



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Graham Walton
graham.walton@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7743

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 30 April 2014

COUNCIL

14 April 2014

**The answers to questions received for the Council meeting
on 14th April 2014 are set out in the attached documents**

- 5 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Pages 3 - 8)**
- 6 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Pages 9 - 18)**
- 7 WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Pages 19 - 54)**

Copies of the documents referred to above can be obtained from
www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

14th APRIL 2014

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(1) From John D Bailey, UK Independence Party Candidate for the Bromley Common & Keston Ward, to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Can the Council say how many empty residential properties, and how many empty commercial properties there are in the Borough of Bromley at this time? Have the Council any plans to fine property owners (as in Islington) who allow properties to remain empty beyond say, three months?

Reply:

As at the 7 April 2014, the Authority's Council Tax records indicate 2,379 residential properties as being empty, 576 of which are designated as second homes. Business Rates records show 752 commercial properties as being empty.

From the 1 April 2013 local authorities were empowered to decide the level of council tax discount to be awarded on classes of property where the rate was previously set nationally.

At the 28 November 2012 meeting of the Executive, Members decided the discount to be applied in respect of second homes and empty homes should be set at 0%.

The changes to Council Tax effective from April 2013 also allowed local authorities to impose an empty homes premium once a property had been empty for 2 years. In respect of these properties, Council Tax liability could be set at 150%. The meeting of the 28th November decided that a premium should not be applied and there are no plans for this to be introduced in the future.

Local Authorities do not possess similar powers in respect of commercial properties. However, the Authority has commenced administering the Governments "reoccupation relief" a national scheme which came into effect on the 01 April 2014. The relief applies to ratepayers moving into properties previously used for retail purposes but empty for 12 months or more immediately prior to their occupation. Under this scheme the relief available for each property is 50% of the business rates liability for a period of up to 18 months.

(2) From Martin Curry to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Some time ago, the pedestrian crossing markings were removed from Juglans Rd. The PHYSICAL crossing features, gap in barrier and embossed paving stones were NOT removed. The entrance to Juglans road is much wider than the road itself so cars sweep in, in many cases ignoring the road markings. This is a danger to pedestrians. Will you please either restore the crossing and/or ADD a traffic island to the middle of the crossing?"

Reply:

I am aware that the junction has been investigated previously following requests for a central traffic island or for a crossing to be restored.

The Traffic Engineering team have however reiterated once again that they hold concerns regarding the impact either might have on larger vehicles turning in and out of this junction.

Whilst the mouth of the junction is quite wide, visibility is good for drivers and pedestrians. The appropriate tactile paving is provided at the informal crossing point and the road markings and surfacing are clear.

The view is therefore maintained that no alterations are required at this time, albeit the situation will continue to be closely monitored in light of your expressed concerns.

(3) From Michael McHale to the Resources Portfolio Holder

The Council publishes "A list of categories of Council Tax discounts and exemptions" on it's own web site of which item T refers to an "unoccupied dwelling which forms part of a property" is entitled to exemption. Why has this exemption not be granted to 5 Elm Grove, Orpington?

Reply:

The information contained on the Authority's web site is a summary as to when discounts and exemptions might apply. In many cases the rules and requirements pertaining to the particular discount/exemption are more complex than the summary indicates and further guidance is required.

In respect of the property referred to in the question, Mr McHale has now been forwarded notification that a "Class T" exemption has been applied.

(4) From Colin Willetts, Governor, Kemnal Technology College to the Leader of the Council

Dear Leader, thank you for your reply 2/4/14, if the owner of the land incorporating the Waste4Fuel transfer station were to offer the land 'gratis' to the Council/EA on the understanding the site would be cleared by either/both EA/LBB would the Council accept this offer?

Reply:

Thank you Mr Willetts for your question.

Firstly, I would say that there is nobody, for the sake of local residents, who wants to see this sorry situation resolved more than me.

Secondly, I again applaud the resolve of local ward councillors, across the political divide, who have been working tirelessly on behalf of residents without choosing to make this a political issue.

And finally with regard to your hypothetical question I am afraid it would be complete madness for the Council to disclose its position ahead of any negotiations with a third party, suffice it to say we are determined to bring this saga to a successful and speedy conclusion.

(5) From Angela Wilkins, Crystal Palace Ward resident, to the Leader of the Council

(As residents of Crystal Palace ward, we welcome the potential of investment that might bring jobs and economic regeneration to the north of the Borough. We feel however that, given the potential scale of the proposals from ZhongRong Group, the public consultations undertaken to date have failed both in terms of their penetration of the local community and in the very scant level of information provided to the public.)

What safeguards are Bromley Council proposing to ensure that any disposal of land at Crystal Palace Park is genuinely in the public interest, is at a true market rate, and via a process that is transparent and fully compliant with current legislation?

Reply:

The Council has a duty under Section 123 of the 1972 Local Government Act to secure the best consideration reasonably obtainable when it disposes of land (other than on a lease of 7 years or less) unless it has the benefit of an express or general consent of the Secretary of State. In the case of the proposals for Crystal Palace, the Council has appointed a valuation expert to undertake the valuations required to ensure that this obligation is met. The consultant was appointed following a selection process to ensure that he has the relevant expertise and experience to undertake this commission. The Council has also sought the advice of Leading Counsel to ensure that it is following the correct process in all its dealings. Authority to enter into any binding agreements with the prospective developer will have to be sought from Council Members and will therefore be reported to a public meeting in the normal way although some elements of the transaction will be commercially sensitive and will therefore be included in a Part II report. If acceptable terms can be agreed with the prospective developer and if Council Members give authority to proceed, the Council's position will be safeguarded through the legal documentation. The Council has appointed suitably experienced legal advisors to provide advice in the preparation of the necessary documentation.

(6) From Angela Wilkins, Crystal Palace Ward resident, to the Leader of the Council

What plans are in place for a true and comprehensive public consultation once the developer's plans are more developed and informed?

Reply:

Where a proposal is of a very large scale I would generally encourage developers to carry out public consultation at an early and formative stage.

In my view, the developer needs to consult with the local community before submitting formal planning or other applications.

The statutory consultation and publicity requirements of the planning process will be met upon receipt of a planning application.

(7) From Richard Williams, Crystal Palace Ward resident, to the Leader of the Council

What guarantees can the Council give as regards crucially important traffic and environmental impact assessments and when will they be undertaken?

Reply:

The developer will need to submit traffic and environmental impact assessments for approval as part of the formal planning process.

(8) From Richard Williams, Crystal Palace Ward resident, to the Leader of the Council

Is there any truth in the rumour that the Council and the Mayor of London are attempting to secure a change in the law via the Queen's Speech this autumn to allow for the sale of land in the park?

Reply:

No we are not and we understand that the Mayor of London isn't either.

(9) From Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group to the Resources Portfolio Holder

BROMLEY WELFARE FUND PAYMENTS

- (a) What was the allocation for 2013/14 for the Fund?
- (b) What is the allocation for 2014/15?
- (c) What was the total monies paid out?
- (d) Who has the Contract to administer the Fund?
- (e) What is the annual value of the Contract?
- (f) Is the cost of the administration taken from the fund allocation?

Reply:

- (a) £819,535
- (b) £819,535
- (c) The provisional figure for 2013/14 is £441,887.37

- (d) Northgate Public Services in partnership with the Family Fund Trust
- (e) Set-up costs of £57,365
£75,218 for 2013/14
£71,470 for 2014/15
- (f) No, this is funded separately

(10) From Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group, to the ResourcesPortfolio Holder

- (a) How many applications for “General Living Expenses” were received, and how many were approved?
- (b) What was the total funding for the G.L.E. category?
- (c) Are vulnerable residents in poverty allowed to make more than one application?
- (d) How is the scheme monitored?
- (e) How are residents made aware of the scheme, and where is it advertised?

Reply:

- (a) 714 applications were made of which 285 were approved.
- (b) The total funding was not assigned to specific categories
- (c) Yes, 3 applications are permitted in each year, with additional awards being considered in exceptional circumstances
- (d) The administration and decision making is monitored by the Authority’s Revenues and Benefits Team.
- (e) Information is provided on the London Borough of Bromley website

Posters/Leaflets have been distributed to Libraries, Jobcentre Plus and other stakeholders including the Citizens Advice Bureau, Registered Social Landlords, Food Banks and the St Giles & St Mungo Trusts.

