Outer London Average of £439.62 and a London average of £571.13.

Details of the Start Up Funding Assessment, other Government Grants and Draft Council Tax Levels (Band 'D' Equivalent, excluding GLA) are shown in the table below:

	Start up Funding Assessment  (note 1) £'000	Start up Funding (per head of population)  £	Other Government Grants (provisional)  (note 2) £'000	Other Government Grants (per head of population)  £	DRAFT Council Tax Band 'D' (excluding GLA) (note 3) £
<b>OUTER LONDON BOROUGHS</b>					
Barking and Dagenham	126,170	643.42	19,186	97.84	1016.40
Barnet	128,427	346.46	28,253	76.22	1113.20
Bexley	80,147	337.04	12,120	50.97	1128.59
Brent	193,132	610.01	29,489	93.14	1058.94
<b>Bromley</b>	<b>84,130</b>	<b>264.25</b>	<b>20,273</b>	<b>63.68</b>	<b>1010.07</b>
Croydon	161,913	436.42	29,883	80.55	1171.39
Ealing	168,606	485.30	32,485	93.50	1059.93
Enfield	162,175	499.35	23,505	72.37	1100.34
Haringey	179,286	682.98	26,299	100.18	1184.32
Harrow	86,759	350.12	15,203	61.35	1210.28
Havering	75,568	310.11	14,066	57.72	1195.18
Hillingdon	103,259	361.95	24,917	87.34	1112.93
Hounslow	107,807	407.79	21,671	81.97	1085.20
Kingston-upon-Thames	48,250	284.94	13,509	79.78	1379.65
Merton	78,636	373.84	14,613	69.47	1106.56
Newham	243,753	765.63	34,416	108.10	945.63
Redbridge	116,858	398.10	17,111	58.29	1095.53
Richmond-upon-Thames	49,362	255.09	12,375	63.95	1287.39
Sutton	79,634	404.37	14,888	75.60	* 1140.89
Waltham Forest	153,411	575.28	18,630	69.86	1152.21
Outer London Average		439.62		77.09	1070.69
<b>INNER LONDON BOROUGHS</b>					
Camden	200,054	865.48	35,629	154.14	1021.77
Greenwich	182,561	705.72	31,023	119.92	981.04
Hackney	242,804	963.80	45,270	179.70	* 998.45
Hammersmith and Fulham	135,261	739.15	26,934	147.18	757.90
Islington	186,425	866.52	39,296	182.65	961.87
Kensington and Chelsea	115,304	725.13	25,036	157.45	782.58
Lambeth	243,879	784.15	39,144	125.86	925.29
Lewisham	208,072	726.68	30,561	106.73	1060.35
Southwark	253,372	833.85	36,485	120.07	912.14
Tower Hamlets	243,865	902.33	54,281	200.85	885.52
Wandsworth	161,622	512.81	35,598	112.95	388.54
Westminster	197,640	858.18	41,213	178.95	378.01
Inner London Average		790.32		148.87	754.58
London Average		571.13		104.01	952.15

Notes:

(1) Start up Funding Assessment, as announced in the local government finance settlement. Based on previous method of formula funding and the rolling in of some additional specific grants. Start up Funding is split between Revenue Support Grant (RSG), the local share of retained business rates and related "top-up" payment under the new Business Rates Retention Scheme.

(2) Provisional figures as published by the CLG relating to a number of specific grants outside of the Start up Funding Assessment. These grants include funding for Public Health, New Homes Bonus, Housing Benefit Subsidy Administration and a number of smaller grants. There are also a range of other specific grants awarded throughout the year and notified separately to individual authorities for which the information is not included in the CLG published figures.

(3) Provisional draft Band 'D' Council Tax (excluding GLA Precept) based on latest available information. Figures for Sutton and Hackney are as per 2012/13 as information is not yet available relating to 2013/14.

## COUNCIL MEETING

27th FEBRUARY 2013

### WRITTEN QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

#### 1. From Councillor Tom Papworth of the Leader of the Council

To ask the Leader to provide the following information:

A breakdown of the number of redundancies in the council broken down by year, starting in 2010/2011, and by department.

What services have been brought back in house and how many jobs did this create;

Details of redundancies by contractors which provide services in the borough;

The amount of money the council/agencies/contractors have spent on redundancy payments during the same time, broken down the same way.

The highest redundancy payment the Council or its agencies paid, and which department/service this member of staff worked for.

#### **Reply:**

[Please see attached Appendix A.](#)

#### 2. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Chairman of the General Purposes and Licensing Committee

Can he list the canvass returns from the Electoral Registration Office in percentages from each of the electoral wards in the borough for this year and last year?

