



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: 14th December 2015

COUNCIL

Monday 14 December 2015

The answers to questions received are set out in the attached documents.

- 5 **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHERE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.**
(Pages 3 - 6)
- 6 **ORAL QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL WHERE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.**
(Pages 7 - 32)
- 7 **WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL WHERE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**
(Pages 33 - 62)

Copies of the documents referred to above can be obtained from
<http://cde.bromley.gov.uk/>

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

14th DECEMBER 2015

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(1) From Hon. Alderman Sue Polydorou JP to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Reserves

The Annual Report and Statement of Accounts for 2014/15 show Council balances on 31.03.2015 as follows:

Total Authority Reserves: £666,193,000, with Usable Reserves of £182,520,000

At the recent Council public consultation meeting regarding the budget on 26 November Cllr Graham Arthur stated usable reserves were £131,000,000, some £50,000,000 less than indicated in the final accounts on 31.3.2015.

Please confirm the Total Authority Reserves and Usable Reserves to date and if Cllr Arthur's statement is correct please explain the reason for the reduction in usable reserves since March.

Reply:

Although the Council holds total reserves of £666m as at 31st March 2015, £484m of these are unusable (i.e. do not represent usable resources). Unusable reserves do not have cash balances and do not provide monies available to fund expenditure. They are held to meet statutory requirements relating to technical accounting purposes. The largest of these is the capital adjustment account (£564m).

Usable reserves total £182m. Of this sum £51m are subject to statutory limitations on their use and can only be used to fund capital expenditure. The remaining £131m, as referred to at the recent public consultation meeting, represents the level of usable earmarked and general reserves that the Council may use to fund revenue expenditure subject to the need to maintain a prudent level of reserves.

Supplementary Question:

At successive public consultation meetings about the budget, including the most recent one, Cabinet members have stressed the need to cut budgets and services because of austerity. In the final accounts in March 2010 the Council had £115m in usable reserves. Despite austerity, usable reserves have increased by 58% over this five year period. The Chancellor George Osborne in his recent Autumn Statement said that Councils needed to draw on their reserves to improve local services – does Councillor Arthur agree with him?

Reply:

No, I do not agree with him and I find it extraordinary that we have to apologise for prudently handling the finances of this Council. What we do know is that the period of austerity, far from being over, has gathered pace for local government. Our income in two to three years' time will be significantly less than it is now. Rather than charge to the edge of the cliff like a lemming, what we have done is take prudent measures well in advance to make sure that we can live within our means for all the tomorrows to come. A half of the Councils across this country are saying that they will not be able to balance their books next year – we are not one of them. The reason we are not one of them is because we have taken the right action on time and we have got ourselves ahead of the game. I make no apology for that.

The use of reserves is something that is far better understood in private industry than it is in public service and public service has to start thinking like a private industry if we are to balance the books.

(2) From Hon. Alderman Sue Polydorou JP to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

As of 31.3.2014 Investment Property assets were £71,548,000. On 31.3.2015 Investment Property assets were £96,724,000.

Please outline the reason for this increase in Investment Property for this period and what is the figure for Investment Property to date?

Reply:

The increase of £25.2m in investment property assets between 31st March 2014 and 31st March 2015 is mainly due to the purchase of five investment properties totalling £22.6m. Annual property revaluations also resulted in a net increase of £2.6m in the value of all investment property assets held. Further purchases of three investment properties totalling £20.9m since 31st March 2015 has increased the current value of investment properties held to £117.6m.

Supplementary Question:

At the recent budget consultation meeting, Cabinet members justified having a property investment portfolio because of the favourable rate of return on investments which is then ploughed back into the revenue budget. Of the £117.6m that Councillor Arthur has outlined the assets now stand at, how much of that sum is the original investment that has been put in by the Council, how much is capital appreciation and how much of the total return over the last five years has been allocated back to the revenue budget?

Reply:

The return on the property investments currently stands at 6%. The reason we have undertaken those investments is to improve the yield that would have been possible having cash reserves in the bank at between 1% and 1.5%, and so by a yield of 6% that is a considerably better form of investment for us. As a subsidiary issue we will also enjoy an increase in the capital value of those investments and £2.6m has been added to the value of those investments during the current year.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Simon Fawthrop asked whether the Portfolio Holder could recall what happened to reserves and the Council Tax under the Lib/Lab pact?

Reply:

Councillor Arthur could not recall the precise reduction in reserves, but the figures he had heard were £30-40m over the three years of the Lib/Lab pact. The Council Tax during that time increased by 32%, so people were hit by a very substantial increase. It had to be appreciated however, that this was a period of high inflation.

The Portfolio Holder also clarified that the total interest income for next year would be about £11.5m and of that every penny would go back to the revenue account to improve or maintain services.

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

14th DECEMBER 2015

QUESTIONS FOR ORAL REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Cllr Russell Mellor to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

May I ask the Portfolio Holder if he is aware of my resident: Mrs Julie North?

Reply:

If he is referring to Mrs Julie North, who is chairman of the Palgrave Estate, Porchester Mead, then the answer is yes.

Supplementary Question

I am delighted that Cllr Morgan is aware of my resident Mrs Julie North who has been patiently waiting for a planning matter to be resolved. The purpose of my question is to tease out the solution he may have to resolve this obnoxious question of the unused site at Stumps Hill, Southend Lane.

Reply:

I have been to see the site myself. It is a site which could easily be developed, it is overgrown, neglected and surrounded by a not particularly attractive painted corrugated iron fence which is in a poor state of repair. The issue is that we all want the site tidied up. Unfortunately, these things are never easy or quick, but I will give you a chronology of where we have got to.

The Council issued a notice on 1st May under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended (Section 215) requiring the tidying of the site. The owner, Mr Winspear, then advised us on the 26th June, exactly 56 days after the 1st May, that he had appealed.

From 12th August 2015 to 7th October 2015, the Council waited for the appeal hearing date from Bromley Magistrates' Court but to no avail. The Council wrote to the Magistrates' Court several times to chase up on the matter.

In September the Council wrote to Mr Winspear to inform him that the Court have said that they do not have any record of his appeal against the Notice dated 1st May 2015. Mr Winspear insisted that he had appealed and was very adamant and wrote to inform the Council that he had indeed appealed against the notice. Again the Council checked with the Magistrates' Court and was informed that they do not have a record of the said appeal.

As a result of no appeal hearing with the Magistrate's Court it was decided that this matter can now proceed to prosecution action.

In November 2015, the Planning Investigation Officer for the above matter completed a statement for a prosecution for the offence of not compliance with the Section 215 Notice.

On 3rd December 2015 further prosecution instructions were requested by and given to our legal team. Details of the relevant correspondence relating to the above matter

have been incorporated as part of the planning investigations officers' witness statement. The matter is ongoing.

If the Magistrates' Court does issue a notice ordering the owner to tidy the site and he does not comply within a stated period then that becomes a criminal offence with all the consequences that flow from that.

2. From Cllr Vanessa Allen to the Leader of the Council

Since the Communities Secretary, Greg Clark, is urging councils to not only save for the future but also to make efficient use of assets to provide services, how does the Leader propose to follow the Minister's recommended course of action and use non ring-fenced reserves to provide the services local people expect to see?

Reply:

The Council faces a significant ongoing budget gap with the need for further savings due to reductions in government grant, new burdens and the impact of population change. It is absolutely right that the Council uses its non ring-fenced reserves to protect and provide services to local people. That is exactly what we are doing. However we do not do what the Labour opposition would have us do, namely throw our reserves at ongoing revenue deficits, which would see all those reserves depleted within four years leading to even greater budget cuts in the future. We say no to that type of financial illiteracy but instead we set aside reserves for specific purposes such as invest to save, supporting economic growth and longer term investment in order to generate income which helps to protect key services. If we did not do this we would already have a further budget deficit of £10-11m. In addition, I can confirm that the Government, as part of the Spending Review 2015, indicated that local authorities will be able to use receipts from asset disposals to spend on "reform" which relates to non- recurring transformation costs only. We say again, reserves do not provide a sustainable solution to maintaining local authority services. In the interests of the residents of this borough, we will continue to do it our way, not theirs.

Supplementary Question:

We have never advocated using all the reserves, just a small proportion. That was the point of the question, because of the cuts that happened last year. Greg Clark was interested in the point that we are putting away more than we are cutting. Can the issue be re-examined again?

Reply:

The Labour Group can challenge these numbers in committee and during the budget process which is ongoing from now until the end of February.

Supplementary Question:

Cllr Colin Smith stated that since 2011/12 the Council had taken £67m out of the revenue budget, in tranches of £16m, £22m etc. multiplied by the number of years we have taken them out, a total of £242m. This year we have an extra £20m to take out of the budget, giving us a potential revenue gap of £87m and a net total of £329m. Had we spent an extra £329m not only would we have no reserves but we would have a significant debt. How would he propose to fund that in these straitened times?

Reply:

There are only two ways – borrowing, and we know what happened when the Labour government borrowed, or cutting services to the depth Cllr Smith has just alluded to.

3. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Leader of the Council

In parallel to cuts to services, Members are often asked what actions the Council will be taking to reflect austerity in its own running costs. In this context, please give details of any plans to change the number of councillors to be elected in the Borough at the local government elections to be held in 2018.

Reply:

As Cllr Wilkins will be aware this is an issue which has been considered at the Constitution Improvement Working Group. From recent figures Bromley has one of the largest number of electors to Councillors in London with there being for example from recent figures 3,958 electors for each councillor in Bromley compared to 2,842 electors per councillor in Bexley.

Therefore whilst we need to make significant savings we also need to maintain an appropriate level of democratic representation and this is something the Constitution Improvement Working Group will consider further.

Supplementary Question:

There are a lot of rumours across the borough about this issue, and I was looking for a more definitive answer – when will we have an answer?

Reply:

It is when the Constitution Improvement Working Group have looked at the issue, deliberated and made recommendations back to the Council.

4. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

Will the LBB consider appointing a “member champion” for the Mental Health Challenge so that we can ensure we are being as effective as we can in promoting the improvement of mental health in Bromley across the full range of authority’s activities and responsibilities?

Reply:

The Council already works hard to ensure that the needs of those suffering from mental health issues are fully met in our borough. However, the suggestion of having this sort of champion certainly sits well with me – we have had over the years a champion for all sorts of causes and groups in Bromley.

My initial thought though is that because our efforts in this area are shared with our partners – particularly health and the third sector – this appointment is probably best made by the Health and Wellbeing Board so that the brief given to the champion is wider than just across the Council. I am very happy to talk with Cllr Jefferys, the chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board, and indeed with Cllr Bance to approve such an appointment.

5. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Leader of Council

You are on record from the September Executive & Resources PDS meeting as saying that you wanted to see budgets planned for three years ahead. Can you please explain to the Council how you plan to do this, with particular reference to the forthcoming budget?

Reply:

Despite seeking a longer term financial settlement, which would further help us to manage our budget, it is unlikely to be forthcoming when we receive the local government finance settlement later this month.

Whilst I would like to see budgets planned for three years, with so much uncertainty around government policy and funding levels this is not yet possible. However, my hope remains that we will be able to move to three year budgeting once the government provides longer term financial settlements.

Supplementary Question:

Three year budgeting can help with uncertainties and identify changes further in advance. For next year's budgeting will you consider bringing forward a three year budget to Executive and Resources PDS Committee on a part 2 basis before the summer so that the Committee can conduct a proper scrutiny of the various options that are being considered?

Reply:

Our hands are tied, but if things do change rapidly and we were to get more information from the Government I think it is in everyone's interests that we look at our budgets, have more time to look in detail and to scrutinise them. Whether the summer is possible, I think some time earlier in the cycle would be helpful and I would be keen to see that happen.

6. From Cllr Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

With Bromley becoming an emerging gangs borough and more gang related violence occurring in Penge earlier this month, do the Council believe the closure of the Hub at Snowdown Close with its positive youth provision was the right decision? Will the Council pledge money gained through any sale of the building to fund an increase in youth activities in the north of the borough?