Awareness sessions have also been provided to internal departments engaging with vulnerable clients

(11) From Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group, to the Resources Portfolio Holder

BROMLEY BOROUGH FOODBANK – CHARGING OF A £8,400 P.A. COMMERCIAL RENT BY THE COUNCIL FOR THE USE OF THE DISUSED SHOP AT 111 COTMANDENE CRESCENT AS A FOOD DISTRIBUTION CENTRE

- (a) Why does the Council not take into account the differences between the operation of the Foodbank, and other charities, which derive an income by using shops to sell donated goods, or receive payment from the Council under contracts, to provide essential services?
- (b) Please explain the justification for this decision.

Reply:

After taking into account differences in size, location, and condition etc of its property and market conditions, the Council aims to charge all its tenants the appropriate market rent applicable at the time of letting, irrespective of the proposed use for the shop unit. The Council does not provide support for charitable organisations through hidden property subsidies, such as preferential rents.

This policy makes property transactions transparent and facilitates consistent and good estate management of the Council's shopping parades.

COUNCIL MEETING

14th April 2014

ORAL QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Councillor Simon Fawthrop to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Is the Portfolio Holder aware of any discussions regarding assigning the Biggin Hill Airport lease under paragraph 5.8.4 of the agreement dated 6th May 1994?

Reply:

No.

Supplementary Question:

Will he assure me that he will be vigilant in watching out for any movement on this – the residents seem to know more about dealings going on behind the scenes and I would not want Councillor Arthur to be embarrassed by anything that might materialise.

Reply:

I am indebted to Councillor Fawthrop for his concern about my embarrassment . I am certainly not aware of any discussions of the type he has mentioned. I will keep it on my radar, and if he hears anything perhaps he would acquaint me with that.

2. From Councillor Tom Papworth to the Environment Portfolio Holder

- How many complaints were received by Bromley regarding potholes in 2013?
- How much did the London Borough of Bromley spend repairing potholes in 2013?
- How much did the London Borough of Bromley spend on compensation for cars damaged by unrepaired potholes in 2013?

Reply:

- 2,884 reports of carriageway issues during 2013 (please note – this figure does not allow for a distinction between potholes and other carriageway issues, nor does it classify between complaint or report, such as Fix my Street, for example).
- £103,258.
- £16,797 paid out during 2013 (please note - these are payments may not relate to 2013 but, perhaps, earlier years as well.)

Supplementary Question:

There was no supplementary question.

3. From Councillor Russell Mellor to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Can you advise as to the number of meetings scheduled for the Improvement and Efficiency Sub-Committee for the current Civic year and the number of meetings, which were cancelled for lack of business?

Reply:

There were four meetings of the Improvement and Efficiency Sub-Committee scheduled in the current civic year. None took place – they were all cancelled by me.

Supplementary Question:

Am I to assume in view of the zero number of meetings that we have convened that we have now reached the optimum in the improvement and efficiency of the Council?

Reply:

Would that we were. In each case, I take the proposed agenda and I consider whether items on there can be better dealt with better by another committee. I would recommend that action to every chairman of committees across this Council. It is extremely expensive and time consuming to organise committee meetings. You should not hold a committee meeting purely because it is scheduled on a calendar. You should look at it critically and decide whether the items there justify the meeting or whether the items can be dealt with better elsewhere. The other point I would make is that members of committees should not consider that the agenda is the sole property of either the chairman or officers. If they have items they wish to raise there is a procedure for doing that and I would encourage you to do that. If you felt that there were items during the course of the year that could probably be dealt with by that committee then you should perhaps draw that to the attention of the Chairman. In that case, I would have held meetings, if I felt it was right to do that, but I will not hold meetings just because of the schedule, I will save money across this Council wherever I can and I would advise others to do the same.

4. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Care Services Portfolio Holder

Why are clients at Sutherland Court not being allowed to attend day centres?

Reply:

Sutherland Court is an extra-care housing unit where the aim is to provide a good level of support for residents in-house. Councillor Fookes has visited Sutherland Court and will know of the excellent facilities it provides. Services to residents are provided on the basis of a full assessment of need. The need includes, in this context, social need. It is the belief of the care managers that Sutherland Court, and the programme of activities it runs both generally and specifically, are such that they would meet the social needs of the residents. Therefore, the alternative of attending a day centre, is not needed.

The only exceptions at present are those with very specialised conditions such as dementia where the assessed needs of individuals may require specialist support.

Supplementary Question:

This seems absolutely disgraceful. In effect, our vulnerable residents, when we are supposed to be promoting independence, are more or less being held prisoner. Why is that the situation?

Reply:

I think any idea that we are keeping the residents prisoner is certainly not true. It is that we provide the care, the social need care, in-house in Sutherland Court which Councillor Fookes has visited and knows very well. Therefore, in terms of cost to the Council, there is no need for the residents to attend a day-centre as well. If they wish to attend a day-centre by themselves, paying for that, there is nothing to stop them doing that.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor John Getgood:

I think the Portfolio Holder's answer is jaw-dropping, it is going back fifty years. It is we decide what is best for you, never mind what you might think you want. It is top-down decision making and where is this freedom of choice? The whole Government policy was to allow elderly people to make their own choices about how they wanted to use any allowances they got, whether they wanted to take advantage of central provision, or to go out and make their own provision for their social needs. Now all of a sudden the Portfolio Holder has pulled the rug from underneath them. Does the Portfolio Holder think that is a good idea?

Reply:

I do not think it is a good idea if things are pressed on people, but if we provide an extra care housing service specifically for the residents the financial situation is such that we simply do not have the resources to provide day centre attendance as well.

5. From Councillor Tony Owen to the Resources Portfolio Holder

What would you advise my constituents at 5 Elm Grove, Orpington to do next? They bought their house with an extension, approved by the Council, containing a bedroom, living area, bathroom and kitchenette which enabled an elderly relative to retain a degree of independence within the confines of the house. The planning permission forbade any division of the property into two and none has taken place.

At some point in time the house was mistakenly redesignated as a house and an annexe. The valuation office has recently reaffirmed this redesignation from their desks. If they had visited they may have noticed that there is only one front door to the property and it is a single house with an extension.

Reply:

I can reassure him that this matter has now been resolved. I spoke with officers today and the matter has been dealt with satisfactorily. It is an interesting one and he quite rightly drew it to our attention. There are lessons to be learnt from this and I will be speaking to officers further about those lessons.

Supplementary Question:

This is 5 Elm Grove (shows a photo), it is the most magical thing since the king's invisible suit of clothes, and only if you are extremely wise (and that mainly means

you work at the Valuation Office) can you see an annex. If this fairy-tale continues, can the Portfolio Holder assure my constituents that their future Council tax demands will be no higher than if the house were taxed as a single dwelling.

Reply:

Yes.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Simon Fawthrop:

I take it from Councillor Arthur's last reply that this is what is meant by a class T exemption?

Reply:

Yes.

6. From Councillor Katherine Bance MBE To the Environment Portfolio Holder

The crossroads at Croydon Road and High Street Penge, continually have the highest statistics for KSI's in the borough. We have been told that the Council will work with TfL in 2014/15 to revisit this location to find an engineering resolution. Can you assure us that funds will be allocated to implement a resolution that can reduce these high KSI figures?

Reply:

I agree that this location needs attention and can advise you that in the 2014/15 – 2016/17 LIP programme, funds are indeed set aside for an investigation into the whole of this route through Penge (the A234), under the Congestion Relief heading, but with casualty reduction identified at this cross-roads as a priority as designs are being developed.

I expect that recommendations will come before Members towards the end of this financial year for potential implementation the year after.

Supplementary Question:

Thank you for that response – it was what I was hoping to hear. If this comes in as an expensive resolution that you would still consider this as the priority and not decide, as has happened in the past, that for the amount of money to put the problems right at this location you could probably solve problems at three other junctions, and that we would get priority here, if it is just a case of the amount of money it will cost.

Reply:

Only a foolish politician would say that money is no object, and I clearly will not be doing that. Self-evidently, from the pot of money that we have available, unless the sum is astronomical and takes the full budget, I very much want to look at the most expensive in terms of KSI junctions first. It could be that, if this junction has, say, five KSIs, and for the cost of that scheme we could save four others with three KSIs, logic would dictate that you might look at the others, but I give you my assurance that it is very much my intention to get this sorted. It has been a long time and it needs doing.

7. From Councillor Russell Mellor to the Leader of the Council

Can the Leader advise me of the changes, which have been undertaken within the Council operating structure since the commencement of the Commissioning programme, also confirming the date the programme was initiated together with substantiated and detailed cost savings since inception.