#### **Reply:**

[Canvass Return Statistics 2012](#)

Ward	Total Properties	Responses received	Percentage
Bromley Common and Keston	6692	6581	98.3
Biggin Hill	4045	3993	98.7
Bickley	6261	6097	97.4
Bromley Town	7964	7713	96.8

Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	5934	5842	98.4
Copers Cope	8487	8187	96.5
Cray Valley East	6943	6713	96.7
Chislehurst	6464	6352	98.3
Clock House	7187	7010	97.5
Crystal Palace	6492	6102	94.0
Cray Valley West	6932	6772	97.7
Darwin	2142	2105	98.3
Farnborough and Crofton	6359	6290	98.9
Hayes and Coney Hall	6306	6262	99.3
Kelsey and Eden Park	6550	6451	98.5
Mottingham	4520	4390	97.1
Orpington	6535	6427	98.3
Penge	8001	7659	95.7
Plaistow and Sundridge	6890	6642	96.4
Petts Wood	5582	5546	99.4
Shortlands	4328	4227	97.6
West Wickham	5917	5853	98.9

[Canvass Return Statistic 2011](#)

Ward	Total Properties	Responses received	Percentage
Bromley Common and Keston	6618	6444	97.4
Biggin Hill	4045	4000	98.8
Bickley	6243	6144	98.4
Bromley Town	7957	7588	95.4
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	5939	5893	99.2
Copers Cope	8472	8128	95.9
Cray Valley East	6942	6790	97.8
Chislehurst	6452	6304	97.7
Clock House	7192	6960	97.0
Crystal Palace	6452	5938	92.0
Cray Valley West	6932	6756	97.5
Darwin	2139	2086	97.5
Farnborough and Crofton	6362	6295	98.9
Hayes and Coney Hall	6307	6232	98.8
Kelsey and Eden Park	6554	6420	98.0



Mottingham	4519	4319	95.6
Orpington	6517	6331	97.1
Penge	7997	7557	94.5
Plaistow and Sundridge	6934	6654	96.0
Petts Wood	5581	5518	98.9
Shortlands	4330	4209	97.2
West Wickham	5921	5853	98.9

### **3. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Resources**

Can he list the percentages of residents in each ward of the borough who are online?

#### **Reply**

The percentage of residents online is not a statistic that we have freely available at ward level. The Office for National Statistics publishes regular statistical bulletins about levels of internet access, but this is derived from their Opinions and Lifestyles Survey, and is based on households not individuals. As it is based on a sample it is not possible to break the data down to ward level.

Available online access is used as a factor in commercial tools like Acorn or Experian to produce their geo-demographic profiling. Licences to access this data run into several thousand pounds and although these rankings are available down to postcode it is suspected the online access element would be derived from sample surveys and this particular data set might be difficult to disaggregate from the overall demographic ranking of an area.

The Council had discussions with a research company about 3 years ago who were able to produce this sort of data, but at the time the cost was in the region of £10k for a detailed report and it was not considered economical to proceed.

### **4. From Councillor Peter Fookes of the Portfolio Holder for Resources**

How many Council buildings are not DDA compliant?

#### **Reply:**

DDA audits have been carried out on all operational buildings and based on the audit findings, physical adaptations have been made to ensure that buildings open to the public are DDA compliant.

DDA audits have also been carried out at schools. Responsibility for DDA compliance at schools depends on the type of school. For those schools where the authority has responsibility, works have been carried out over time and continue to be carried out to improve accessibility.

All new capital build schemes are designed with full accessibility requirements built into the brief.

**5. From Councillor Russell Mellor of the Leader of the Council**

Further to my question to Council on the 21<sup>st</sup> January 2013 can you provide the figures for the MG grades of staff with the relevant numbers in each grade for the two Civic years, 2011/2012 and 2012/2013 together with the salary scales.

**Reply:**

As at 31 March 2011*		
Grade	Headcount	FTE
MB	6.00	6.00
MG1	3.00	3.00
MG2	12.00	11.58
MG3	16.00	16.00
MG4	23.00	23.00
MG5	54.00	53.80
MG6	122.00	118.75
<b>Total</b>	<b>236.00</b>	<b>232.13</b>

As at 31 March 2012*		
Grade	Headcount	FTE
MB	5.00	5.00
MG1	3.00	3.00
MG2	9.00	9.00
MG3	13.00	12.60
MG4	19.00	18.90
MG5	53.00	52.80
MG6	114.00	110.86
<b>Total</b>	<b>216.00</b>	<b>212.16</b>

As at 31 January 2013**		
Grade	Headcount	FTE
MB	5	5.00
MG1	2	2.00
MG2	8	8.00
MG3	11	10.80
MG4	19	18.80
MG5	48	47.80
MG6	97	95.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>187.48</b>

\*Headcount and FTE must be calculated as at a specific date. Therefore dates have been selected from the beginning and end of the respective years.