Reply:

At the last full Council meeting I outlined the plethora of activities in Penge that the Council organises in order to tackle gangs. In reply, you welcomed the actions set out and stated that it sounded like there was a lot of work going on. In addition to these activities, the Council is aware of a number of voluntary organisations who deliver various services to young people in Penge aged 8 to 25 years old. The letting arrangements at Snowdown Close were only ever temporary. Christ Central Church run a youth session at Snowdown Close on a Wednesday which is the same night as when the Council's Youth Service deploys a detached provision in Penge in nearby

Queen Adelaide Estate or near the High Street. The Church stated that it envisaged expansion and other projects if they kept the building, however, they are already able to do this from the Church, running a number of other activities throughout the week, including a Youth Service on a Friday evening. The Church is only a four minute walk from Snowdown Close. It can also often be the case that a building that is not in use 24/7 may also attract anti-social behaviour, whereas residential development is unlikely to attract the same problem. Any money raised from the sale of this building will ultimately be used to support the stretched Council services in order to protect the most vulnerable members of our community.

Supplementary Question:

This is an issue that is very worrying in our part of the borough. Will you work more closely with the local councillors so that we can help you in solving this gang problem in Penge?

Reply:

Following the peer gang review this time last year, a gangs strategic board was set up and formulated a 15 point action plan. A key part of this plan, which was discussed at Holy Trinity Church at the event you mentioned, includes the mapping out of diversionary activities across the borough and we asked you as local councillors to come forward with the activities that you are aware of. Vic McNally, our single point of contact at the Home Office, is coming to the Board at the next meeting in January to review the progress we have made so far. If he is not happy with the work being done around diversionary activities and intervention then we will review what else can be done. Ultimately, I am very happy to work with the ward Councillors on an ongoing basis to discuss what we can do within your local community.

7. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP to the Leader of the Council

If he will comment on the claim made in the 'Open Letter' to him dated 16th November 2015 from the Leader of the Opposition that 'the Council's assets and reserves are approaching £400m and these could be used "to fund council expenditure and protect services"?'

Reply:

I would like to know where this figure comes from – as far as I am aware, there is no reference to a sum of £400m for assets and reserves reflected in the Council's accounts. Pantomime season has come early this year, as Cllr Wilkins, despite being informed to the contrary, has been spinning this fairy tale for far too long now.

The Council has usable revenue reserves of £131m (as at 31/03/15). Of this, £13m belongs to schools, our health partners and the insurance fund, £57m is set aside for invest to save and to support economic growth and longer term investments in order to generate income which helps to protect our key services. The remaining £20m held in general reserves provides a degree of protection against general financial risks as part of the Council's overall financial strategy. We also hold reserves of £51m which are subject to statutory limitations on their use and can only be used to fund capital expenditure.

The seven Labour economic financial dwarves would do better sticking to Father Christmas, or writing to me via the local journals and newspapers.

Supplementary Question:

As the assets of the Council include roads, school buildings and parks, has the Leader received a list from the Labour party of those that they wish to flog off?

Reply:

No.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Wilkins suggested that when she went to her bank manager, they would look at not just what was in her account, but at a number of different things. Would the Leader accept that “reserves” was a very broad term and in fact we have £307.6m in investments and over £60m in property. Those are reserves – that is all I have ever said, and I would like that to be recognised.

Reply:

This is a serious issue when we are dealing with significant grant reductions from central government. We maintain that the best way to do that is not to flog off the family silver, but to invest in the future through invest to save projects, investing in properties generating higher returns to support the revenue account. We are struggling to come to terms with a philosophical and pragmatic difference in the way we see things on this side about living within our means as opposed to the Labour Group over the last 13 years of their administration demonstrating that they did not understand the importance of living within one’s means. We will do everything we can to protect frontline services for vulnerable residents and we believe we are doing exactly that with the investments we have made rather than cutting frontline public services.

8. From Cllr Tony Owen to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Given that developers at Berwick House, Orpington and the former police station are selling parking spaces at £10,000 and £20,000 respectively, what approach will be taken when the inevitable request for residents parking permits is received?

Reply:

The answer will be no, so far as I am concerned, if I am still in post and supported by the PDS Committee of the day.

In my opinion, the farcical Planning policy which encourages such over development at the cost of lost office space and employment opportunities in the future, self-evidently remains in complete denial that many inhabitants of such properties will still want and choose to purchase cars.

If left unchecked, this policy will continue to choke and change forever the pleasant character of many more of our Borough’s roads than it already has in recent years. I would therefore encourage all colleagues present this evening who are keen to preserve the pleasant nature of our Borough, to write to their MPs, urging its repeal.

Supplementary Question:

There was no supplementary question from Councillor Owen.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Ian Dunn referred to the report to Development Control Committee on Orpington Police Station which made reference to a confidential viability assessment that showed that no affordable housing could be provided as part of the development. He asked whether the confidential viability assessment had any reference to selling off parking spaces at £20,000 each, and if it did not did the Council have any remedy against the developer?

Reply:

Councillor Peter Morgan responded that he did not think the Council would be in a position to prevent an owner selling something that they owned.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher asked whether the Portfolio Holder could confirm that the Transport advice on these two developments in his ward was that owners would not be entitled to a parking space. He asked whether he could be sure that for developments marketed as car-free developments this would continue to be the advice from Transport.

Reply:

I believe it was the case that these developments were declared no-car premises. The Transport Team have to make recommendations based on the NPPS. The Transport Team is definitely trying to make these developments car-free, but how can you stop someone buying a car if they want one?

9. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Leader of Council

Please can you provide a list of those Residents' Associations (and any other groups) invited to attend the two budget consultation meetings held recently and the dates on which invitation letters were sent?

Given the absence of any representation from Crystal Palace and Penge & Cator wards on these lists, can you please explain how this list was compiled and why many other interested RAs and community groups were not invited?

Reply:

I do have the list of Residents Associations invited to the budget round table discussions ([Appendix 1.](#)) They are separated into broadly East and West areas. The invitations were sent out by email on 6th November followed by letters where we have the postal addresses. The West Group were invited to the 30th November meeting and the East Group to the 1st December meeting with an indication that they could swap meetings if that was more convenient. The groups invited from the areas in question were the Penge Forum, the Penge East Residents Association and the Crystal Palace Triangle Planning Group. Mr Stephen Brush attended for the Penge Forum on 30th November – former Councillor John Getgood sent his apologies for the night.

Supplementary Question:

I do not know the Crystal Palace Triangle Planning Group and Councillor Bance does not know the Penge East Residents Association – perhaps we need to look further at this. If we are going to have consultation, can we do it better than this next year?

Reply:

The West Beckenham Residents Association also covers the area concerned. We are trying to evolve the best system of public consultation and I am very happy to keep reviewing that.

10. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Portfolio Holder for Education

Bromley has 77% of its primary school pupils in Academies, the highest percentage in England. With the poor Ofsted results for our Bromley Primary Schools shown in the recently published Ofsted Annual Report, should we hold off pushing further primary schools into Academies?

Reply:

You have rightly picked out an interesting piece of information, that Bromley has the highest number of pupils educated in Academy schools at primary level, 77%. We are proud of this achievement and that we are meeting the Government's aspirations for Academy and Free School provision. All 14 of our Outstanding schools are Academies based on pre-conversion judgements and we would expect these schools to be maintaining their high standards.

6 RI and 2 inadequate schools should have now had their inspection under the new Common Inspection Framework, but it appears that there are delays in the 24 month re-inspection timetabling. We are optimistic that when inspected these schools, 5 of which are Academy schools awaiting their first post conversion inspection, will show an improvement.

Of the 10 Academy schools already inspected post conversion, 3 have remained at good, one has gone from inadequate to Good and one has gone from Outstanding to good.

With regard to Ofsted Outcomes, therefore, I believe that our policy related to Academisation remains on track but we are working to build relationships at local, regional and national level, and support new Academy structures to help ensure there remains a strong quality assurance oversight of Academy schools that enhances the work of Ofsted.

Supplementary Question:

What is being said that academy schools are not bringing the results down, it is the maintained schools. Is the Portfolio Holder confident that failing academy schools would be brought to our attention in time to intervene with school improvement resources?

Reply:

In the answer I spoke about some of the schools that have not yet been re-inspected with the new framework in place. When they are inspected we expect some improvement. It is vital that we ensure that we maintain a high standard of educational provision. This gets to the fundamental nature of what academies are meant to do. The academies in Bromley are trailblazers and are, like all academies across the country, held to higher standards, standards put in place by the current government. One of the other welcome changes to help maintain those standards is the introduction of a Regional Schools Commissioner. He is coming to our PDS Committee next month and Members will be able to scrutinise him there. We believe that it is not just about safeguarding and making sure there is better educational

provision. These changes provide greater freedom in decision making, improvements are driven by teachers and not by bureaucrats, schools are more responsive to parents, schools can get more engaged with their communities – there is a great list of advantages which is why the Labour Government decided to introduce them.

(As the thirty minutes allotted to questions had expired at this point, the Mayor asked whether Members wished to continue with the remaining questions. On a show of hands, Members decided to continue.)

11. From Cllr Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

In the wake of the Chancellor's statement allowing a 2% Council Tax precept to help Social Care funding, will the Portfolio Holder seriously and actively consider supporting projects and places such as Melvin Hall which is used by Age Concern to provide help and companionship to elderly residents.

Reply:

Should the Council decide to levy the 2% precept this may help to mitigate existing cost pressures in social care but is unlikely to result in the Council being able to grant fund the voluntary sector. Social care funding must be directed towards those most in need and to the services which best meet their needs. The Council already commissions Age Concern Penge and Anerley to provide day opportunities for older people who choose to have their eligible needs met in that way.

Supplementary Question:

In my ward the residents of Melvyn Hall regard it as very important, and the organisers are using their own funding. With the current underspend, would you be able to outline any future support?

Reply:

I certainly appreciate the work done at Melvyn Hall, and I am looking forward to enjoying lunch with them next Thursday. In terms of where we put our money, the days of grant funding very worthy organisations are over. We are now in the process of commissioning services, and we commission Penge and Anerley Age Concern to provide day opportunities for people in the area who need those services and choose to have those services. In terms of helping them, we do have moneys available for new projects, and Melvyn Hall are interested in setting up a new project. So we do help day centres as much as we can, but we cannot simply give grants in the way we used to.

12. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP to the Leader of the Council

What estimates he has as to projected increase in the Borough's population to 2030 and the impact that this will have on the Borough's facilities and services?

Reply:

The Planning Division disseminates all projections (GLA, DCLG and ONS), together with other data to all Council Departments and Divisions who deal with this data in respect of their areas of service provision. The GLA population projections are more accurate, because they use local information that is not available nationally on a consistent basis. The ONS projections only use information that can be provided nationally.

The ONS and GLA 2014 trend based projections show an increase in the Borough's population of approximately 5.5% from 325,000 in 2015 to 343,000 by 2030. If this projection proves accurate and there is no local intervention, in my opinion it will put an intolerable burden on our schooling provision, health services, housing stock, transport capabilities, utilities services and all Council services.

Supplementary Question:

As we do not live in North Korea and cannot put Police points round Bromley to stop people getting in, is it not time to review Building a Better Bromley to see how we can accommodate what is likely to happen.

Reply:

Councillor Bennett makes a valid point so perhaps we do need to take stock and have a plan for how we deal with the next 15 or 20 years.

Additional Supplementary question:

Councillor Mary Cooke asked whether, when the Council considers whether to seek a reduction in the number of councillors, it would be sensible to take into account the increasing number of residents.

Reply:

That is a valid point. There is already a high number of residents per councillor and we need to take that into account in making any future decision. Since the borough was formed, local authorities have taken on significant additional burdens, such as public health and health and social care integration. It is really important that we have the right balance of councillors versus population to deal with these ongoing issues and new burdens. All these things will be taken into consideration in the months to come.

Additional Supplementary question:

Councillor Simon Fawthrop asked whether the Leader would agree that it was not just about the supply side, but that we should also look at the demand side in this situation of population growth? We should work with the government to ensure that immigration is controlled in a sensible fashion so that the population does not spiral out of control. If houses have got to be built somewhere eventually there will be no land left to build on if that logic is followed to its conclusion.

Reply:

That is what I have been doing for some time. I have the scars as the only Leader across London raising these issues at London Councils about the importance of managing demand as well as supply – it is not good enough to do what we are doing at the moment. As part of the Outer London Commission has been looking at the topic of removing barriers to building, and quite madly there appears to be a determination to remove barriers to building on green belt land to which I am opposed. There is clearly a move and direction towards finding room to build considerably more homes in London. It has now been accepted by Will McKee and the Outer London Commission that it should not be London but the South East Region as a whole that should be dealing with this issue of providing these additional homes, if indeed they are necessary.