Reply:

Thank you Cllr Mellor for your question. This Council has a long and proud history of seeking the best, most efficient way of delivering Council services. For many years Members and officers of this Council have worked with service users (our residents) to move the organisation towards its established Target Operating Model as a commissioning organisation determining who is best placed to deliver high quality services based on local priorities and value for money principles. As a consequence approximately 30% of the Council's controllable spend is externalised. The Council's approach to becoming a fully commissioning authority with the majority of services, where appropriate, externalised, was given greater priority as a consequence of recent public sector funding cuts and the forecast financial gap that faces the Council, over the coming years.

In answer to your question, when the Commissioning programme commenced, my answer is, as I have just indicated, we have been on this road for some time now, it is not a new development but one we are having to give greater priority to over the next year or two to ensure we can continue to provide quality services to our residents within a balanced budget.

The second part of your question relates to the Council's Operating Structure which was restructured at the beginning of 2013 into three departments reflecting our focus on People and Place services and the Chief Executive's Department, comprising in the main, support services. This structure brings services together to better reflect a commissioning authority organisation structure.

As part of this restructuring a Commissioning team was established comprising key assistant directors in the three departments, Marc Hume – Lead Director, and Cllr Arthur – Portfolio Holder for Resources. The role of this team is to ensure corporate coordination in the delivery of the commissioning programme. Where appropriate proposals relating to individual services are submitted to the respective PDS Committees for scrutiny and approval.

Your last question asks about cost savings. As indicated earlier, significant efficiencies are already being achieved through our commissioning of services and our aim is to drive further savings through our current activities. However, I should clarify that commissioning of services in the public sector typically results in savings of c10% of costs (on the first occasion these are put to tender). Larger, more significant savings, have to be obtained by changing service specifications, or to put it another way, we need to focus on what we do as much as how we do it and this is being considered as part of our Baseline Review of all services. Only when we are clear on service specifications are we in a position to make considered decisions on commissioning out of services.

Our approach then to Commissioning is ongoing and the most recent cost savings we have achieved was in the Customer Services contract to Liberata, saving £68k pa with more savings from a further invest to save. Further reports will be brought to Members with detailed analysis and options in the following service areas: HR Transactional, Regulatory Services, Facilities Management, Parking Services, Transport, Education Services, Libraries, Direct Care Services, Nurseries, Phoenix Centre, Adult Education and other areas where appropriate. Reports will be considered by Cabinet and appropriate PDS Committees prior to the Executive consideration, and as before these reports will include recommendations on potential opportunities to commission services differently and will include assessments of future cost savings that can delivered.

I would be happy to discuss details of my response with Cllr Mellor at any time.

Supplementary Question:

I thank the Leader for his most comprehensive and detailed response to my question. It would probably be unfair of me if I was to put a further question probing into specific items that the Leader has referred to, and in that context I look forward to a detailed written response in the minutes.

8. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Is he aware that Steve Reed, MP for Croydon North has commissioned an independent report into the state of the streets in his constituency?

Reply:

I don't tend to study the political machinations of inexperienced Labour MPs as a rule, but given your interest I have made an exception in this instance.

What I have found is quite interesting. It reveals that the latest recorded 'state of the streets' statistics for Lambeth, which Mr Reed led until recently, Croydon and Bromley read as follows.

Lambeth :

NI 195a (litter): 7%
NI 195b (detritus): 9%
NI 195c (graffiti): 12%
NI 195d (flyposting): No return

Croydon :

NI 195a (litter): 8.2%
NI 195b (detritus): 6.8%
NI 195c (graffiti): 2.3%
NI 195d (flyposting): 0.5

Bromley :

NI 195a (litter): 5.2%
NI 195b (detritus): 6.5%
NI 195c (graffiti): 1.0%
NI 195d (flyposting): 1.3%

Were one to be generous, one might opine that Mr Reed has mistakenly commissioned a survey of the wrong Borough.

Supplementary Question:

The reality is that shouldn't we be commissioning a similar independent report ourselves into what is going on in this borough, particularly with the increasing number of complaints that we are getting in the north of the borough over the fact that street cleaning is only taking place on one day a month and it is simply not good enough, particularly in urban areas.

Reply:

Labour cannot spend our money on enough silly reports. We have reports. If you look in front of you, you will see the reports of various street failures in the relevant boroughs – that is what the national indicators are for. They reveal time and time again that Bromley's streets are amongst the cleanest in London. Are they perfect? No. How can you help? Not by continually coming to the Council Chamber to try and boost your political kudos by complaining that your ward gets the rough end of the stick, which it does not. What you should be doing, as I have told you untold times, is report the faults as and when you see them. That way, the statistics can be gathered empirically, poor performance can be man-managed and corrected. But no, all we have, particularly in the run-up to the election times, is this continual ongoing complaint that you are being treated unfairly. It does you no credit and it does your residents no favours, that you are not representing them properly, and I would urge you to consider that in the new Administration if you are returned.

Additional supplementary question from Councillor David McBride:

Would the Portfolio Holder agree that there are still issues in certain parts of the borough with street cleaning, and is he aware of headlines on the Fix My Street website such as "street cleaning ineffective," "street cleaning not up to standard," "street cleaning outside the bus-shelter could be improved." Those are comments not from an opposition member but from the chairman of the Environment PDS Committee. Has he got any comments on Councillor Huntington-Thresher's views of street cleaning in his ward.

Reply:

I take Councillor McBride's comments constructively. Councillor Huntington-Thresher's comments (and you will find plenty of comments from me as well) show what all Councillors should be doing. You should be tending the faults in your ward and reporting them. It is by reporting them that we can tell if any crews are under-performing. The system acts as a magnificent management tool, please use it. That way, not only will your ward be seen to be represented but it will be better. I hasten to pay credit to a good number of colleagues who do use it, one of whom is sitting beside you. I would also point you to the work of Councillor Jefferys. Rather than just moaning about it, which seems to be the default position of far too many people, he has got together and formed a project with residents associations, and got the whole neighbourhood working together around keeping the streets better. It is the only way, we have to find £55m out of a £205m budget by 2017. There is not a money tree out there, the cavalry are not coming over the horizon, we have got to work with residents to do more together and we have got to be on the front foot, we have got to lead and not follow.

Additional supplementary question from Councillor Tom Papworth:

Will the Portfolio Holder agree with me that aggregate figures across the borough could potentially mask a multitude of sins. Could he circulate these figures to us broken down by ward so that each member may judge for themselves the efficiency in their own ward.

Reply:

I am very happy to give that undertaking. It is easily available and I will provide that to you hopefully by the end of the week.

9. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Leader of the Council

What was the cost of the leaflet that went out recently in the borough from him with an explanation of the Council Tax for 2014/15?

Reply:

We feel it is extremely important to feed back to residents following the consultation process which took place prior to setting the budget, especially as many people took time to attend public meetings or send in written contributions for consideration. It is only right and proper that we explain, in a way that is accessible to all, the final outcome; how we are fighting for our fair share of funding; and how residents' money is being spent. That is why, in line with many other councils, we provide this information to every household, every year.

In previous years, the information was contained in a sixteen-page leaflet posted to all households. This year we have reduced the size of the communication to one single sheet of paper and included details on where to find further information on the Council's website. Since delivery took place as part of a regular door drop, we considered this to be a better and more cost effective solution to give residents more information about their council tax. This meant that we could keep costs to an absolute minimum of just 2p per household. Sometimes a small investment in paper, such as on this occasion, ensures that information we think our residents will want to know is instantly available to all. This also serves to signpost the many who do have access to the internet to the wealth of online information now available that they can consult at any time convenient to them, thus helping to save the council even more money in the future.

Supplementary Question:

Wasn't this just electioneering on the rates.

Reply:

No – we all know that it is not and it is just Councillor Fookes clutching at straws.

Additional Supplementary question from Councillor Tom Papworth:

As we are talking about peculiar bits of expenditure before the elections can he give an indication of whether the Council spent more on that leaflet than on doing up the Chamber Chamber? If we had a comparative figure that would give an indication of the prudence of this administration.

Reply:

I am not sure of the relevance of this question. You have heard the amount that was spent on distributing the leaflet on the council tax. The sum that was spent refurbishing the chamber was certainly more, but that is seen as invest to save, generating income for many years to come.

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

14th April 2014

WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Leader of the Council

If he will set out the main points of his proposed programme for the next four years for the Council to be elected on May 22nd 2014?

Reply:

As Council knows the country is only now turning the corner after a catastrophic period of mismanagement by the Labour Government, thankfully ending in 2010, leading to a period of austerity which Councils such as Bromley have had to bear the brunt.