\*\*As we are not at the end of the 2012/2013 Civic Year the figures were calculated as at the 31 January 2013 as it is the end of the last full calendar month.

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

Further to my question on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2007, how many sq feet of additional office accommodation have been purchased or leased since that date and how many sq feet have been sold or relinquished?

**Reply:**

<b><u>Acquired</u></b>	
Burnhill Business Centre	891ft <sup>2</sup> (short term relocation to allow refurbishment works to permanent accommodation)

<b><u>Sold/ Relinquished</u></b>	
Burnhill Business Centre	891ft <sup>2</sup> (lease surrendered)
1906 Building, Tweedy Road (Old Town Hall)	16,930 ft <sup>2</sup> (under offer)
1939 Building, Widmore Road (Exchequer House)	20,703 ft <sup>2</sup> (under offer)
Ann Springman Hall	20,602 ft <sup>2</sup> (vacated and future options under consideration)
Joseph Lancaster Hall	21,356ft <sup>2</sup> (vacated and future options under consideration)
North Lodge	969 ft <sup>2</sup> (vacated and future options under consideration)
The Walnuts Offices	5027 ft <sup>2</sup> (converted to library use [new Orpington Library] during recent refurbishment works)

**7. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Portfolio Holder for Resources**

Further to my question on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2008 if he will provide the following information for each of the subsequent years 2008-9 to 2012-13;

- i) The total kWh Gas consumption and;
- ii) The total unit electricity consumption;
- iii) The total cost for each category?

**Reply:**

Attached (Appendix B) is the information requested which relates to Bromley Civic Centre. The information is extracted from our energy supplier's software system. This reporting system has been in use for the last two years and therefore the information is not based on the same criteria that were used in compiling the response in 2008.

**8. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP of the Chairman of the General Purposes and Licensing Committee**

What is the Council's policy in respect of staff found guilty of a criminal offence either by way of conviction or admission by way of police caution?

**Reply:**

The council gives individual consideration to each case of staff found guilty of a criminal offence and takes any appropriate action.

**9. From Councillor Katherine Bance MBE of the Portfolio Holder for Care Services**

Can the Portfolio Holder advise if there any services currently provided at Beckenham Beacon that will not be provided by the new Clinical Commissioning Group at Beckenham Beacon.

**Reply:**

The future use of Beckenham Beacon is to be determined following the changes to healthcare locally resulting from both the implementation of the Report of the Trust's Special Administrator (TSA) into the failure of the South London Healthcare Trust, and the new role of the Clinical Commissioning Group as it succeeds the local PCT. Although the Council will certainly have an opportunity to make the wishes of residents known, service delivery is primarily a matter for the health economy. I would anticipate that both the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Care PDS, acting in its Statutory health scrutiny role, will be able to inform this debate.

**10. From Councillor Katherine Bance MBE of the Portfolio Holder for Education**

Would the portfolio holder provide a list of Bromley schools and the outcomes of their recent Ofsted since new inspection regime introduced in Sept 2012.

**Reply:**

School	New Ofsted Framework	Ofsted Judgements		
		Recent		Previous
Alexandra Infant		Outstanding	24/05/2011	Good
Alexandra Junior	√	Good	01/11/2012	Satisfactory
Bickley Primary		Good	20/05/2009	Good
Blenheim Primary	√	Requires Improvement	29/11/2012	Satisfactory
Bromley Road Infant		Satisfactory	29/02/2012	Satisfactory
Burnt Ash Primary		Satisfactory	18/01/2012	Good
Castlecombe Primary		Good	15/11/2011	Good
Chelsfield Primary		Good	11/09/2011	Good
Chislehurst Primary		Good	26/03/2009	Good
Churchfields Primary		Satisfactory	03/10/2011	Good
Clare House Primary		Good	10/05/2012	Satisfactory