13. From Cllr Tony Owen to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Why is Environmental Services raising no objections to planning proposals for flats with no parking provision in Station Square, Petts Wood?

Reply:

I assume question 13 refers to 9 Station Square, Petts Wood.

If so, I am advised that the proposal was to extend the upper floors of the building and convert them from a 3 bed flat to a one bed and 3 x 2 bed flats. The initial application (15/01485) had a highway ground of refusal relating to the lack of parking. The subsequent application (15/03834) for the same proposal included a Transport Report with a parking stress survey.

Most of the roads around the site have some form of controlled parking during the day so it would be difficult to keep a car on-street all the time. The roads nearest the site with free parking during the day are West Way and Fairway.

The parking stress survey, carried out overnight to establish the residential parking demand, showed many more available spaces than would be taken up by the likely number of vehicles which could be generated by this development.

Perhaps crucially, the Government's guidance in its 'National Planning Policy Framework' is that "development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe".

Given the information supplied about the available parking nearby, officers could not therefore sustain an objection on highway grounds.

Supplementary Question:

We have a number of free bays around Station Square, which the Department are looking at changing to pay and display bays. I would ask, can we all sing from one hymn sheet and act sensibly.

Reply:

As it is Christmas, we will all sing from the same carol sheet and I will try to act sensibly.

14. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

Our local police, traders and residents have asked for support from the Council to assist them to deal with the growing numbers of rough sleepers who are bedding down in rear shop doorways after drinking throughout the day. With money being scarce to address the problem directly, would the Council consider a Ward wide drinking ban to discourage the influx of problem drinkers to the area?

Reply:

There is currently an alcohol exclusion zone in Penge that covers the area immediately surrounding the High Street. Under the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 this current zone will expire in 2017. Therefore, we will review the position before 2017 and consider the need for a Public Spaces Protection Order which could be made wider and controls alcohol consumption in a similar way. There

is a process of consultation before an order can be made, and there will have to be evidence of the need for such an order. The order will also need Police backing as main body for enforcement. Street drinking can be associated with the consumption of high strength beers and where the problem of street drinking has been particularly severe in other boroughs, other initiatives have been tried such as one titled "Reducing the Strength." This is a voluntary scheme adopted by local off-licences who agree not to sell high strength beer and cider. Resources are needed to implement such a scheme.

Your question refers to a growing number of rough sleepers who are bedding down in the rear shop doorways after drinking throughout the day. Rough sleeping is often associated with alcohol use and this is something that Thames Reach London Street Rescue, the organisation who deliver rough sleeper outreach services for us, monitor closely in order to engage with and help people off the street. The last rough sleeper headcount was undertaken in Penge on 26th November by Thames Outreach. As part of the headcount, a very thorough search of Penge was undertaken, including shop doorways, rear access to shops and local parks. The headcount found two rough sleepers bedding down in Penge, both already known to Thames Reach. Thames Reach also inform us that in general, although incidences of rough sleeping have increased in the last eighteen months or so, these are generally isolated incidences and are still relatively low. Whilst a number of the identified rough sleepers do have mental health and/or alcohol use issues they do not tend to be part of any entrenched street drinking culture either in Penge or anywhere else in the borough.

Supplementary Question:

With respect, none of those facts are correct. There are at least nine rough sleepers sleeping nightly in Penge. I support looking at the wider issues prior to 2017, and I know you will get Police backing – they can tell you how many rough sleepers there are each night. The local Police have asked me, as we expected this answer as we are aware of the audit figures, to ask whether, as some support from the Council, they could be given advanced referral forms to get these rough sleepers who are sleeping outside the shops into the night shelter, which has been given some money in an anonymous donation, to stay open this winter. Thames Reach do work, and do a terrific job, but they are not on hand when the Police are. They come round and if the person is not where they were told three hours ago they go away again. The police find them two roads away, and they are looking for some support.

Reply:

The evidence provided by Thames Reach, who are experts in their field, suggests that there is not a significant problem in Penge and therefore it does not require urgent attention. If you or the police have information about where they could go to seek them out to perhaps get the data more accurate that would be very helpful. I am also very happy to look at the issue of referral forms to the police.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Ian Payne asked the Portfolio Holder if she was aware of the Bromley Shelter which is running until March, which will accommodate homeless people and rough sleepers, which is funded by donations and run by Churches Together in Central Bromley.

Reply:

I am well aware of the shelter and the very good work they do.

15. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

How often are the containers, situated at sites around the borough for the disposal of bottles, paper etc, emptied?

Reply:

The banks are emptied at varying frequencies, depending on how well used the sites are by the public.

- Paper banks – Almost all sites are emptied weekly, with some emptied 2 or 3 times per week.
- Bottle banks – Half the sites are emptied every week, with the majority of the remainder emptied every other week.
- Can/Plastic Banks – The majority of the sites are emptied weekly, with the remainder emptied every other week.
- Textile banks – All sites are emptied weekly, with some visited twice per week.

Officers have attached schedules to tonight's papers (Appendices 2 and 3) for councillors contemplation and, if necessary, amendment.

Supplementary Question:

The borough is rightly proud of its green and clean reputation, being the second best in London for recycling. Is the Portfolio Holder aware that it is becoming a common occurrence now that when one visits many of these banks they are overflowing. For instance, last Saturday week I tried The Spa, Shortlands Station, The Hill. At all three banks there was paper piled up outside, and at Waldo Road on Sunday even the banks there were full. It does seem to me that we ought to be looking at the timing of these collections, given that we have gone to fortnightly collections. We want to ensure that our citizens who do a good job continue to do so, and having overflowing containers is being a discouragement to them.

Reply:

I concede it is not an infrequent concern that Councillor Bennett rightly raises. Waste managers are in ongoing discussions with Veolia on the matter. I do not know if there is an easy answer to this. Clearly the more collections we require there is a cost involved. If any colleague is seeing a bin that is not being emptied as frequently as they believe it should, please let Mr Bosley know, copying me in. I will happily discuss this further outside the meeting.

This page is left intentionally blank

Residents' Association East and Unknown

Aperfield Green Belt Action Group
Badgers Mount Residents' Association
Beechwood Residents' Association
Biggin Hill Partnership
Biggin Hill Residents' Association
Biggin Hill Society
Camden Close Residents Association
Camden Park Estate Ltd
Chelsfield Park Residents' Association
Chelsfield Park Residents' Association
Chelsfield Park Residents' Association
Chelsfield Park Residents' Association
Chelsfield Village Society
Chislehurst Society
Chislehurst Society
Downe Residents' Association
Downe Residents' Association
Farnborough Village Society
First Stapleton Management Co.Ltd Residents' Association
Glen View Road & The Glade Residents' Association
Goddington North Residents' Association
Goddington Park Preservation Association
Hoblands End Association
Homefield Rise Residents' Association
Kevington Residents' Association
Knockholt Society
Knoll Residents' Association
Knoll Residents' Association
Leesons Residents' Association
Lower Amhurst Residents' Association
Lower Amhurst Residents' Association
Mottingham Estate Tenants' Residents' Association
Mottingham Residents' Association
Mottingham Residents' Association
Mountview & Perry Hall Residents' Association
Oregon Park Residents' Association
Oregon Park Residents' Association
Orpington & District Amenity Society
Petts Wood and District Residents' Association
Petts Wood and District Residents' Association
Petts Wood and District Residents' Association
Pratts Bottom Residents' Association
Restovan Park Residents' Association
Rowan Park Residents' Association
SCOTRA
Sparrow Drive & Crofton Place Residents' Association
Sparrows Drive & Place Farm Estates Residents' Association
St. Paul's Cray Residents' Association

St. Paul's Cray Residents' Association
St. Paul's Cray Tenants & Residents' Association
Stirling Drive Residents' Association
The Federation of Private Residents' Associations
The London Borough of Bromley Residents' Federation (Crofton Residents'
Association?)
The Riverbirds Residents' Association
Vale Road Residents Association
Vinson Close Residents' Association
Well Hill Residents' Association
Windsor Drive Community Association
Woodlands Valley Residents' Association
Yester Park Residents Association
Residents Federation

Residents' Associations West

Aldersmead Road Residents' Association / Beckenham RA/NHW
Andace Park Residents' Association
Anerley Residents' Association
Babbacombe Road Residents' Association
Barnmead Residents' Association
Beadon Road Residents' Association
Beckenham Place Park Residents' Association
Beckenham Society/ Beckenham Civic Society*
Beckenham Village Residents' Association
Blenheim and Arpley Residents Association
Blenheim and Arpley Residents Association
Blenheim and Arpley Residents Association
Broadoaks Estate Association
Bromley Civic Society
Bromley Common & Hayes Lane Association of Residents
Bromley Common 2,4,6,8 Residents' Group
Bromley North and Sundridge Park Association and Rail Travellers
(BRONSPART)
Bromley North Residents' Association
Copers Cope Area Residents' Association
Crystal Palace Triangle Planning Group
Crystal Palace Triangle Planning Group
Durham Avenue Residents' Association
Eden Park Residents' Association
Fernwood Close Residents' Association
Gipsy Hill Residents Association
Grove Park Residents' Association
Hayes Village Association
Hayes Village Association
Hayes Village Association
Hazelhurst Residents' Association
Hilda Lane Community Association Ltd
Holwood Estate Residents' Association
Ivychurch Close & Laurel Grove Tenants' Association
Kelsey Park Estate & District Protection Society
Keston Mark & Bromley Common Residents' Association
Keston Mark & Bromley Common Village Residents' Association
Keston Park (1975) Ltd
Keston Park (1975) Ltd
Keston Village Residents' Association
King William 1V Residents Association
Knoll House Residents' Association
Leaves Green & Keston Vale Residents' Association (Bromley Residents'
Federation, Airport Sub-Committee)
Links Estate Residents' Association
London Borough of Bromley Residents Federation
Lullington Road Tenants' Association
Madeline & Versailles Road Residents' Association

Nash & District Residents' Association
Nineteen The Mall Management Co Ltd
North Bromley Residents' Association
North Street Residents' Association
Oakfield Lane Residents' Association
Palace Estate Residents' Association
Palace Road Residents' Association
Park Langley Residents' Association
Penge East Residents' Association
Penge Forum
Penge Forum
Queen Adelaide Court Tenants & Residents' Association
Ravensbourne Valley Preservation Society
Ravensbourne Valley Preservation Society
Ravensbourne Valley Preservation Society
Ravensbourne Valley Preservation Society
Ravensbourne Valley Preservation Society
Royston Estate Residents' Association
Shortlands Residents' Association
Shortlands Residents' Association
South Penge Park Residents' Association
Sundridge Avenue Residents' Association
Sundridge Avenue Residents' Association
Sundridge Avenue Residents' Association
Sundridge Preservation Society
The Gardens Residents' Association
The Grove Park Community Group
The Groves Residents' Association
The Mead & Mead Way Residents' Association
The Quinton Close Residents Association
Trafalgar Residents' Association
Turpington Community Association
West Beckenham Residents' Association
Wickham Common Residents Association
Wickham Common Residents' Association