The first major priority will be to finish the intensive work to keep our Authority on a sound financial footing. Much has been achieved already but we will continue to deliver on our pledge for further efficiency to ensure high quality key frontline services can be maintained. It is in our nature to insist on efficiency and we are instinctively an Administration of low taxation. That will not change.

This will involve support for our local economy to enable significant private investment creating jobs and a positive future, particularly for our young people. Growth in retail and business is crucial if we are going to be able to benefit from the Government's incentive to Local Authorities to keep part of any business rate growth. We are working with the private sector and the GLA to deliver retail and leisure schemes in Crystal Palace, Orpington, Biggin Hill, Bromley and Beckenham and would expect to deliver huge investment into our Borough for the benefit of all residents. This also includes the considerable lobbying we are undertaking to improve much needed upgrades in the Boroughs infrastructure both road and rail.

Success in our Borough can only be achieved if we have a high quality well motivated workforce, so we will be doing further work to ensure we have the highest quality and choice of Education for our young people. We will work with Government and indeed the schools and Further Education Colleges to provide the skills and training required.

Very much related to this is the environment we currently enjoy in our Borough. Bromley is seen as a clean and relatively safe place to live and work encouraging business to locate so will be renewing our pledge to residents and the business community that we keep the Borough Clean and Green. We will support local people through our friends Groups and hold our contractors to account, ensuring our roads and footways are kept as tidy as is possible.

We will protect our cherished Green Belt Land and seek to further improve our waste and recycling services, invest in the quality of our highways and pathways and replace fallen trees.

The current and any future Conservative Administration will also be committed to supporting the voluntary sector and our frail and vulnerable residents. We will continue to explore ways of delivering sustainable high quality services reaching those most in need.

We are committed to working with partners and particularly the Bromley Clinical Commission Group to secure the future of Orpington Hospital and a new Health and Wellbeing Centre in Orpington Town Centre.

Finally, we will be lobbying the Mayor's Office for our fair share of Police resources and working with our new Borough Commander to ensure the residents of the LBB (London's Best Borough) remain safe and do not live under the fear of crime.

2. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Environment Portfolio Holder

If he will make a statement on the flooding in West Wickham in 2014 and the actions taken by the Council to assist local residents?

Reply:

Following a period of heavy rainfall, groundwater rose to levels not seen since 2001 resulting in flooding of gardens and sub-floor voids to properties in Courtfield Rise, together with the gardens of properties in Corkscrew Hill and Addington Road. The initial response was to involve London Fire Brigade to pump water from the affected premises in Courtfield Rise across the A232 Glebe Way to an open section of watercourse behind properties in Addington Road. This operation commenced on Wednesday 19th February.

Due to the heavy commitment required from LFB to sustain this operation (up to 6 fire tenders working in 6hr shifts), the Council hired in a high volume pump which has been in situ since 25th February, which has been supplemented when required by further LFB pumping.

This operation has successfully protected the properties in Courtfield Rise, however the increased groundwater level has also flooded the playing fields at Sparrows Den, where a dam has been installed to prevent flooding of Corkscrew Hill and Addington Road.

The Environment Agency have also commissioned contractors to clear both the watercourse into which LFB were originally discharging, and the culvert running underneath the gardens of properties between there and Sparrows Den. It should be noted that the condition of this culvert & watercourse are not the cause of this flooding, although their condition does influence our ability to discharge groundwater into them.

Thames Water have also been pumping 13 million litres per day from a groundwater abstraction facility higher up the valley from Sparrows Den which has helped reduce levels in Courtfield Rise.

Predictions from the Environment Agency suggest groundwater will remain at higher than normal levels until at least the end of April, so we will continue our pumping operation until levels subside using the £100k fund set aside for this purpose by the Executive committee.

A full review of the flooding we have experienced this winter will be undertaken and reported to the Environment PDS in July.

3. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder

What action he is taking to detect and combat fly-tipping in West Wickham?

Reply:

During the fifteen months from January 2013 to date, there were 4,451 incidents of fly tipping in the Borough. In West Wickham there were 84 cases reported, being 2% of all fly tips in the borough and the fourth lowest incidence within Bromley Wards.

As there is no single site in West Wickham Ward that has a particularly high incidence of tipping, there are no special projects nor CCTV surveillance operations currently running within the Ward and fly tipping is currently being tackled in the same way as all twenty-two Wards in the Borough.

Any fly tipping incidents reported in the West Wickham Ward would result in the following actions:-

- Immediately remove any rubbish that is blocking the Highway and arrange removal of any that is found to be on Council owned land
- Check the rubbish for any identifiers that might lead us to the origin of the rubbish
- Serve formal Notice on the owner of the land, where it is private land and arrange its removal
- Use all available intelligence e.g witnesses, photos, paperwork etc., to identify the perpetrators
- interview any persons identified as being involved with the incident
- Serve appropriate FPN's, Warnings and enforcement Notices and instigate legal proceedings if the evidence supports this.
- Charge our costs back to all such offenders that we take through the legal process.

4. From Councillor Russell Mellor to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Further to my question placed before Council on the 24th February 2014 can the Portfolio Holder provide the salary scales for the staff grades BR and MG together with the number of staff within the relevant grades in each department as listed in the Appendix 1 in reply to my question of the 24th February 2014 for the years 31/03/2011, 31/03/2012, 31/03/2013 and up to the 31/03/2014

Reply:

See [appendix 1 attached](#).

For the BR grades there are salary scales for 1 April 2009, 1 April 2013 and 1 April 2014, for the Management Grades there are salary scales for 1 April 2009, 1 April 2012, 1 April 2013 and 1 April 2014. There was no pay award in the other years.

5. From Councillor David McBride to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee

Could he list the yearly attendance figures of each Councillor from the 2010/11 municipal year, including the figure so far for the current year?

Reply:

The latest attendance figures for the current year to date are attached as [Appendix 2](#). The final figures will be available for the annual meeting of the Council on 4th June. The figures for the Council years 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13 have already been published at the end of each year, and are available on the Council website via the following link –

[Useful resources - Councillor Attendance](#)

6. From Councillor David McBride to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

Could he list the shop unit vacancy rates for Bromley, Beckenham and Orpington town centres from May 2010 up to the latest available figures?

Reply:

See [Appendix 3](#) attached.

7. From Councillor David McBride to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

Could he itemise the financial support from the Council given to areas for their Christmas lights since 2010 and tell me how much those areas can expect in support from the Council this coming Christmas?

Reply:

Between 2010 and 2013, the Council has directly commissioned lights for the 4 main town centres and the costs are as follows:

Expenditure by the Council on Christmas lights

Summary by town centre	2010	2011	2012	2013	Totals
Bromley	41,180	8,000	13,435	13,435	76,050
Orpington	10,770	2,500	5,485	5,485	24,240
Beckenham	10,220	4,700	6,580	6,000	27,500
Penge	4,770	0	4,035	4,035	12,840
Totals	66,940	15,200	29,535	28,955	140,630

NB Excludes costs covered by external funding (e.g. Mayor of London's Outer London Fund)

In the smaller town centres and parades, the Council has encouraged local groups to organise funds for Christmas lights schemes, with the Council offering a small donation towards the overall cost. The amount of the donation has been variable between years and it is not always the same areas obtaining this support. The table below provides a useful summary.

Smaller town centre Christmas lights donations

Year	2010	2011	2012	2013
Total donations	£7,720	£6,000	£3,500	£4,000
Number of areas	8	6	7	8
Average donation	£965	£1,000	£500	£500

Due to the necessary cuts in expenditure which have affected all areas of Council spending, particularly areas which are non-statutory such as Christmas lights, we are only able to devote a maximum of £25k to Christmas lights schemes in 2014. This funding will be focussed on keeping the lights on within 3 main town centres – Bromley, Beckenham and Penge – noting that the lights scheme in Orpington will be paid for by the Orpington 1st BID. The available level of funding means that smaller town centres and other parades will not receive any donations in support of Christmas lights in 2014. This withdrawal of subsidy will apply equally to all areas which previously received support.

8. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Resources Portfolio Holder

What are the latest statistics for electoral registration in the borough, please list by ward in percentage terms?

Reply:

See [Appendix 4](#) attached.

9. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Environment Portfolio Holder

What has been the cost to date for the Council and the other agencies involved of clearing up after the floods in Sparrows Den and Courtfield Rise?

Reply:

The Council's costs to date have been £80,000 including sand bags, plant hire, fuel, contractors and officer time. We do not have information on costs incurred by other agencies.

10. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Why are Friends Groups being denied access to basic information about the contracts for their local park?

Reply:

Your question is based on a false premise because it isn't true.