School	New Ofsted Framework	Ofsted Judgements		
		Ofsted Judgement	Date	Overall Rating
Cudham Primary		IAL - 29.1.13 - school will not be re-inspected any earlier than summer 2014	18/11/2009	Good
Darrick Wood Junior	√	Good	04/10/2012	Satisfactory
Dorset Road Infant		Good	30/03/2011	Good
Downe Primary		Good	18/10/2011	Good
Edgebury Primary		Outstanding	27/01/2009	Good
Farnborough Primary	√	Outstanding	27/11/2012	Good
Gray's Farm Primary		Special Measures	27/06/2012	Satisfactory
Hawes Down Infant		Good	12/02/2009	Good
Hawes Down Junior	√	Requires Improvement	10/01/2013	Good
Highfields Infant		Outstanding	21/01/2008	Good
Highfield Junior		Outstanding	21/01/2009	Good
Holy Innocents Primary		Satisfactory	03/11/2011	Good
James Dixon Primary	√	Good	13/02/2013	Satisfactory
Keston Primary		Outstanding	03/06/2009	Good
Leesons Primary		Good	02/02/2012	Satisfactory
Malcolm Primary	√	Special Measures	09/10/2012	Satisfactory
Manor Oak Primary	√	Good	07/02/2013	Satisfactory
Marian Vian Primary		Good	21/06/2012	Outstanding
Mead Road Infant		Outstanding	05/03/2009	Outstanding
Midfield Primary		Good	10/11/2010	Satisfactory
Mottingham Primary		Good	12/05/2011	Satisfactory
Oak Lodge Primary		Satisfactory	15/11/2011	Good
Oaklands Primary		Good	09/12/2010	N/A
Parish Primary		Outstanding	03/11/2011	Good
Perry Hall Primary		Outstanding	22/11/2011	Good
Poverest Primary	√	Requires Improvement	17/01/2013	Satisfactory

#### 11. From Councillor Katherine Bance MBE of the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Can you advise what the future is for the former CAB office in Snowdon Close, Penge.

#### Reply:

As agreed by the Executive in December 2011, the CAB is implementing new outreach services at various locations in Penge from 4<sup>th</sup> March 2013. Consideration is being given to potential future uses for the building at Snowdon Close, Penge and I am expecting a report to be submitted to me early in the spring setting out options for the future.

**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 20 non-householder and 16 householder meetings between 15<sup>th</sup> January and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2013.

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

**APPENDIX A**

**Written Question by Councillor Tom Papworth - Council Meeting 27 February 2013  
Redundancies from 1 April 2010 to 31 January 2013 By Year and By Department**

**2010 - 2011 By Department**

<b>Dept</b>	<b>No of Redundancies</b>	<b>Redundancy Costs</b>
CEX	2	8,769.00
Education & Care Services	38	197,949.51
Environment	2	48,028.62
Renewal and Recreation	1	27,661.53
Resources	6	83,454.56
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>365,863.22</b>

**Highest Payment 2010-11**

The highest redundancy payment for 2010/11 cannot be disclosed pursuant to the Data Protection principle and relevant section of the Freedom of Information Act. This is because the information relates to a junior officer.

**2011-2012 By Department**

<b>Dept</b>	<b>No of Redundancies</b>	<b>Redundancy Costs</b>
CEX	6	35,214.60
Education & Care Services	75	736,442.98
Environment	8	97,984.83
Renewal and Recreation	24	245,883.40
Resources	12	199,630.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>1,315,155.88</b>

**Highest Payment 2011 - 2012**

The highest redundancy payment – circa £72k (Resources Dept)

**2012-13 By Department (to 31 Jan 2013)**

<b>Dept</b>	<b>No of Redundancies</b>	<b>Redundancy Costs</b>
CEX	7	144,912.09
Education & Care Services	34	349,369.89
Environment	2	42,638.51
Renewal and Recreation	8	198,482.75
Resources	16	169,804.68
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>905,207.92</b>

**Highest Payment 2012 - 31 Jan 2013**

The highest redundancy payment – circa £74k (Education and Care Services Dept)

<b>Total Redundancies</b>	<b>241</b>
<b>Total Redundancy Costs</b>	<b>2,586,227.02</b>

**The Council does not hold information regarding redundancy payments by third party contractors.  
The Council has not brought services in house since 2010/11**

This page is left intentionally blank



## Bromley Civic Centre - Total Site Energy Consumption for Gas and Electricity

APPENDIX B

	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	Elec		Gas		Elec		Gas		Elec		Gas	
	Units (kWh)	Cost	Units (kWh)	Cost	Units (kWh)	Cost	Units (kWh)	Cost	Units (kWh)	Cost	Units (kWh)	Cost
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,376,927</b>	<b>£289,606.40</b>	<b>3,693,673</b>	<b>£78,150.84</b>	<b>3,142,029</b>	<b>£318,144.76</b>	<b>2,824,671</b>	<b>£60,566.06</b>	<b>3,213,564</b>	<b>£261,082.97</b>	<b>2,698,396</b>	<b>£71,897.23</b>

	2011-2012				2012-2013 incomplete year to date			
	Elec		Gas		Elec		Gas	
	Units (kWh)	Cost	Units (kWh)	Cost	Units (kWh)	Cost	Units (kWh)	Cost
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,033,335</b>	<b>£247,666.14</b>	<b>1,716,947</b>	<b>£55,877.69</b>	<b>2,160,824</b>	<b>£185,917.34</b>	<b>349,251</b>	<b>£10,998.59</b>

This page is left intentionally blank