Site	Address1	Address3	Postcode	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Chipperfield Road Car Park	St Pauls Cray, Cotmandene Crescent	Orpington	BR5 2RB					
St Marys Cray Railway Station	Cray Avenue	Orpington	BR5 2NB					
Sainsburys Car Park	Pallant Way	Orpington	BR6 8NZ					
Norman Park Car Park 2	Hook Farm Road	Bromley	BR2 9SX					
Norman Park Car Park 1	Hayes Lane	Bromley	BR2					
Baths Road Opp Central Depot	Baths Road	Bromley	BR2 9RB					
Waitrose	Bromley South approach road	Bromley	BR2 9HD					
Waters Yard	West Street	Bromley	BR1 1TP					
Civic Center	off Rochester Avenue top end through the Barriers	Bromley	BR1 9SA					
Sundridge Park Station	Plastow Lane	Bromley	BR1 3JE					
Brindley Way Car Park	Burnt Ash	Bromley	BR1 4QT					
Multi-Story Car Park	Beckenham Lane	Bromley	BR2 0DN					
Shortlands Railway Station	Shortlands Road	Bromley	BR2 0JA					
St Georges Car Park	Aldermarle Road	Bromley	BR3 5LN					
Fairfield Road	off Beckenham High Street	Bromley	BR3 3LD					
Spa Leisure Center	off Beckenham Road	Bromley	BR3 4PF					
Opp 1 Blanford Road	Blanford Road	Beckenham	BR3 4NE					
Opp Centra Park	Anerley Hill	Anerley	SE19 2AF					
Sparrows Den Car Park	Corkscrow Hill	Bromley	BR3 4NE					
Harvington Park Estate	South Eden Park Road	Bromley	BR3 3BS					
Tescos Car Park	Croydon Road	Bromley	BR3 4AA					
Hayes Station Car Park	Station Approach	Bromley	BR2 7EN					
Rays Road	off RedLodge Road	Bromley	BR4 0EQ					
Rear of Sainsbury Car Park	Ravens Wood Avenue	Bromley	BR4 0PU					
Pawleyne Close	off Kranklin Road	Bromley	SE20 8JH					
Eldred Drive	of Tintagle Road	Orpington	BR5 4PE					
Charterhouse Road	top end by Shops	Orpington	BR6 9EJ					
Crescent Way	Opp the Buff pud	Orpington	BR6 9NL					
Carlton Parade	shops bottom end of high street	Orpington	BR6 0JD					
Esso Service Station	Pratts Bottom off Sevenoaks road	Orpington	BR6 7SQ					
Windsor Drive		Chelsfield	BR6 6HD					
West Approach	By Morrisons	Pettswood	BR5 1DB					
Oast House Way	off Cray Vally Road, on the Corner	St Mary Cray	BR5 3PU					
Nunnington Close	in small car park	Chislehurst	SE9 4LD					
Kimmeridge Road	Co Op car park	Chislehurst	SE9 4LD					
Car park entrance by Waitrose	Main Road	Biggin Hill	TN16 3BB					

Banks on HWRS sites

Churchfields Tip Textile Bank	Churchfields Road	Beckenham	BR3 4QY					
Waldo Road Tip Textile Bank	Waldo Road	Bromley	BR1 2QX					

Book Banks

Baths Road Book Bank	Baths Road	Bromley	BR2 9RB					
Churchfields Tip Book Bank	Churchfields Road	Beckenham	BR3 4QY					

This page is left intentionally blank

Site ID	Site Name	No of Pods Paper	Week 1					Week 2					
			M	T	W	TH	FR	M	T	W	TH	FR	
1	Normans Park, Bromley (Hook farm Road)	1											
2	Normans Park, Hayes Lane	1											
3	Station Approach, Hayes	2											
4	Rays Road, West Wickham Station	3											
5	Ravenswood Avenue, West Wickham (Sainsburys)	2											
6	Sparrows Den, West Wickham, Cork Screw Hill	2											
7	Tesco Elmers End, Croydon Road	5											
8	Harvington Park, South Eden Park Road (Car Park Entrance)	1											
9	Fairfield Road, Beckenham (LIDL Car Park)	2											
10	Spa Leisure Centre, Beckenham Road (Turners Meadow)	1											
11	Pawleyne Close, Penge	1											
12	St Georges Road, Beckenham	3											
13	Southend Road, Beckenham (Waitrose Car park)	1											
14	Tovil Close, Anerly	1											
15	Ledington Road, Crystal Palace (Anerly Hill)	1											
16	Penge East Railway Stn, Station Road	1											
17	Croydon Road, Penge (Texaco Station)	1											
18	Beckenham Lane, Bromley (Car Park Rear)	1											
19	Burnt Ash Lane (Roslin Way Car park)	3											
20	Plaielow Lane, Bromley (Sundridge Station)	1											
21	Civic Centre Bromley, Rochester Avenue	4											
22	Bromley Town Centre North (Sainsburys, Walter Yard)	2											
23	Shortlands Station	1											
24	Bromley South Station	2											
25	Baths Road, Bromley	2											
26	High Street, Chislehurst (Sainsburys Car Park)	2											
27	Kimmeridge Road, Mottingham	1											
28	Nunnington Close, Mottingham	1											
29	Tesco Superstore, Sidcup, Edgington Way	1											
30	Cray Valley Road, Cray	1											
31	Cotmandene Crescent Cray (Car Park, St Pauls Cray)	3											
32	Station Approach, St Mary Cray	1											
33	Tintagel Road, Eldred Drive, Orpington	1											
34	Carlton Parade, Orpington (Court Road)	2											
35	Orpington Town Centre, Juglands Road	1											
36	Crescent Way, Green Street Green (Pinewood Drive)	2											
37	Charterhouse Road, Chelsfield (Saltwood Close)	2											
38	Windsor Drive, Chelsfield	3											
39	Esso Station, Pratts Bottom (Sevenoaks Road)	1											
40	Morrisons Petts Wood, West Approach off Queensway	2											
41	Pallant Way, Locks Bottom (Sainsburys)	2											
42	Magpie Hall Lane, Bromley (TS Narvik)	1											
43	Main Road, Biggin Hill (Morrisons)	2											
Total Number of Banks/Collections		74	13	11	12	10	10	13	11	12	10	10	

Site ID	Site Name	No of Pods	
		Plastics/Cans	M
1	Normans Park, Bromley (Hook farm Road)	1	
2	Normans Park, Hayes Lane	1	
3	Station Approach, Hayes	1	
4	Rays Road, West Wickham Station	1	
5	Ravenswood Avenue, West Wickham (Sainsburys)	1	
6	Sparrows Den, West Wickham, Cork Screw Hill	1	
7	Tesco Elmers End, Croydon Road	1	
8	Harvington Park, South Eden Park Road (Car Park Entrance)	1	
9	Fairfield Road, Beckenham (LIDL Car Park)	1	
10	Spa Leisure Centre, Beckenham Road (Turners Meadow)	1	
11	Pawleyne Close, Penge	1	
12	St Georges Road, Beckenham	1	
13	Southend Road, Beckenham (Waitrose Car park)	1	
14	Tovil Close, Anerly	1	
15	Ledrington Road, Crystal Palace (Anerly Hill)	1	
16	Penge East Railway Stn, Station Road	1	
17	Croydon Road, Penge (Texaco Station)	1	
18	Beckenham Lane, Bromley (Car Park Rear)	1	
19	Burnt Ash Lane (Roslin Way Car park)	1	
20	Plaistow Lane, Bromley (Sundridge Station)	1	
21	Civic Centre Bromley, Rochester Avenue	1	
22	Bromley Town Centre North (Sainsburys, Walter Yard)	1	
23	Shortlands Station	1	
24	Bromley South Station	1	
25	Baths Road, Bromley	1	
26	High Street, Chislehurst (Sainsburys Car Park)	1	
27	Kimmeridge Road, Mottingham	1	
28	Nunnington Close, Mottingham	1	
29	Tesco Superstore, Sidcup, Edgington Way	1	
30	Cray Valley Road, Cray	1	
31	Cotmandene Crescent Cray (Car Park, St Pauls Cray)	1	
32	Station Approach, St Mary Cray	1	
33	Tintagel Road, Eldred Drive, Orpington	1	
34	Carlton Parade, Orpington (Court Road)	1	
35	Orpington Town Centre, Juglands Road	1	
36	Crescent Way, Green Street Green (Pinewood Drive)	1	
37	Charterhouse Road, Chelsfield (Saltwood Close)	1	
38	Windsor Drive, Chelsfield	1	
39	Esso Station, Pratts Bottom (Sevenoaks Road)	1	
40	Morrisons Petts Wood, West Approach off Queensway	2	
41	Pallant Way, Locks Bottom (Sainsburys)	1	
42	Magpie Hall Lane, Bromley (TS Narvik)	1	
43	Main Road, Biggin Hill (Morrisons)	1	
Total Number of Banks/Collections		44	9
Spare		1	

Site ID	Site Name	No of Pods		
		Green	Amber	Flint
1	Normans Park, Bromley (Hook farm Road)	1	1	1
2	Normans Park, Hayes Lane	3	1	1
3	Station Approach, Hayes	2	1	1
4	Rays Road, West Wickham Station	1	1	1
5	Ravenswood Avenue, West Wickham (Sainsburys)	1	1	1
6	Sparrows Den, West Wickham, Cork Screw Hill	2	1	1
7	Tesco Elmers End, Croydon Road	1	1	1
8	Harvington Park, South Eden Park Road (Car Park Entrance)	2	1	1
9	Fairfield Road, Beckenham (LIDL Car Park)	1	1	1
10	Spa Leisure Centre, Beckenham Road (Turners Meadow)	2	1	2
11	Pawleyne Close, Penge	1	1	1
12	St Georges Road, Beckenham	1	1	1
13	Southend Road, Beckenham (Waitrose Car park)	1	1	1
14	Tovil Close, Anerly	2	1	1
15	Ledrington Road, Crystal Palace (Anerly Hill)	2	1	1
16	Penge East Railway Stn, Station Road	1	1	1
17	Croydon Road, Penge (Texaco Station)	1	1	1
18	Beckenham Lane, Bromley (Car Park Rear)	1	1	1
19	Burnt Ash Lane (Roslin Way Car park)	1	1	1
20	Plaistow Lane, Bromley (Sundridge Station)	1	1	1
21	Civic Centre Bromley, Rochester Avenue	1	1	1
22	Bromley Town Centre North (Sainsburys, Walter Yard)	1	1	1
23	Shortlands Station	1	1	1
24	Bromley South Station	1	1	1
25	Baths Road, Bromley	1	1	1
26	High Street, Chislehurst (Sainsburys Car Park)	1	1	1
27	Kimmeridge Road, Mottingham	1	1	1
28	Nunnington Close, Mottingham	1	1	1
29	Tesco Superstore, Sidcup, Edgington Way	1	1	1
30	Cray Valley Road, Cray	1	1	1
31	Cotmandene Crescent Cray (Car Park, St Pauls Cray)	1	1	1
32	Station Approach, St Mary Cray	1	1	1
33	Tintagel Road, Eldred Drive, Orpington	1	1	1
34	Carlton Parade, Orpington (Court Road)	1	1	1
35	Orpington Town Centre, Juglands Road	1	1	1
36	Crescent Way, Green Street Green (Pinewood Drive)	1	1	1
37	Charterhouse Road, Chelsfield (Saltwood Close)	1	1	1
38	Windsor Drive, Chelsfield	1	1	1
39	Esso Station, Pratts Bottom (Sevenoaks Road)	3	1	2
40	Morrisons Petts Wood, West Approach off Queensway	1	1	1
41	Pallant Way, Locks Bottom (Sainsburys)	1	1	1
42	Magpie Hall Lane, Bromley (TS Narvik)	1	1	1
43	Main Road, Biggin Hill (Morrisons)	1	1	1
Total Number of Banks/Collections		53	43	45

COUNCIL MEETING

14th DECEMBER 2015

QUESTIONS FOR WRITTEN REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Cllr Simon Fawthrop to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Can I be provided with a breakdown by ward of -

A) How much council tax is raised in each ward in £.00.

B) How much council money is spent in each ward in £.00.

I appreciate that B may not be easy to calculate quickly so an estimate would be accepted if the full amount cannot be calculated. In which case please indicate that the figure is an estimate.

Reply:

It is not possible to provide a breakdown per ward as requested. The Council Tax system cannot be interrogated to provide information on a ward basis. However, tabled below is the amount of Council Tax billed in respect of 2015/16 for each of the Authority's post codes.

postcode	debit
BR1	£23,190,505.87
BR2	£28,902,703.50
BR3	£30,584,616.29
BR4	£11,827,190.25
BR5	£25,225,018.74
BR6	£29,178,606.66
BR7	£12,301,127.06
BR8	£67,508.59
CR0	£1,433.76
CR6	£23,558.05
DA14	£80,459.08
SE9	£4,259,711.43
SE12	£4,269.90
SE19	£1,994,922.39
SE20	£11,874,962.50
SE25	£1,387.30
SE26	£2,372,188.01
TN14	£561,850.22
TN16	£7,090,873.45
Total	£189,542,893.05

Our financial information system does not record actual expenditure by individual ward and many of our contracts relate to the borough as a whole and are not sub-divided into expenditure/service by individual wards

2. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Leader of the Council

Whilst I recognise that the council's accounting terminology is technical and concise, it is also important that the council makes information available in terms easily understood by the public.

Please provide the following information:

- Value of available cash reserves held by the council,
- Value of commercial investment properties owned,
- Value of other properties owned (excluding school buildings),
- Value of other assets, reserves and investments (excluding school buildings),
- Value of school buildings.