11. From Councillor Katherine Bance MBE to the Resources Portfolio Holder

For cases of overdue Council Tax is there a case to answer that Bromley Council resorts to bailiffs too early in the process? What are the conciliation procedures?

Reply:

The Authority makes a considerable effort to collect a households Council Tax liability prior to their case being referred to bailiffs. Unfortunately, on some occasions it is only once a bailiff letter is received or visit undertaken that the charge payer is willing to engage and/or make payments. For the Authority to maintain service provision and ensure equality with fellow residents it is necessary for all appropriate means of recovery to be considered.

For information I have detailed the recovery process which I believe demonstrates the opportunities afforded to the charge payer prior to the employment of bailiffs.

- Statutory bill issued – advises as to charge payers liability and instalment dates for the financial year
- Reminder issued – Issued 10 days after the instalment date should the full amount not have been paid. Reminder requests payment within 7 days of date on the letter
- Final Notice issued – Issued 9 days after date of reminder should full payment not have been received. Notice advises instalment arrangement have been cancelled and full payment required within 7 days of date on the letter
- Summons Notice issued – Issued no sooner than 5 days after the date by which the final notice required payment. A minimum of 14 days' notice of hearing is provided. The summons notice advises of a “drop-in summons surgery” and direct line telephone numbers for residents to make arrangements or raise any queries.
- Liability hearing
- 14 day notice issued – Once a Liability Order has been obtained the Bailiffs forward a letter on the Authority's behalf. The communication advises that a liability order has been obtained and they have 14 days to contact them to arrange payment or discuss the account. A financial enquiry form is enclosed for completion in order for alternative recovery methods to be considered, which might include agreeing an extended recovery period.
- Where there is no contact made after 14 days then the 'enforcement' process will commence with the Enforcement Agents.

It is important to note that at any stage in the process identified above an individual debtor can arrange to pay outstanding monies. Even prior to a summons there are three separate letters/statements issued to an individual giving sufficient time to make reasonable arrangements for payment. The majority of our residents pay their council tax on time and would expect us to ensure that council tax is collected from all council tax payers which helps keep the council tax low.

12. From Councillor Katherine Bance MBE to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

Is the underpinning work at Anerley Town Hall scheduled to go ahead and if so when is the expected start date?

Reply:

Unfortunately the underpinning works at Anerley Town Hall did not proceed as planned in January. The decision to postpone the works followed the receipt of tenders which were significantly at variance with the budget allocated for the works and therefore the Council could not proceed at that time.

Consultant engineers have since reported that there are no immediate stability issues with the building, and, subject to continued monitoring, the underpinning can be postponed until at least next year. Given that there is now more time to carry out further investigation work on the building, a full condition survey of the whole building is being commissioned to update and properly inform Members about its existing condition and the extent of the maintenance back log. Once this report is received and evaluated, a decision can be taken on the underpinning works, although it has been noted that the Crystal Palace Community Development Trust would prefer the works to be undertaken in January and February 2015.

13. From Councillor Katherine Bance to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Will the Council help to resolve the daily fly-tipping on High Street, Penge by use of temporary CCTV. The Council has said this is not their preferred solution, if that is so, do they have a workable solution?

Reply:

Just to be clear, CCTV IS the Council's preferred solution.

Unfortunately my advice remains that we are prohibited from using technology in situations like this due to overbearing and frankly, certainly in my opinion, borderline illogical RIPA constraints.

Consideration remains ongoing as to how we might better improve the situation locally, including greater use of the Council's littering enforcement officers and/or alternative household waste receptacles and I undertake to update you on any development at the earliest possible opportunity.

14. From Councillor Simon Fawthrop to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

How many food recycle bags (bundles) were sold in Bromley's libraries in the last 12 months?

Can these be shown by Library?

Reply:

Food recycle bags sold by library – 2013/14

Library	Number of packs
Central	19,950
Anerley	980
Beckenham	9,205
Biggin Hill	4,795
Burnt Ash	1,295
Chislehurst	4,550
Hayes	1,785
Mottingham	1,400
Orpington	18,690
Penge	2,240
Petts Wood	7,665
Shortlands	2,660
Southborough	5,460
St Paul's Cray	2,800
West Wickham	10,535
Total:	94,010

15. From Councillor Simon Fawthrop to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

How many visits were there to Bromley's libraries in the last 12 months compared with the previous 12 months?

Can these be shown by Library?

Reply:

Visits to Libraries –

Library	2012	2013
Anerley	54,107	54,095
Beckenham	177,477	165,241
Biggin Hill	247,462	222,528
Burnt Ash	28,221	28,332
Central	475,447	468,096
Chislehurst	88,440	84,450
Hayes	33,236	31,650
Mobile Library	20,561	16,566
Mottingham	41,870	41,752
Orpington	319,180	308,966

Penge	81,902	80,989
Petts Wood	102,727	103,309
Shortlands	34,706	32,971
Southborough	33,662	31,454
St Pauls Cray	44,121	41,089
West Wickham	130,344	122,026
Total	1,913,463	1,833,514

16. From Councillor Simon Fawthrop to 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:

Between 24th February and 7th April 2014 the Development Control Teams have had 19 householder pre-application meetings and 22 non-householder pre-application meetings. Details of the individual applicants and sites at present is exempt information and not disclosable in respect to a Council Question.

This page is left intentionally blank

SALARY SCALES OPERATIVE FROM 1ST APRIL 2009 (post Single Status implementation)

BR1 - 14

BR1	BR2	BR3	BR4	BR5	BR6	BR7
£	£	£	£	£	£	£
14697 (4)	14940 (6)	15615 (8)	16482 (11)	17196 (13)	18582 (17)	21375 (22)
14814 (5)	15216 (7)	16005 (9)	16794 (12)	17484 (14)	18915 (18)	21951 (23)
		16290 (10)	17196 (13)	17808 (15)	19563 (19)	22608 (24)
		16482 (11)		18195 (16)	20205 (20)	23277 (25)
				18582 (17)	20877 (21)	
BR8	BR9	BR10	BR11	BR12	BR13	BR14
£	£	£	£	£	£	£
23970 (26)	26400 (29)	28800 (32)	29601 (33)	30987 (35)	33510 (38)	36306 (41)
24711 (27)	27225 (30)	29601 (33)	30390 (34)	31761 (36)	34542 (39)	37179 (42)
25455 (28)	28032 (31)	30390 (34)	30987 (35)	32607 (37)	35418 (40)	38070 (43)
			31761 (36)	33510 (38)	36306 (41)	38961 (44)

<u>Stand-by per session</u>	£
Monday-Friday	6.00
Saturday-Sunday	12.00
Public Holidays	16.14

Caretaker Standby	
Non-Residential Allowance	£8.38 p/wk

<u>Caretaker Lettings</u>	£
Monday - Friday	
6:00 pm – 11:30 pm	26.10
Saturday	
Up to 1:00 pm	26.10
1:00 pm – 6:00 pm	26.10
6:00 pm – 11:30 pm	60.77
Sunday	
Up to 1:00 pm	26.10
1:00 pm – 6:00 pm	49.18
6:00 pm – 11:30 pm	60.77

This page is left intentionally blank

PAY SCALES OPERATIVE FROM 1ST APRIL 2013 – LOCALISED PAY

BR1 - 14

BR1	BR2	BR3	BR4	BR5	BR6	BR7
£	£	£	£	£	£	£
14949 (4)	15195 (6)	15882 (8)	16764 (11)	17490 (13)	18900 (17)	21633 (22)
15066 (5)	15477 (7)	16278 (9)	17082 (12)	17784 (14)	19239 (18)	22215 (23)
		16569 (10)	17490 (13)	18111 (15)	19896 (19)	22881 (24)
		16764 (11)		18507 (16)	20550 (20)	23559 (25)
				18900 (17)	21234 (21)	
BR8	BR9	BR10	BR11	BR12	BR13	BR14
£	£	£	£	£	£	£
24258 (26)	26718 (29)	29148 (32)	29958 (33)	31359 (35)	33915 (38)	36744 (41)
25008 (27)	27552 (30)	29958 (33)	30756 (34)	32145 (36)	34959 (39)	37626 (42)
25761 (28)	28371 (31)	30756 (34)	31359 (35)	33000 (37)	35844 (40)	38529 (43)
			32145 (36)	33915 (38)	36744 (41)	39429 (44)

<u>Stand-by per session</u>	£
Monday-Friday	6.00
Saturday-Sunday	12.00
Public Holidays	16.14