Reply:

The value of assets, reserves and investments is set out in the Council's balance sheet and supporting notes as published in the annual statement of accounts. The information, as at 31st March 2015, is summarised in the table below:

	Balance at 31/03/15 £'m
General Fund Reserve	20
Earmarked Reserves	111
Capital Receipts Reserve	29
Capital Grants Unapplied	22
Total Usable (Cash) Reserves	182
Provisions	11
Other Working Capital (Creditors/Debtors/Cash)	64
Total Usable Reserves and Other Assets	257
Invested as Follows:	
Long Term Investments	196
Short Term Investments	39
Money Market Funds & Other Short-Term Liquid Deposits	22
Total Investments	257
Land & Buildings and Other Fixed Assets:	
Investment Properties	97
Other Properties (excluding Schools)	200
Assets under Construction	16
Infrastructure Assets (Roads)	92
Community Assets (Parks & Open Spaces)	1
Vehicles, Plant, Furniture & Equipment	21
Total Property, Plant & Equipment (Excluding School Buildings)	330
School Buildings	193
Heritage Assets	1
Assets Held for Sale	8
	9
Total Land & Buildings and Other Fixed Assets	629

3. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

How many Council staff were subsequently made redundant when the grounds maintenance contract was handed to The Landscape Group and what was the total cost of those redundancy payments to this Council?

Reply:

15 former staff were involved in total, by way of voluntary and compulsory personal circumstances.

As to the costs involved, your colleagues will I'm certain recall the following paper:

VARIATION TO THE GROUNDS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT TO PROVIDE A WHOLLY MANAGED SERVICE

This appeared on the Agenda of the Environment PDS Committee on 17th March followed by the Executive meeting of 24th March 2015, which I have circulated before Members this evening and have asked to be read into the minutes. ([Appendix 1](#))

I am further advised that the costs of the severance packages was contained within the estimate provided on 'big page' 5 of that report.

More happily, I am finally advised that most who wish to have already commenced new careers in other Local Authorities and business settings.

4. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

Given the government's decisions to grant right to buy to Housing Association tenants, what action is this Council taking to ensure that much needed additional social & affordable housing will be built during the next 5 years and beyond?

Reply:

The Council works closely with its housing association partners to promote the development of new affordable housing including new build and also options such as purchase and repair schemes. Housing and Planning Divisions work closely to ensure the implementation of the Affordable Planning Policy to deliver new supply. This includes promoting on site provision wherever possible through s106 negotiations.

5. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Portfolio Holder for Recreation and Renewal

Penge & Cator Ward is supporting the Greater London National Park City Green Paper. Have any other of Bromley's Wards supported this initiative? With Bromley being one of the most green and leafy boroughs in Greater London how will the Council be promoting the Greater London National Park City?

Reply:

In Bromley Borough, only Penge and Cator Ward have signed up. We protect our Green spaces through established Planning policies at present and will continue to do so. We will monitor the progress of this initiative.

6. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Leader of the Council

We are receiving a number of enquiries asking us to gain support from the LBB to make sure the UK does not sign up to Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). Is this something LBB is considering?

Reply:

Although I consider this to be a national issue rather than for local authorities to consider my initial response would be supportive as it helps reduce the cost of trading with partners and could lead to wider economic benefits including the creation of new jobs. I should state that this

is my personal opinion and were it to become an issue for us as local members I would seek wider opinion.

7. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

In February 2015, the Council agreed a schedule of 76 savings options. Can the Portfolio Holder please provide the schedule of forecast savings, with the addition of the forecast outturn savings for 2015/16 and the forecast outturn full year saving for each line.

Reply:

(See appendix 2)

8. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

Can the portfolio holder provide the number of residential units for which planning permission was given in 2014/15 and for as much of 2015/16 as information is available, broken down by number of bedrooms. Can he also provide this information for affordable homes, also broken down by number of bedrooms.

Reply:

(See appendix 3)

9. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Can the Portfolio Holder please provide:-

- i) The spend for the year to date, broken down by month on the Adecco Agency Worker contract and the forecast out turn for the end of 2015/16?
- ii) The number of person days provided under this contract by month for 2015/16.
- iii) The percentage of directly employed staff represented by point ii) above

Reply:

(See appendix 4)

10. From Cllr Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Residents on roads near stations are increasingly concerned about out of borough commuters parking all day. Will the Portfolio Holder please confirm the criteria and process for the consideration and possible implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone.

Reply:

The criteria is uncomplicated and will hopefully be helpful to assist the work Cllr Brooks is currently engaged upon in his Ward.

In areas where residents have little or no off street parking opportunity available to them to park, where an interest in investigating the possibility is raised, either by a residents Group (possibly by way of Petition) or Ward Councillor, the designated area will be added to a list for consideration of such measures.

Following the design of and consultation on any given scheme, the Council will install such measures in roads where the majority of residents have indicated a positive interest in receiving such measures; in roads where residents are not in favour, no further action will be taken.

11. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP to the Portfolio Holder for Education

If he will list the proximity to each primary school which a child would have to live to gain admission in 2015?

Reply:

The table below shows the proximities for each school at National Offer Day April 2015 for the September 2015 reception intake.

School	Distance
Alexandra Infant	0.212
Balgowan	0.38
Bickley	0.362
Biggin Hill	ALL
Blenheim	ALL
Bromley Road	0.682
Burnt Ash	1.242
Castlecombe	0.523
Chelsfield	1.529
Chislehurst (St Nicks)	Church
Churchfields	0.856
Clare House	0.327
Crofton Infant	1.244
Cudham CE	1.071
Darrick Wood Infant	0.951
Dorset Road Infant	0.609
Downe	1.519
Edgebury	0.313
Farnborough	0.327 (extra class takes to) 1.435
Gray's Farm	ALL + D
Green St Green	0.899

Harris Pri Crystal Palace	0.612
Harris Pri Kent House	0.738
Harris Pri Beckenham	ALL
Harris Pri Shortlands	ALL
Hawes Down Infant	0.572
Hayes	0.796
Highfield Infant	0.541
Hillside	ALL+D
Holy Innocents Catholic	Church
James Dixon	0.455 (extra class takes to) ALL
Keston CE	1.844
La Fontaine	Dist 1.765 /Ballot Alloc
Leesons	ALL
Manor Oak	0.427
Marian Vian	0.342 (extra class takes to)0.624
Mead Road Infant	0.372
Midfield	1.122
Mottingham	ALL
Oaklands	ALL
Oak Lodge	0.837
Parish CE	0.426
Perry Hall	0.568
Pickhurst Infant	1.304
Poverest	ALL
Pratts Bottom	2.226
Princes Plain	ALL
Raglan	0.246

Red Hill	0.62
St Anthony's RC	Church
St George's CE	0.942
St James' RC	Church
St John's CE	Church
St Joseph's RC	Church
St Mark's CE	Church
St Mary Cray	0.65
St Mary's Catholic	Church
St Paul's Cray CE	ALL
St Peter & St Paul Cath	Church
St Philomena's RC	Church
St Vincent's RC	Church
Scotts Park	1.561
Southborough	0.824
The Highway	0.281
The Pioneer Academy Stewart Fleming	0.362 (extra class takes to) 0.764
Tubbenden	2.921
Unicorn	0.593
Valley	0.275
Warren Road	1.229
Wickham Common	1.458
Worsley Bridge	ALL

* ALL indicates that all pupils were offered a place;

* CHURCH refers to the Church of England or Roman Catholic Schools who include children of parents who attend the local church or from a particular religious background as a selection criteria within their admissions policy.

12. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP to the Portfolio Holder for Education

What action has he taken and is taking to provide sufficient school places in the Borough?

Reply:

I have continued to work with officers and the EFA to ensure the delivery of sufficient school places in the borough. This includes the delivery of the Council's primary and secondary school development plans that were agreed in January 2015 that will be reviewed and updated in the New Year.

Over the past 12 months we have made significant progress in the delivery of our primary school development plan. We have completely rebuilt Clare House Primary School and have delivered or funded works to permanently expand Churchfields Primary School, Clare House Primary School, Harris Academy Crystal Palace, Midfield Primary School, Parish Primary School, St Paul's Cray Primary School Worsley Bridge Primary School. Other expansion schemes such as Edgebury Primary School, St George's Bickley CE Primary and Stewart Fleming Primary School have received planning permission and will be proceeding to construction. Together these schemes make a significant impact on delivering the 600 additional primary school places now needed in the borough.

I have continued to work with Free School providers and the EFA to give what support I can to new schools where they meet our basic need.

We shall also strive to achieve effective communication with stakeholders, parents and ward Councillors to ensure that local communities work together to continue to provide the best educational opportunities for our Borough's children.

13. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

If he will list by Plans Sub-Committee the number of applications recommended for permission and how many of these were refused by the sub-committee in each year since 2012?

Reply:

The numbers of overturned recommendations for each year sorted by PSC number are as follows (these do not include deferrals):

2015

Total 2015 PSC cases where recommendation overturned: 36:

PSC 1 – 7

PSC 2 - 14

PSC 3 - 5

PSC 4 - 10

2014

Total 2014 PSC cases where recommendation overturned: 70:

PSC 1 - 15

PSC 2 - 18

PSC 3 - 21

PSC 4 – 16

2013

Total 2013 PSC cases where recommendation overturned: 56

PSC 1 - 15

PSC 2 - 15

PSC 3 - 10

PSC 4 - 16

2012

Total 2012 PSC cases where recommendation overturned: 44

PSC 1 - 14

PSC 2 - 13

PSC 3 - 6

PSC 4 - 11

14. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

How many legal challenges has Bromley received over the poor quality of temporary housing accommodation?

Reply:

During the current financial year the Council has received 40 requests for a review of the suitability of the temporary accommodation offered. Of these 15 have been upheld that the accommodation did not meet the suitability criteria and alternative provision has been made. In all cases this was resolved at the review stage without progressing to full legal proceedings.

15. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

What progress has been made in getting the former lodge in Penge Recreation Ground back into use?

Reply:

The works to the lodge have now been completed and the property is carpeted. The owner has indicated that he will let it early in the new year and agents have visited the property to advise on rent levels and potential tenants. It has previously been reported that given its condition that there is no legal action available to the officers to require the owner to bring the property back into use and this remains the case. Last year Members were invited to visit the property and I understand that this was done.

16. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

When will the new health clinic/pharmacy be opening in Oakfield Rd, Penge?

Reply:

Community pharmacy services are commissioned by NHS England and we are not aware of an opening date.

Decision Maker: Executive

For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by Environment PDS Committee on:

Date: 17 March 2015

Decision Type: Not Urgent Executive Key

Title: **VARIATION TO THE GROUNDS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT TO PROVIDE A WHOLLY MANAGED SERVICE**

Contact Officer: Dan Jones, Assistant Director Street Scene and Green Space
Tel: 0208 313 4211 E-mail: Dan.Jones@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

Ward: (All Wards);

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 As part of the 2015/16 Budget process all areas of expenditure have been scrutinised by officers with a view to delivering services in a more efficient and effective way, particularly given the significant funding gap identified in the four year forecast. This has included looking at the option of outsourcing services through the Commissioning approach where appropriate.
- 1.2 In light of this scrutiny, this paper proposes to vary the current Grounds Maintenance Contract with The Landscape Group, to include the provision of Parks Management functions currently delivered 'in house', and extend the Contract until 31st March 2019.
-

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 **That the Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee is asked to comment on the proposals in the report, noting the comments from staff, stakeholders and staff representatives as outlined in Appendix B.**
- 2.2 **That the Executive is asked to:**
- i. **Approve the Variation to the current Grounds Maintenance Contract with the Landscape group, to include the functions outlined in this Report, and extend the Contract to 31st March 2019 to allow the packaging and tendering of all Streetscene & Greenspace Contracts at that date;**
 - ii. **Agree the transfer of Parks and Greenspace Services and the associated staff, as outlined in Appendix A, to The Landscape Group, as outlined in this report;**

- iii. Delegate to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Director of Resources, the authority to transfer the unplanned maintenance functions associated with parks and greenspaces to The Landscape Group if deemed appropriate.**

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: £9.7m for the variation and extension of existing contract to 31.3.19, with an option to add a further £0.7m for reactive property maintenance. Potential redundancy costs of between £200k and £300k.
 2. On-going costs: Part year savings of between £70k to £110k (2015/16) and full year savings of between 250k and £300k (2016/17 onwards)
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Street Scene and Green Space Division
 4. Total current budget for this head: £30.8m
 5. Source of funding: Existing controllable revenue budget for 2015/16
-

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 80
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory and Non-Statutory - Government Guidance:
 2. Call-in: Applicable:
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All residents
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

Drivers for change

- 3.1 The Council's Corporate Operating Principles include a commitment that services will be provided by whoever offers customers and council taxpayers excellent value for money. This is underpinned by a commitment to be a commissioning organisation determining who is best placed to deliver high quality services based on local priorities and value for money principles.
- 3.2 To support this, the Council has undertaken to review why and how we provide services and to identify who is best placed to deliver services.
- 3.3 There is a significant financial driver to consider, with the current reductions in Government funding to the Council forecast to create a gap between income and expenditure currently in the order of £50m by 2018/19.
- 3.4 Subject to Member agreement this proposal would release savings of approximately £70-110k per annum in 2015/16 and £250-300k from 2016/17, whilst maintaining service levels and better integrating the management of operational and community engagement functions in the P&GS service. The final amount will depend on the outcome of on-going negotiations with TLG but is estimated to be up to £1m to 31 March 2019
- 3.5 The proposal will contribute to achieving budget savings from the SS&GS budget of £182K in 2015/16 and £530K for 2015/16 and thereafter.

Background

- 3.6 As part of the Commissioning Board's programme, the commissioning of services and the client/contract management functions within the Environment and Community Services Department (ECS) were reviewed.
- 3.7 The review considered the current staffing structures and commissioning arrangements within ECS and reviewed the values and contract lengths of currently outsourced functions and services, as well as current services/functions that are provided 'in house'.
- 3.8 The significant majority (73%) of the ECS budget is within the Street Scene and Green Space Division:

Waste Services	£19.8m,
Street Cleaning	£3.9m;
Parks and Green Space	£6m,
Highways reactive maintenance	£1.7m.

This division also accounts for 21% of the department's headcount.

- 3.9 Whilst the majority of the SS&GS services are provided by contractors there are still a number of services provided by 'in house' teams.
- 3.10 The review therefore focused on three elements:
 - I. the short, medium and long term procurement opportunities, with a view to identifying any possible efficiency from packaging services to the market in a different way i.e. bundling.
 - II. the contract management arrangements in place, and
 - III. the commissioning options for services currently provided by 'in house' teams.
- 3.11 Whilst the potential for largest savings may be possible via alternative procurement options, (although market intelligence and benchmarking indicates LBB contracts already achieve very

good value for money), realistically this procurement repackaging could not take place until March 2019, when the Waste Services Contract will end, without terminating existing contracts at a potentially significant cost and disruption to LBB.

- 3.12 The scope for the greatest potential efficiencies was identified as being the Parks and Greenspace service, where, in addition to a contract management team, a number of functions are delivered by 'in house' teams.
- 3.13 Discussions with Grounds Maintenance Contractors, including the current Contractor, concluded that opportunities exist to release potential efficiencies by including current services provided by LBB within the range of services provided for within an outsourced arrangement.
- 3.14 Considerations were also given to restructuring the contract management functions to provide a fit for purpose function. This will be subject to a separate management restructure in due course.
- 3.15 The review concluded that, whilst potential savings may be achievable in procuring contracts in a different way in the future (2019), the biggest immediate opportunity for saving is in restructuring the contract management arrangements and potentially commission current 'in house' services differently.

Options and Outline proposal

- 3.16 Given the significant financial drivers for change it has been necessary to consider how the functions and services delivered by the P&GS team could be continued whilst realising significant savings.
- 3.17 Work began on considering options, with the target of achieving annual savings of between 10-15% of budget whilst maintaining service levels.
- 3.18 Reorganisation of the current management structure was considered but concluded that whilst the savings could be realised, the loss of staff and resources needed to achieve the cost saving target had too significant an impact upon capacity to enable current service levels/standards to be met.
- 3.19 Consideration was therefore given to how a merging of the LBB functions and the contracted services could realise the savings.
- 3.20 Initial discussions with the current contractor for grounds maintenance, The Landscape Group (TLG), indicated that a fundamental review of both the LBB and TLG organisational structures, functions and operations would result in potential savings to LBB, whilst maintaining service standards.
- 3.21 The Contractor was requested to develop a proposal to deliver efficiency savings whilst maintaining and, where possible, improving service standards by merging the community engagement and development functions with operational delivery, to deliver a more locally focussed operation; more responsive to the needs of local users, friend groups and communities.
- 3.22 The Council has been clear about its purpose and the outcomes that will be expected to be achieved through this process, in particular:
 - Increased efficiencies and reduced costs whilst maintaining Service Standards
 - Assurances that the Council meets its statutory responsibilities whilst passing on operational responsibility and cost management.

- 3.23 Appendix A summarises those functions currently delivered by the Parks and Greenspace Team and details those functions to be transferred.
- 3.24 In summary the proposal achieves budget savings, maintains standards and offers the prospect of giving Bromley Friends' Groups and stakeholders a greater say in what happens on the ground in their communities. It is proposed that a holistic Parks and Greenspace service would be designed based on a Neighbourhood approach with localised teams being responsible for all aspects of the service – both community liaison and the delivery of maintenance duties. This integrates the two aspects of service delivery currently managed by separate organisations (LBB and TLG).
- 3.25 The management contractor will work to a number of Key Performance Indicators that are jointly agreed at the outset of the contract. The contractor would implement a transparent, real-time quality reporting system that can be accessed by Members and Officers. LBB will retain a contract management team to ensure on-the-ground delivery is delivered to the agreed standards. The structure of this team will be subject to a separate consultation following the decision by the Executive.
- 3.26 The proposal from The Landscape Group is the conclusion of a process undertaken over a number of months. It has been scrutinised by LBB officers to ensure that all the functions currently undertaken by LBB staff are addressed in the proposal, that the savings identified may be achieved and that legal and procurement requirements have been met.
- 3.27 Consultation on the principles of possible changes to the way we commission and manage services has been ongoing with Staff and key stakeholders. Appendix B summarises the initial process of Engagement and then Formal consultation, with issues raised and how these have been addressed where necessary.
- 3.28 If Executive accepts the recommendations in this report, it is proposed that the transfer to TLG will take place as soon as practically possible, subject to TUPE consultation.

The Variation – Key Elements

- 3.29 It is proposed to vary the existing Ground Maintenance Contract to include those functions specified in Appendix A, so that it will be in essence a wholly managed service. It will retain the flexibility to vary or remove elements of work from the specification to achieve future savings.
- 3.30 The Scope of the Variation will mean that all Parks Management and Grounds Maintenance functions will be included in the enlarged Contract, given an extension of the current Contract period to March 2019. The rationale for the extension of the Contract period is two-fold.
- a. to enable the contractor to realise the efficiencies; and
 - b. to align the end date of the varied contract with other contracts within ECS department, therefore allowing a strategic approach to commission to be applied.
- 3.31 A Partnership Board would be established to manage the contract. It is proposed that membership includes: the AD Street Scene & Greenspace, the Chief Executive of TLG, other key management posts from LBB and TLG. The 'Board' will manage the strategic direction of the Parks and Greenspace service; set targets for performance and key deliverables, together with establishing the freedoms to be allowed at a local level in service choices, all within the Council determined Budget.
- 3.32 The Board will receive an Annual Plan from TLG for achievement of the performance and deliverables set by the Board, and monitor delivery quarterly. The Board will maintain a Contract monitoring function, which will through a process of joint monitoring with the Contractor, assess

performance against an output based performance framework based upon agreed service standards, together with a set of key deliverables. Performance, as reported through the Quarterly Report to the Board will be linked to overall payment to the Contractor. In addition to the current KPIs for the GM contract, Key Performance Indicators and key deliverables would include:

Service Response Times to Customer Enquiries	Value of external grants received
Customer Satisfaction	Delivery of annual action plan targets
Level of complaints	Delivery against key actions/milestones in key strategic documents.

- 3.33 To assist in the strategic management of the P&GS service it is proposed that a Stakeholder Engagement Panel is established to engage with interested local groups and organisations, such as The Friends Forum, delegated sport managers, allotment associations and other similar groups. The panel would help to inform the development and delivery of the Annual Action Plan which would include actions relating to the Bio Diversity Plan and management plans for parks, SSSI, heritage sites and Woodland works.
- 3.34 Performance of the contract will be scrutinised in line with corporate procurement regulations, via an annual report presented to the Environment PDS and the Executive.
- 3.35 The Variation extends the Contract to the 31st March 2019, from 31st December 2017, this will allow the service to be included in a larger package of services, including Waste Services, Street Cleansing and Highways Maintenance, which fits with the strategic objectives for the SS&GS Division to commission services between 2017-19. It is hoped this strategy will provide the potential for further efficiency savings at that time.
- 3.36 The Service also currently spends approx. £200k pa in maintenance of the Parks Infrastructure. Discussions are currently underway with TLG to see if they are able to bring forward a proposal for management and delivery of this work, that demonstrates value for money when compared with the existing service. This would enhance the local service structure this variation should deliver, and allow local users and communities to resolve many parks operational issues with devolved parks officers.
- 3.37 It has not been possible to conclude these discussions on Parks Infrastructure Maintenance and obtain a financial proposal from the Contractor and undertake appropriate consultation in time for this Report. It is therefore recommended to delegate to the Executive Director of ECS in consultation with the Director of Resources, the authority to approve the inclusion of Parks Infrastructure Maintenance in this variation, if he is satisfied that the proposal represents value for money to the Service.
- 3.38 Any such proposal regards Parks Infrastructure Maintenance would be the subject of consultation with any affected staff and their representatives before final decisions are taken.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Moving to a Commissioning Authority is in line with the Corporate Operating Principles and is key to achieving the Building and Better Bromley 2020 Vision to ensure that services continue to provide as efficiently and effectively as possible, in light of the financial pressures facing the Council over the next few years.
- 4.2 The proposal supports Bromley's Corporate Operating Principle to "*encourage and empower the voluntary sector, community groups and individuals to take more control of how their local area and its resources are managed*".

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The transfer of the Parks and Green Space Services to The Landscape Group as proposed in this report will generate part year savings of between £70k and £110k in 2015/16 and full year savings of between £250k and £300k from 2016/17 onwards. The final amount will depend on the outcome of on-going negotiations with TLG but is estimated to be up to £1m to 31 March 2019. The contract variation would also stipulate the need to deliver annual efficiency savings from 2017/18.

5.2 Savings of £182k have been included in the 2015/16 budget, with an expected full year effect of £530k for 2016/17, from the restructuring of the Street Scene and Green Space division including; a fully commissioned park service and a review of the client contract monitoring function across the whole division. The table below provides details of the estimated part year and full year savings: -

	2015/16	2016/17
	£'000	£'000
Agreed budget option	182	530
Delivered by: -		
Fully commissioned park service	-90	-280
Client review functions	-92	-250
	-182	-530

5.3 The result of the future staffing review may give rise to redundancy costs of between £200k and £300k. LBB will indemnify TLG for costs attributable to the redundancy of transferees from LBB. This cost will be met from the central contingency provision set aside for redundancy/early retirement costs arising from budget options.

5.4 The maximum amended contract value could be £40.3m as shown in the table below: -

	Contract Value £m
Contract spend to 31.3.15	21.5
Estimated contract spend to 31.12.17	8.4
Value of variation for additional parks service to 31.12.17	3.9
Total value of contract to 31.12.17	<u>33.8</u>
Value of extension to 31.3.19	5.8
Total value of contract to 31.3.19 excl property maint	<u>39.6</u>
Value of property reactive maintenance to 31.3.19	0.7
Total maximum value of TIG contract to 31.3.19	<u>40.3</u>

6. LEGAL /PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The existing Grounds Maintenance contract was formally procured following a full tender process in 2007 and runs for ten years from Jan 2008.

6.2 The General classification of services, in the OJEU Notice placed, does not differentiate between Client Management and Contractor functions as such, and an opportunity now exists to rationalise these arrangements under the contract by means of a variation / extension order

in order to seek economies of scale and reduced service costs. This is possible under the categorisation as “B” services. A Voluntary Ex-Ante Transparency Notice will be issued.

6.3 The extension would be for 15 months and there will need to be a fresh formal procurement process (under the new Regulations), for a Contract to commence in April 2019

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE) will apply to this situation. Currently there are 30 people employed with the combined teams who it is proposed would TUPE across to TLG if members agree to the proposals within this report. The posts affected are set out in Appendix A.