Caretaker Standby	
Non-Residential Allowance	£8.38 p/wk

Residential Staff	
Sleeping- in allowance	£33.34

<u>Caretaker Lettings</u>	£
Monday - Friday	
6:00 pm – 11:30 pm	26.10
Saturday	
Up to 1:00 pm	26.10
1:00 pm – 6:00 pm	26.10
6:00 pm – 11:30 pm	60.77
Sunday	
Up to 1:00 pm	26.10
1:00 pm – 6:00 pm	49.18
6:00 pm – 11:30 pm	60.77

This page is left intentionally blank

SALARY SCALES OPERATIVE FROM 1ST APRIL 2014

BR1 - 14

BR1	BR2	BR3	BR4	BR5	BR6	BR7
£	£	£	£	£	£	£
15204 (4)	15456 (6)	16152 (8)	17049 (11)	17790 (13)	19224 (17)	21894 (22)
15324 (5)	15741 (7)	16557 (9)	17373 (12)	18087 (14)	19569 (18)	22482 (23)
		16851 (10)	17790 (13)	18420 (15)	20235 (19)	23157 (24)
		17049 (11)		18822 (16)	20901 (20)	23844 (25)
				19224 (17)	21489 (21)	

BR8	BR9	BR10	BR11	BR12	BR13	BR14	ADDITIONAL POINTS
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
24552 (26)	27039 (29)	29499 (32)	30318 (33)	31737(35)	34323(38)	37185 (41)	40755 (45)
25311 (27)	27885 (30)	30318 (33)	31128 (34)	32532 (36)	35379 (39)	38079 (42)	41700 (46)
26073 (28)	28713 (31)	31128 (34)	31737 (35)	33396 (37)	36276 (40)	38994 (43)	42618 (47)
			32532 (36)	34323 (38)	37185 (41)	39903 (44)	43527 (48)

Stand-by per session	£
Monday-Friday	6.00
Saturday-Sunday	12.00
Public Holidays	16.14

Caretaker Standby	
Non-Residential Allowance	£8.38 p/wk

Residential Staff	
Sleeping- in allowance	£33.34

Caretaker Lettings	£
Monday - Friday	
6:00 pm – 11:30 pm	26.10
Saturday	
Up to 1:00 pm	26.10
1:00 pm – 6:00 pm	26.10
6:00 pm – 11:30 pm	60.77
Sunday	
Up to 1:00 pm	26.10
1:00 pm – 6:00 pm	49.18
6:00 pm – 11:30 pm	60.77

This page is left intentionally blank

London Borough of Bromley

Management Grade Salary Structure Effective from 1 April 2009

(current as at March 2012)

Management Grades

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
1	£79,688	£89,648	£99,610	£109,569	£119,531
2	£67,069	£75,465	£83,850	£92,238	£100,621
3	£57,503	£64,689	£71,879	£79,066	£86,253
4	£48,983	£55,108	£61,232	£67,356	£73,479
5	£43,028	£48,403	£53,784	£59,162	£64,541
6	£35,507	£39,944	£44,382	£48,821	£53,260

Management Board

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
Chief Executive	£136,362	£153,407	£170,453	£187,500	£204,546
Directors ACS, CYP, ES, R&R, RES,	£92,635	£104,215	£115,796	£127,377	£138,947

This page is left intentionally blank

London Borough of Bromley

Management Grade Salary Structure Effective from 1 April 2012

Management Grades

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
1	£80,086	£90,096	£100,108	£110,117	£120,128
2	£67,404	£75,842	£84,269	£92,699	£101,124
3	£57,790	£65,013	£72,239	£79,462	£86,685
4	£49,228	£55,383	£61,538	£67,692	£73,846
5	£43,243	£48,645	£54,052	£59,458	£64,863
6	£35,685	£40,144	£44,604	£49,065	£53,527

Management Board

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
Chief Executive	£137,044	£154,174	£171,305	£188,438	£205,568
Directors ACS, CYP, ES, R&R, RES,	£93,099	£104,737	£116,374	£128,013	£139,642

This page is left intentionally blank

London Borough of Bromley

**Management Grade Salary Structure
Effective from 1 April 2013**

Management Grades

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
1	£80,649	£90,729	£100,809	£110,889	£120,969
2	£67,878	£76,374	£84,861	£93,348	£101,832
3	£58,197	£65,469	£72,747	£80,019	£87,294
4	£49,575	£55,772	£61,971	£68,166	£74,364
5	£43,548	£48,987	£54,432	£59,877	£65,319
6	£35,937	£40,428	£44,919	£49,410	£53,904

Professional and Technical Grades

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
5	£43,548	£48,987	£54,432	£59,877	£65,319
6	£35,937	£40,428	£44,919	£49,410	£53,904

Management Board

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
Chief Executive	£138,006	£155,256	£172,506	£189,759	£207,009
Directors	£93,753	£105,471	£117,189	£128,910	£140,622

This page is left intentionally blank

London Borough of Bromley

**Management Grade Salary Structure
Effective from 1 April 2014**

Management Grades

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
1	£81,456	£91,638	£101,820	£111,999	£122,181
2	£68,559	£77,139	£85,710	£94,284	£102,852
3	£58,779	£66,126	£73,476	£80,820	£88,167
4	£50,073	£56,331	£62,592	£68,850	£75,108
5	£43,986	£49,479	£54,978	£60,477	£65,973
6	£36,297	£40,833	£45,369	£49,905	£54,444

Professional and Technical Grades

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
5	£43,986	£49,479	£54,978	£60,477	£65,973
6	£36,297	£40,833	£45,369	£49,905	£54,444

Management Board

Grade	Minimum £	Lower Quartile £	Mid-Point £	Upper Quartile £	Maximum £
Chief Executive	£139,389	£156,810	£174,234	£191,658	£209,082
Directors	£94,692	£106,527	£118,362	£130,200	£142,029

This page is left intentionally blank

Council Question from Cllr Mellor

Department	As at 31.03.11	
	Headcount*	FTE*
Chief Executive's	92	80.39
Education, Care & Health Services	1578	1212.59
Environmental & Community Services	294	274.47
Renewal & Recreation	367	275.23
Resources	321	289.33
Total	2652**	2132.01**

As at 31.03.12	
Headcount*	FTE*
78	67.01
1384	1118.00
284	264.17
324	251.22
305	274.83
2375**	1975.23**

As at 31.03.13	
Headcount*	FTE*
402	364.21
1277	1030.87
466	382.83
2145**	1777.92**

As at 31.03.14	
Headcount*	FTE*
349	317.16
1280	1030.48
440	359.82
2069	1707.46

Grade	Headcount	FTE
BR1	13	4.83
BR2	6	3.19
BR3	83	27.69
BR4	43	35.07
BR5	333	236.69
BR6	381	281.30
BR7	206	179.21
BR8	150	128.20
BR9	216	196.33
BR10	113	102.92
BR11	175	161.53
BR12	110	101.28
BR13	193	180.64
BR14	64	57.85
Total	2086	1696.73

Headcount	FTE
13	4.60
5	3.19
72	26.38
41	31.99
266	189.12
367	270.84
191	168.17
133	112.60
196	179.42
113	102.88
166	151.16
118	109.26
199	184.81
58	53.93
1938	1588.35

Headcount	FTE
12	4.33
3	1.69
83	35.08
31	24.26
236	163.44
323	226.36
166	145.42
133	113.47
174	155.90
108	100.69
157	143.70
118	109.47
185	172.86
68	63.26
1797	1459.93

Headcount	FTE
13	4.60
2	0.72
82	34.69
35	25.83
217	154.17
298	211.31
148	128.58
129	109.88
166	149.10
106	95.13
154	142.81
112	104.00
190	175.96
65	62.05
1717	1398.84

Grade	Headcount	FTE
MB	6	6.00
MG1	3	3.00
MG2	12	11.58
MG3	16	16.00
MG4	23	23.00
MG5	54	53.80
MG6	122	118.75
Total	236	232.13

Headcount	FTE
5	5.00
3	3.00
9	9.00
13	12.60
19	18.90
53	52.80
114	110.86
216	212.16