7.2 Staff within P&GS have been engaged and consulted on the principles of possible changes to the way services are commissioned and managed in the process of developing this report. Following a Divisional meeting on the 8 September 2014, staff were written to and the outline proposal was communicated to them. Team meetings were held between 6-16 October 2014 and the opportunity to feedback via email and in person was offered. A formal consultation process commenced on 19th January, when staff and their representatives were informed of the proposals to change the way Parks Services are commissioned and managed by way of a transfer to TLG, and given the opportunity to comment and submit any other viable proposals. Staff and their representatives were also invited to a meeting with TLG on 18 February and provided with an overview of the company.

7.3 A summary of the main questions raised by staff together with the management response is provided in Appendix B. Whilst staff recognised that there is a need to make changes and find efficiencies to achieve the required savings, they queried the appropriateness and principles of outsourcing the management and community engagement functions and questioned how the desired savings could be realised whilst maintaining service levels. They also sought further information as to how the proposed variation would be managed, and had some concerns as to how the proposals would impact on them personally.

7.4 Should the transfer to TLG be agreed then a further period of consultation on the detailed transfer proposals would take place with staff and their representatives in accordance with TUPE and Council’s Managing Change Procedures. This will enable staff to explore in more detail the impact of the transfer on their employment situation.

7.5 In addition there are 8 staff currently within the P&GS team who will be subject to a management restructure as part of the wider SS&GS reorganisation.

Non-Applicable Sections:	None
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	E&LS PH 10/07-2 Grounds Maintenance Contract Award – 31 October 2007

Below are a summarised list of functions currently carried out by LBB Parks and Green Space Team. The following list of P&GS functions* are within scope of the proposals:

- **Community and Development Team (excluding the post of Environmental Campaigns Officer)**
- **Countryside management**
- **Forest and woodland management**
- **Environmental Education**
- **Parks Improvement & Development**
- **Healthy Communities**
- **Community Partnership and Development**
- **Biodiversity and Natural Heritage Management**
- **Fund Raising**
- **Play, Landscaping and Project Management**
- **Rangers Service**

*A list of the roles and tasks for each of the functions above have been compiled and shared with all staff within P&GS for comment. These have then been used to develop a specification.

The Grounds Maintenance Contract Management Team and the Arboriculture Team are excluded from this proposal.

There are 30 people (27.43 FTEs) currently working in the above functions included in the scope of this proposal. The posts affected by the proposals in this document are identified in Table 1

Table 1 – Posts affected

Post	Job Title
2486	Head of Parks and Greenspace
13624	Contracts Assistant
11009	Community Partnerships Officer
11604	Development and Community Manager
12130	Healthy Communities Officer
13518	Principal Community Development Officer
13519	Biodiversity and Natural Heritage Officer
13628	Senior Fundraising Officer
13629	Fundraising Assistant
9886	Environmental Education Instructor
10207	Recycling Project Officer
11857	Environment Education Team Leader
13517	Countryside Development Officer
	Principal Greenspace and Countryside Development Officer
13625	Officer
13627	Community Forest Officer
11595	Landscape Project Officer
11602	Principal Play and Projects Officer
2513	Senior Ranger
2518	Ranger
2520	Ranger

13520	Ranger
13631	Events and Contracts Coordinator
13632	Senior Ranger
13633	Ranger
13634	Ranger
13635	Ranger
13636	Ranger
13637	Ranger
13638	Ranger
13639	Ranger

**Variation of the Grounds Maintenance contract -
Proposal for a wholly outsourced Parks and Greenspace service**

Outcome of staff and stakeholder consultation

During the formal consultation stage during January and February 2015, a number of questions were received from both staff and other stakeholders; such as Friends of groups, delegated sports providers; representatives from leisure gardens and allotments and other interest groups. As a result of that undertaking, a number of consistent themes emerged which are summarised below together with the management response.

1 ASSET MANAGEMENT/RECORD KEEPING

Question: How will the Council be confident that its assets are being adequately maintained and appropriate records kept?

Response: The Landscape Group (TLG) will maintain existing secure information (as it currently undertakes with its cemeteries and burial records) as part of 'intellectual' data at potential transfer; and will under the contract documentation, be required to keep this updated and returned at the end of the contract period. This will likely be stored within appropriate mechanisms largely within their offices/accommodation. TLG will be governed by the Data Protection Act and will only be given relevant information needed for the delivery of the contract.

All of the assets and equipment will remain in the ownership of the London Borough of Bromley. TLG will merely be an agent of the Authority acting on its behalf

Question : **How will the current insurance arrangements be varied in the proposal?**

Response: Claims for accidents resulting from TLG's negligence will be subject to TLG's own policy for this with their own insurers. Where the negligence is not TLG's responsibility, the claim will be against the London Borough of Bromley's via its insurers. Similarly, the Public Liability insurance cover provided for Friends whilst 'volunteering' will remain in place.

2 GOVERNANCE AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

Question: How will the proposed contract variation will be managed and governed?

Response: It is proposed that a Partnership Board will be established to manage the contract. Proposed membership includes: the AD Street Scene & Greenspace, the Chief Executive of TLG, and other key management posts from LBB and TLG. The 'Board' would agree the strategic direction of the Parks and Greenspace service and set targets for performance and key deliverables, together with establishing the freedoms to be allowed at a local level in service choices, within the Council determined Budget.

The Board would receive an Annual Plan from TLG for achievement of the performance and deliverables set by the Board, and monitor delivery quarterly. The Board would maintain a Contract monitoring function, which, through a process of joint monitoring with the Contractor, would assess performance against an output based performance framework based upon agreed service standards, together with a set of key deliverables. Performance, as reported through the Quarterly Report to Board would be linked to overall payment to the Contractor.

LBB would retain a staffing resource to conduct the contract management function.

In addition, to assist in the strategic management of the P&GS service it is proposed that a Stakeholder Engagement Panel is established to engage with interested local groups and organisations, including The Friends Forum, The Leisure Gardens and Allotments Consultative Panel, The Countryside Consultative Panel and representative members of the delegated sports community

This panel would help to inform the development and delivery of the annual action plan.

Question: How will LBB make strategic and policy decisions that affects the broad and varied aspects of Parks and Greenspace?

Response: Under advice and guidance from LBB officers, Elected Members will continue to set the strategic direction of the P&GS service; develop policy and scrutinise the delivery of the service. TLG will prepare and update strategic and operational plans for approval by the relevant AD and the Partnership Board.

Question: How will the Council ensure that the services in the proposal are actually delivered?

Response: A reorganisation of Council's Street Scene and Greenspace client staff who are not identified in the 'transfer list' will be undertaken in tandem with those moving to TLG. It would be the responsibility of the new Client team to monitor contracts and service delivery. Staff who transfer and are employed by TLG will remain the acknowledged experts in their areas of operation – being best suitably qualified to specify, deliver and review outcomes and satisfaction in partnership with the Council. This will be underpinned by a robust reporting procedure to a joint LBB/TLG Board which will meet regularly to review and assess performance and future development/service improvement opportunities.

3 COMMISSIONING AND PROCUREMENT

Question Why is there a need to commission the service differently now, rather than when the GM contract expires?

Response: There is a significant financial driver to consider, with the current reductions in Government funding to the Council forecast to create a gap between income and expenditure currently of the order of £53m by 2018/19. Whilst there is an option to 'salami slice' the budget further to achieve savings, this proposal is considered more favourable as it seeks to maintain, and if possible, improve services whilst delivering a saving. Waiting until 2019 to realise savings is not an option given the significant budget gaps forecast.

If the proposal does not proceed, then savings of £530k for 2016/7 and thereafter, will still have to be found from the Street Scene and Greenspace budget. Without adopting a holistic view of how the Parks and Greenspace Service could be delivered differently, this would likely mean a number of functions will have to cease and this could affect the viability/critical mass for any future option.

Question: **Have other options been considered?**

Response: Reorganisation of the current management structure was considered but concluded that whilst the savings could be realised, the loss of staff and resources needed to achieve the cost saving target had too significant an impact upon capacity to enable current service levels/standards to be met. Consideration was also given to the establishment of Trusts and Community Interest Companies (CIC), however, these were deemed not to be financially viable options at this time.

4 SUPPORTING VOLUNTEERS

Question: **What changes will friends of parks and other voluntary groups expect to see if the proposal proceeds?**

Response: Should the proposal be agreed, Friends, voluntary groups and key stakeholders would expect to see the same level of resource and commitment that is currently delivered by LB Bromley staff. In addition, it is envisaged that grounds maintenance and other services can be 'tailored' to meet local requirements in a way that is not possible under the current contracting arrangements. Operational staff will play an enhanced role in resolving local issues and ensuring overall satisfaction in their area.

Question: **What will happen to the respected umbrella organisations like the Friends Forum'?**

Response: The Friends' Forum would continue to be fully supported under the proposals; with TLG managers and staff, facilitating and serving this organisation and ensuring that key strategic documents like the '*Toolkit*', '*Programmes of Work*' and '*Insurances*' are maintained and further developed. It is intended that an organisation such as the Friends' Forum should be included within any scrutiny arrangements, as an independent party with Elected Members, Council Officer and key personnel from TLG's corporate Management. In addition TLG have proposed to make major presentations to primary organisations, including the Consultative Panels, throughout 2015 and possibly on an annual basis thereafter.

Question: **Will voluntary groups be expected to undertake unpaid work for which TLG could invoice the Council?**

Response: No. Friends 'volunteer' for their community, not any external provider nor the Council. They undertake many valued tasks including grant applications, developments, research and maintenance operations - none of which currently are undertaken or budgeted for by the Council. Neither TLG nor the Council will be able to take any payment, or profit financially from the activities of volunteers.

Question: **Under the proposals, will TLG seek to reduce support for the provision of allotments or sports within the Borough?**

Response: The proposals place the community at the very core of the intended service. TLG managers and staff will continue to support the Elected Member meetings including the Leisure Gardens & Allotments and Countryside Consultative Panels, arrange the appropriate annual tours and receptions and continue to deal with both day to day issues and arbitration hearings. Delegated sports organisations will receive the same level of assistance as currently exists, including identifying and applying for grants for improvements to both pavilions and pitches.

Question: **What confidence can countryside volunteers take from the proposal?**

Response: TLG have proposed an integrated service that it is envisaged will retain the current skill base held by LBB's Parks and Greenspace officers who currently carry out important conservation work. Both parties are aware of the statutory sites and the habitat and management plans that are required for this purpose. TLG has indicated that it would wish to retain the key skills of transferring LBB staff in the delivery of the countryside and habitat management function who would continue to interact in much the same way with Bromley's Countryside Friends and Volunteers under any contractual arrangements, if agreed.

However there are additional benefits arising from the fact that because the grounds maintenance teams and the countryside management team would be within the same organisation; this would greatly improve communication, help to ensure that sensitive habitat is not damaged through lack of knowledge, and provide a more flexible resource when specific projects are required to be delivered.

5 COMMERCIAL SENSITIVITY

Question: **Why have details of the savings not been made available at this stage?**

Response: The savings are identified in the letter to staff, unions and stakeholders sent at the commencement of formal consultation. A detailed breakdown of the proposal is commercially sensitive at this stage and Elected Members are being asked only to vary an existing contract which will generate a saving.

6 HR IMPLICATIONS

How many posts are affected and what would the impact on staff be?

There are 30 people currently employed in the functions which it is proposed to transfer as identified in the consultation paper circulated on 19 January. TUPE would apply to the transfer. This means that staff terms and conditions are preserved/protected at the point of transfer except for any measures identified by TLG as part of the TUPE information and consultation processes. Should the transfer to TLG be agreed then a further period of consultation on the detailed transfer would take place with staff and their representatives in accordance with TUPE and Council's Managing Change Procedures. Staff raised a number of detailed questions about TUPE and the impact on their continuing employment; they have received a written response addressing these issues and will have the opportunity to continue these discussions as part of any TUPE transfer process.

This page is left intentionally blank

In February 2015, the Council agreed a schedule of 76 savings options. Can the Portfolio Holder please provide the schedule of forecast savings, with the addition of the forecast outturn savings for 2015/16 and the forecast outturn full year saving for each line.