Headcount	FTE
5	5.00
3	3.00
8	8.00
9	8.80
20	19.80
45	44.80
95	93.07
185	182.47

Headcount	FTE
5	5.00
3	3.00
8	8.00
9	8.80
19	19.00
38	37.80
86	82.50
168	164.10

* Includes staff with multiple contracts

** Includes non BR grade staff, eg centrally employed teachers, TUPE staff etc.

Employees by Grade and Department as at 31 March 2011

Grade	Chief Executive's		Education & Care Services		Environmental Services		Renewal & Recreation		Resources		Total Headcount	Total FTE
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE		
BR1 - BR3*	1	0.69	65	32.78	0	0	34	1	2	1.24	102	35.71
BR4	3	1.61	18	14.14	2	2	5	3.39	15	13.93	43	35.07
BR5	10	6.96	192	125.75	6	4.91	69	53.65	56	45.42	333	236.69
BR6	11	10.35	220	151.32	38	34.39	68	47.8	44	37.44	381	281.3
BR7	5	3.5	136	117.98	16	14.7	35	29.84	14	13.19	206	179.21
BR8	6	5.44	71	61.45	42	37.21	15	10.89	16	13.21	150	128.2
BR9	12	11.43	114	102.43	45	42.15	21	18.32	24	22	216	196.33
BR10	2	1.57	40	35.82	28	26.64	22	19.5	21	19.39	113	102.92
BR11	5	4.11	104	96.69	31	29.42	17	15.71	18	15.6	175	161.53
BR12	14	12.22	51	46.44	12	11.62	11	9.81	22	21.19	110	101.28
BR13	4	4	114	106.98	31	29.18	24	21.67	20	18.81	193	180.64
BR14	2	2	51	45.56	3	2.67	6	5.62	2	2	64	57.85
Total	75	63.88	1176	937.34	254	234.89	327	237.2	254	223.42	2086	1696.73

* Due to the small numbers of employees these grades have been amalgamated for the public response to ensure no breach of data protection. A further breakdown can be given direct to Members on request.

Grade	Chief Executive's		Education & Care Services		Environmental Services		Renewal & Recreation		Resources		Total Headcount	Total FTE
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE		
MB	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	6
MG1	1	1					1	1	1	1	3	3
MG2			5	4.58	2	2	3	3	2	2	12	11.58
MG3	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	3	4	4	16	16
MG4	1	1	12	12	1	1	2	2	7	7	23	23
MG5	2	2	17	17	13	13	7	7	15	14.8	54	53.8
MG6	7	7	41	40.33	19	18.59	18	16.72	37	36.11	122	118.75
Total	16	16	80	78.91	38	37.59	35	33.72	67	65.91	236	232.13

Employees by Grade and Department as at 31 March 2012

Grade	Chief Executive's		Education & Care Services		Environmental Services		Renewal & Recreation		Resources		Total Headcount	Total FTE
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE		
BR1 - BR3*	1	0.69	62	31.45	0	0	23	0.11	4	1.92	90	34.17
BR4	2	0.61	18	12.24	2	1.69	8	6.44	11	11	41	31.98
BR5	8	5.07	148	98.07	6	4.81	62	47.31	42	33.86	266	189.12
BR6	11	10.04	212	144.09	33	29.89	63	45.21	48	41.61	367	270.84
BR7	4	3.69	133	116.22	12	11.08	28	24.79	14	12.39	191	168.17
BR8	2	2	69	56.63	39	34.44	9	8	14	11.52	133	112.59
BR9	6	5.39	109	98.7	44	41.46	16	15.06	21	18.81	196	179.42
BR10	5	4.07	44	39.92	26	24.34	18	16	20	18.56	113	102.89
BR11	4	2.75	96	89.05	30	27.84	17	15.23	19	16.29	166	151.16
BR12	13	11.69	59	53.96	14	13.63	11	9.81	21	20.17	118	109.26
BR13	3	3	118	109.46	32	30.24	24	21.39	22	20.72	199	184.81
BR14	2	2	46	42.64	3	2.67	5	4.63	2	2	58	53.94
Total	61	51	1114	892.43	241	222.09	284	213.98	238	208.85	1938	1588.35

* Due to the small numbers of employees these grades have been amalgamated for the public response to ensure no breach of data protection. A further breakdown can be given direct to Members on request.

Grade	Chief Executive's		Education & Care Services		Environmental Services		Renewal & Recreation		Resources		Total Headcount	Total FTE
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE		
MB	1	1.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	5	5
MG1	1	1.00					1	1.00	1	1.00	3	3
MG2			3	3.00	2	2.00	2	2.00	2	2.00	9	9
MG3	3	2.60	2	2.00	2	2.00	2	2.00	4	4.00	13	12.6
MG4	1	0.90	8	8.00	1	1.00	2	2.00	7	7.00	19	18.9
MG5	2	2.00	16	16.00	13	13.00	8	8.00	14	13.80	53	52.8
MG6	7	7.00	37	36.08	20	19.08	16	15.50	34	33.19	114	110.86
Total	15	14.50	67	66.08	39	38.08	32	31.50	63	61.99	216	212.16

Employees by Grade and Department as at 31 March 2013

Grade	Chief Executive's		Education, Care & Health Services		Environment & Community Services		Total Headcount	Total FTE
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE		
BR1 - BR3*	5	2.604167	62	33.125	31	5.37	98	41.10
BR4	9	8.61	20	13.96	2	1.69	31	24.26
BR5	42	34.74	137	85.49	57	43.21	236	163.44
BR6	42	35.70	205	131.06	76	59.59	232	226.36
BR7	25	21.81	110	96.05	31	27.56	166	145.42
BR8	22	19.35	69	57.42	42	36.70	133	113.47
BR9	25	21.14	100	89.42	49	45.33	174	155.90
BR10	26	25.25	48	45.18	34	30.26	108	100.69
BR11	32	28.41	97	89.65	28	25.65	157	143.70
BR12	33	30.42	63	57.46	22	21.58	118	109.47
BR13	36	33.91	110	103.78	39	35.17	185	172.86
BR14	10	8.75	50	46.84	9	7.67	68	63.26
Total	307	270.71	1071	849.44	419	339.78	1797	1459.93

* Due to the small numbers of employees these grades have been amalgamated for the public response to ensure no breach of data protection. A further breakdown can be given direct to Members on request.

Grade	Chief Executive's		Education, Care & Health Services		Environment & Community Services		Total Headcount	Total FTE
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE		
MB	3	3.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	5	5.00
MG1	3	3.00					3	3.00
MG2	1	1.00	4	4.00	3	3.00	8	8.00
MG3	6	5.80	1	1.00	2	2.00	9	8.80
MG4	10	9.90	9	8.90	1	1.00	20	19.80
MG5	19	18.80	14	14.00	12	12.00	45	44.80
MG6	42	41.50	35	34.89	18	16.68	95	93.07
Total	84	83.00	64	63.79	37	35.68	185	182.47

Employees by Grade and Department as at 31 March 2014

Grade	Chief Executive's		Education, Care &		Environment &		Total	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	Total FTE
BR1 - BR3*	3	1.35	64	33.69	30	4.97	97	40.02
BR4	11	10.50	16	9.89	8	5.44	35	25.83
BR5	36	28.53	130	86.24	51	39.40	217	154.17
BR6	23	20.17	207	138.05	68	53.09	298	211.31
BR7	22	19.72	100	86.44	26	22.42	148	128.58
BR8	19	17.25	68	56.74	42	35.90	129	109.88
BR9	22	19.79	91	80.32	53	49.00	166	149.10
BR10	22	18.75	50	45.31	34	31.08	106	95.13
BR11	24	21.98	108	100.68	22	20.15	154	142.81
BR12	37	34.19	56	51.23	19	18.58	112	104.00
BR13	35	33.43	118	109.86	37	32.67	190	175.96
BR14	9	8.47	47	44.91	9	8.67	65	62.05
Total	263	234.13	1055	843.35	399	321.36	1717	1398.84

* Due to the small numbers of employees these grades have been amalgamated for the public response to ensure no breach of data protection. A further breakdown can be given direct to Members on request.

Grade	Chief Executive's		Education, Care & Health Services		Environment & Community Services		Total	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	Total FTE
MB	3	3.00	1	1.00	1	1.00	5	5.00
MG1	3	3.00					3	3.00
MG2	1	1.00	4	4.00	3	3.00	8	8.00
MG3	6	5.80	1	1.00	2	2.00	9	8.80
MG4	8	8.00	10	10.00	1	1.00	19	19.00
MG5	16	15.80	12	12.00	10	10.00	38	37.80
MG6	37	34.93	35	33.99	14	13.58	86	82.50
Total	74	71.53	63	61.99	31	30.58	168	164.10

This page is left intentionally blank

Councillor Attendance at formal meetings 2013/14 (Interim: 15/5/13 to 11/4/14)

Appendix 2

Please note that this information relates only to formal meetings of the Council, the Executive, Committees, Sub-Committees and Working Groups and does not attempt to reflect the overall workload of Councillors. Councillors attend a wide and varied workload range of meetings not listed below such as pre-meetings, consultative panels, partnership meetings and events in their wards.

	Present	Absent <i>(Figures in brackets are for apologies received)</i>	Percentage meetings attended <i>(excludes as a visiting Member)</i>	Present as Visiting Member	Total meetings attended	Councillor comments
Cllr Reg Adams	38	7 (5)	84	2	40	
Cllr Graham Arthur	27	8 (8)	77	15	42	
Cllr Douglas Auld	28	3 (3)	90	3	31	
Cllr Kathy Bance	27	5 (4)	84	0	27	
Cllr Jane Beckley	5	5 (5)	50	0	5	
Cllr Julian Benington	24	5 (4)	83	2	26	
Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP	57	4 (4)	93	9	66	
Cllr Ruth Bennett	17	1 (1)	94	1	18	
Cllr Eric Bosshard	30	4 (4)	88	12	42	
Cllr Katy Boughey	18	5 (5)	78	0	18	
Cllr Lydia Buttinger	20	2 (2)	91	0	20	
Cllr John Canvin	26	2 (0)	93	1	27	
Cllr Stephen Carr	31	5 (5)	81	7	38	
Cllr Roger Charsley	25	3 (3)	89	1	26	
Cllr Peter Dean	21	3 (2)	88	3	24	
Cllr Nicky Dykes	17	3 (3)	85	0	17	
Cllr Judi Ellis	14	6 (4)	68	1	15	Deputy Mayor 2013/14
Cllr Robert Evans	34	8 (8)	84	19	53	
Cllr Roxy Fawthrop	22	6 (1)	85	0	22	
Cllr Simon Fawthrop	23	2 (2)	92	4	27	
Cllr Peter Fookes	54	2 (2)	96	16	70	
Cllr Peter Fortune	18	3 (3)	86	8	26	
Cllr John Getgood	21	13 (12)	62	1	22	
Cllr Julian Grainger	45	5 (3)	90	0	45	
Cllr Ellie Harmer	31	5 (3)	86	2	33	
Cllr Will Harmer	18	0	100	5	23	
Cllr David Hastings	11	7 (3)	61	2	13	
Cllr Brian Humphrys	12	1 (1)	92	1	13	
Cllr S Huntington-Thresher	14	5 (5)	74	0	14	
Cllr W Huntington-Thresher	23	3 (3)	88	6	29	

	Present <i>(Figures in brackets are for attendance as a substitute)</i>	Absent <i>(Figures in brackets are for apologies received)</i>	Percentage meetings attended <i>(excludes as a visiting Member)</i>	Present as Visiting Member	Total meetings attended	Councillor comments
Cllr John Ince	29	1 (1)	97	3	32	
Cllr Russell Jackson	18	4 (4)	82	1	19	
Cllr David Jefferys	18	8 (8)	69	0	18	
Cllr Charles Joel	23	1 (1)	96	2	25	
Cllr Kate Lymer	28	4 (4)	86	4	32	
Cllr Paul Lynch	16	4 (3)	80	0	16	
Cllr Mrs Anne Manning	34	1 (1)	97	1	35	
Cllr David McBride	25	1 (1)	96	1	26	
Cllr Russell Mellor	36	6 (5)	86	21	57	
Cllr Alexa Michael	34	0	100	3	37	
Cllr Nick Milner	18	0	100	2	20	
Cllr Peter Morgan	27	1 (1)	96	8	35	
Cllr Ernest Noad	6	2 (2)	75	0	6	Mayor 2013/14
Cllr Gordon Norrie	18	12 (11)	60	0	18	
Cllr Tony Owen	33	5 (4)	87	1	34	
Cllr Tom Papworth	22	9 (6)	71	2	24	
Cllr Ian Payne	14	5 (2)	74	4	18	
Cllr Sarah Phillips	18	0	100	4	22	
Cllr Neil Reddin	32	2 (1)	94	4	36	
Cllr Catherine Rideout	13	4 (4)	76	4	17	
Cllr Charles Rideout	25	4 (4)	86	3	28	
Cllr Richard Scoates	24	4 (2)	86	9	33	
Cllr Colin Smith	25	4 (3)	86	9	34	
Cllr Diane Smith	34	7 (7)	83	6	40	
Cllr Tim Stevens JP	34	3 (3)	92	3	37	
Cllr Harry Stranger	25	3 (1)	89	1	26	
Cllr Michael Tickner	12	3 (2)	80	6	18	
Cllr Pauline Tunnicliffe	24	4 (0)	86	4	28	
Cllr Michael Turner	21	1 (1)	95	1	22	
Cllr Stephen Wells	28	8 (6)	78	12	40	

Appendix 3
(Answer to question 6)

BROMLEY TOWN CENTRE

Vacancies	TCM count¹	Local Data Company²
Bromley	% vacancy	% vacancy
Jun-10	4.0%	9.1%
Sep-10	2.0%	
Dec-10	2.0%	7.5%
Jan-11		9.0%
Feb-11	7.2%	
May-11	6.8%	
Jul-11	6.4%	10.3%
Dec-11	4.7%	
May-12		9.5%
Jul-12	6.6%	
Oct-12		10.1%
Dec-12	4.7%	
Mar-13	7.4%	
May-13		11.3%
Jul-13	8.3%	
Sep-13	9.8%	
Nov-13		11.2%
Dec-13	8.3%	
Feb-14	8.0%	

Notes

1 - From July 2012 the Bromley TCM only surveyed primary areas of the town outside the Glades (Intu Bromley) and the Mall Previous to July 2012 the vacancy figure included the Glades and the Mall (483 units in total).

2 - Local Data Company survey the furthest extent of the town as defined by DCLG including London Road, Tweedy Road, roads around Bromley North Station and Masons Hill (509 units). The more peripheral areas of the town centre traditionally have higher levels of vacancy and therefore increase the overall LDC vacancy rate.

3 - From this point on a more consistent approach to vacancy data will be adopted with an increased reliance on Local Data Company information. The boundaries of the LDC count area can be adjusted to be contiguous with the proposed Bromley BID boundary.

ORPINGTON TOWN CENTRE

Vacancies	TCM count	Local Data Company ¹
Orpington	% vacancy	% vacancy
Jun-10	9.0%	10.5%
Sep-10	7.1%	
Dec-10	8.7%	10.6%
Mar-11	8.0%	13.3%
Mar-12		14.2%
Apr-13	8.0%	
May-13		10.9%
Mar-14		15.3%

Notes

1 - Local Data Company survey the furthest extent of the town as defined by DCLG including the High Street beyond the junction with Chislehurst Road, which has suffered from high vacancies for some years. This differs from the TCM / BID survey which includes only the High Street south of this junction and the Walnuts.

2 - It should be noted that at in April 2014 10 out of the 44 units in the Walnuts were vacant - which provides a 22.7% vacancy rate. The high street rate is currently nearer to 10% according to the BID Manager.

3 - From this point on a more consistent approach to vacancy data will be adopted with an increased reliance on Local Data Company information. The boundaries of the LDC count area can be adjusted to be contiguous with the actual Orpington BID boundary.

BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE

Vacancies	TCM count	Local Data Company ¹
Beckenham	% vacancy	% vacancy
Jun-10		10.30%
Dec-10	5%	12.50%
Jun-11		9.60%
Oct-11	11%	
Dec-11		9.40%
May-12		9.50%
Nov-12		8.40%
Dec-12	4.70%	
Jan-13	2.50%	
Mar-13	4.70%	
Jun-13		7.10%
Dec-13	5.10%	6.80%

1 - Local Data Company survey the furthest extent of the town as defined by DCLG including more peripheral areas and buildings not included in TCM survey.

2 - From this point on a more consistent approach to vacancy data will be adopted with an increased reliance on Local Data Company information. The boundaries of the LDC count area and the buildings which are defined as retail frontage will agreed and set to provide a consistency with TCM definitions.

Canvass Response Rates 2013/14

(as at publication of the new Register on 17th February 2014)

Bickley	97.74
Biggin Hill	98.35
Bromley Common & Keston	98.20
Bromley Town	97.02
Chelsfield & Pratts Bottom	98.84
Chislehurst	96.21
Clock House	97.36
Copers Cope	94.93
Cray Valley East	95.71
Cray Valley West	97.49
Crystal Palace	91.54
Darwin	95.81
Farnborough & Crofton	98.71
Hayes & Coney Hall	99.41
Kelsey & Eden Park	97.63
Mottingham & Chislehurst N	95.51
Orpington	98.39
Penge & Cator	95.01
Petts Wood & Knoll	99.48
Plaistow & Sundridge	95.96
Shortlands	97.40
West Wickham	99.14