Line	Division	Saving Option	15/16	Forecast Outturn Saving	16/17	Full Year Saving (£000k)	Forecast Outturn full year Saving	Comments
ALL DEPARTMENTS								
1	Essential Car Users		300	300	300	300	300	Was changed to further org eff. & mgt costs
2	Organisational efficiencies & Management costs restructure		1,500	1,454	2,000	2,000	1,954	£20k Corporate & £26k of Education not achieved.
SUB-TOTAL			1,800	1,754	2,300	2,300	2,254	
CHIEF EXECUTIVES DEPARTMENT								
Corporate Services Division (£21m Controllable Budget)								
3	Facilities & Support	Retendering of cleaning contract	60	60	60	60	60	
4	Facilities & Support	Restructuring Attendant service	25	25	25	25	25	
5	Facilities & Support	Changes to franking machine provision	2	2	2	2	2	
6	Information Systems and Telephony	Post revisions, software removal, resource days	121	121	121	121	121	
7	Legal Services	Staff reduction	10	10	10	10	10	
8	Contact Centre	North Shoring - transferring whole contact centre to Barrow SSC	13	13	26	26	26	
9	Contact Centre	**Reduce contact centre SLA from 80% of calls answered in 30 seconds to 50% of calls answered within 1 minute	31	31	31	31	31	
10	Contact Centre	Cease supply of caddy liners at Reception (available via Libraries)	6	6	6	6	6	
11	Contact Centre	*Electoral register to be viewed by appointment only	4	4	4	4	4	
12	Contact Centre	Parking fine appeals to only be online only	4	4	4	4	4	
13	Contact Centre	Meeting attendees to self-serve notifying their arrival via internal phone - incl. training courses, officer & member meetings	4	4	4	4	4	
14	Contact Centre	LBB staff & Cllr's to self serve and use online forms	4	4	4	4	4	
15	Democratic Services	Remove coordination of complaints/FOI	50	50	50	50	50	
16	Democratic Services	Approved changes to Cllr IT/Telephones	34	34	34	34	34	
SUB-TOTAL			368	368	381	381	381	
Financial Services & Procurement Division - (£11m Controllable Budget)								
17	Exchequer - Payments & Income	Saving from outsourcing and charging	221	221	221	221	221	
18	Exchequer - Revenue & Benefits	Reduction of licence fees	75	75	75	75	75	
19	Exchequer - Revenue & Benefits	Increased Council Tax & NNDR court costs	100	100	100	100	100	
20	Exchequer - Revenue & Benefits	Contract negotiation with Liberata	100	100	100	100	100	
21	Management Accounting & Systems	Delete further two finance posts within management accounting teams (if frequency of BM reduced to quarterly & response for financial information not so timely)	30	30	30	30	30	
22	Management Accounting & Systems	Delete manager in FIS team (will then be dependent on 1 senior post for all interfaces in financial systems, FBM, EBM, BACS payments etc)	0	0	70	70	70	
SUB-TOTAL			526	526	596	596	596	
Transformation & Regeneration - £2.5m Controllable Budget								
23	Acquisition of Investment Properties	Assuming we invest £40m in the purchase of commercial property at a yield of 5.3% or higher £2m p.a. could be achieved	1,000	1,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	
24	Planning	Increase pre-application advice fees (on top of inflation)	15	15	15	15	15	
25	Renewal	Renewal Team costs to be charged to Economic Development Fund	51	51	155	155	155	
26	Strategic Property Services	Charge some of Strategic Property costs to the Investment Fund	20	20	129	129	129	
27	Strategic Property Services	Anerley Business Centre	21	21	52	52	52	
SUB-TOTAL			1,107	1,107	2,351	2,351	2,351	
ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT								
Public Protection (£2.5m Controllable Budget)								
28	Public Protection and Community Safety	Review of staffing and associated budgets, including Portfolio Holder grants, to reduce services to the statutory baseline	169	169	339	339	339	
29	Community Safety	Reduction of the Prtfolio Holder Cgrant budget	50	50	100	100	100	
30	Public Protection	Reduction of CCTV staffing costs	50	50	50	50	50	
SUB-TOTAL			269	269	489	489	489	
Street Scene & Green Spaces (£30.5m Controllable Budget)								
31	Area Management & Street Cleansing	Cleansing of Public Conveniences Contract - Closure of remaining facilities (Bromley Town Centre, Beckenham, Penge and West Wickham)	22	22	89	89	89	
32	Area Management & Street Cleansing	Reduce central contingency sum for street cleansing contract from £200k to £60k	140	140	140	140	140	
33	Street scene and green space	Restructuring of SSGS division including: a fully commissioner park service and a review of the client contract monitoring function across the whole division.	182	182	530	530	530	
34	Parks and Green Space	Parks Strategy - cease development function in parks	80	80	80	80	80	
35	Waste Services	Reduced opening hours of the green garden waste satellite sites as per Environment PDS report 4 Nov 2014	146	146	271	271	271	
36	Waste Services	Reduce frequency of kerbside paper collections from weekly to fortnightly. Savings achieved by rationalising vehicle utilisation.	250	250	250	250	250	
37	Waste Services	Introduce charges for collection of domestic clinical waste, o transfer costs back to health authority	30	30	30	30	30	
38	Waste Services	Increase price of food waste liners from £2 to £2.50	35	35	35	35	35	
39	Waste Services	Increase price of GWV Wheelie Bin service from £60 to £65 per annum from 1 April 2016	0	0	30	30	30	Report expected in January 2016.
SUB-TOTAL			885	885	1,455	1,455	1,455	
Transport & Highways (£6.9m Controllable Budget)								
40	Parking	Increase parking charges	390	550	230	230	550	£550k built into the 2015/16.
41	Network management	Additional £60k staffing to be charged to TfL Principal Road Maintenance capital budget	60	60	60	60	60	
42	Traffic & Road Safety	New charges for disabled parking bays and white bar markings as per report to Environment PDS 23 September 2014.	20	20	20	20	20	
SUB-TOTAL			470	630	310	310	630	
Recreation (£6.8M Controllable Budget)								
43	Town Centre Management & Business Support	Efficiencies in TCM	0	0	46	46	46	Report expected January 2016 for decision.

44	Culture	Relocate Museum Service to Central library as part of the agreed Heritage Strategy	0	0	44	44	11	Report to 10.6.15 Executive. Expected saving of £56k in 2017/18	
45	Libraries	Create 6 Community managed libraries as per the agreed library strategy report R & R PDS 18.11.14	0	0	250	250	TBC	Progress on tender exercise to identify community management arrangements for 6 libraries was reported to the Executive 9th November 2015. A further report detailing the outcome of this exercise is expected during 2016.	
SUB-TOTAL			0	0	340	340	57		
EDUCATION, CARE & HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT									
Children's Social Care (£32.7m Controllable Budget)									
46	Care and Resources	Personal Education Allowances	30	30	30	30	30		
47	Care and Resources	Reorganisation of the service	50	50	50	50	50		
48	Safeguarding and Care Planning	Support to hard to reach groups	33	33	33	33	33		
49	Referral and Assessment	Contract efficiencies already achieved	125	125	125	125	125		
50	Children's Disability Services	Changes to playgroup funding	66	66	66	66	66		
51	Bromley Youth Support Programme	Service redesign	50	0	50	50	0	Not achieved, issues with inspection	
52	Safeguarding and Quality Assurance	Contract efficiencies already achieved	38	38	38	38	38		
53	Safeguarding and Quality Assurance	Reorganisation of the service	27	27	27	27	27		
SUB-TOTAL			419	369	419	419	369		
Adult Social Care (£33.9m Controllable Budget)									
54	Assessment and Care Management	Deletion of vacant posts	81	81	81	81	81		
55	Assessment and Care Management	Contract efficiencies already achieved	181	181	181	181	181		
56	Assessment and Care Management	Care management efficiencies already achieved	130	130	130	130	130		
57	Assessment and Care Management	Management of demand at first point of contact	250	250	250	250	250		
58	Assessment and Care Management	Charging Policy update	200	200	200	200	200		
59	Direct Services	Carelink	25	0	25	25	0	Not achieved, reviewing options	
60	Direct Services	Reduce extra care housing capacity	150	150	150	150	150		
61	Learning Disabilities Day and Short breaks Service	Staffing restructure - vacant posts	70	70	70	70	70		
62	Learning Disabilities Day and Short breaks Service	Reduce leisure activity funding	52	52	52	52	52		
63	Learning Disabilities Day and Short breaks Service	Running expense reduction	26	26	26	26	26		
64	Learning Disabilities Care Management	Restructure to achieve integration	100	44	100	100	100	delay in implementation meant not achieved in 2015/16. is achieved in 2016/17	
SUB-TOTAL			1,265	1,184	1,265	1,265	1,240		
Commissioning Division (£37.0m Controllable Budget)									
65	Supporting People	Review service levels at retender for all contracts	213	213	213	213	213		
66	Commissioning	Contract efficiencies	202	202	202	202	202		
SUB-TOTAL			415	415	415	415	415		
Strategic & Business Support (£2.6m Controllable Budget)									
67	Performance & Information	Service reconfiguration	31	31	31	31	31		
68	Performance & Information	Running cost reduction	48	48	48	48	48		
69	Performance & Information	Income generation	45	45	45	45	45		
SUB-TOTAL			124	124	124	124	124		
Housing Division (£4.1m Controllable Budget)									
70	Housing Needs	Contract reductions	51	51	51	51	51		
SUB-TOTAL			51	51	51	51	51		
Childrens Social Care (Education Portfolio)									
71	All areas	Bromley Youth Music Trust	230	230	306	306	306	delay in 2015/16 of implementing has meant a shortfall of £248k. Full amount saved in 2016/17	
72	Youth Service	Service redesign	506	258	506	506	506		
73	Children's Centres	Income generation	120	120	120	120	120		
SUB-TOTAL			856	608	932	932	932		
Education (£1.0m Controllable Budget)									
74	Schools & Early Years Commissioning and QA	Reorganisation of service including charging some elements t	130	130	160	160	160		
75	Strategic Place Planning	DSG Charge 50% of 1 post to capital	33	33	33	33	33		
76	Schools & Early Years Commissioning and QA	Reorganisation of contracts	48	48	48	48	48		
SUB-TOTAL			211	211	241	241	241		
TOTAL			8,766	8,501	11,669	11,669	11,585		

Appendix 3 (Question 8)

Based on gross units granted planning permission.

Planning permissions granted for residential use 2014/15 -

Total No. of bedrooms	Total no. of units granted planning permission	Intermediate tenure	Social rented tenure	Affordable rented tenure
1	480	4	7	
2	509	14	6	85
3	128	2	10	
4	165		1	
5	19			
6	8			
7	3			
8	1			
Gross number of units	1,313	20	24	85

Planning permissions granted for residential use 2015/16 recorded to date (up to December 2015) -

Total No. of bedrooms	Total no. of units granted planning permission	Intermediate tenure	Social rented tenure	Affordable rented tenure (to date)
1	160	2	4	
2	270	10	2	
3	51			
4	16			
5	23			
6	3			
7	1			
14	1 (HMO)			
Gross number of units	525	12	6	

Appendix 4 (Question 9)

	Net	Vat	Gross
Totals 14/15	6,983,630.26	1,396,727.42	8,380,357.68
Totals 15/16	5,210,959.75	1,042,192.51	6,253,152.26
Forecast Outturn 15/16	7,816,439.63	1,563,288.77	9,379,728.39

Year	Month	Financial Year	Net	Vat	Gross	Total Hours	Days (calculated)	Agency staff as % of direct employees
2014	April	14/15	319,087.39	63,817.57	382,904.96	15,968.50	2217.85	6.18%
2014	May	14/15	592,088.59	118,418.09	710,506.68	30,064.25	4175.59	11.68%
2014	June	14/15	473,846.89	94,769.60	568,616.49	23,849.25	3312.40	9.26%
2014	July	14/15	548,669.14	109,733.87	658,403.01	27,728.00	3851.11	10.81%
2014	August	14/15	659,665.46	131,933.38	791,598.84	32,769.50	4551.32	12.86%
2014	September	14/15	518,963.42	103,792.88	622,756.30	25,472.50	3537.85	10.11%
2014	October	14/15	662,373.00	132,474.83	794,847.83	32,790.50	4554.24	13.10%
2014	November	14/15	590,122.36	118,024.51	708,146.87	28,196.00	3916.11	11.21%
2014	December	14/15	614,731.69	122,946.02	737,677.71	29,941.00	4158.47	11.90%
2015	January	14/15	620,783.83	124,156.90	744,940.73	30,240.50	4200.07	12.12%
2015	February	14/15	583,005.18	116,600.98	699,606.16	28,841.00	4005.69	11.57%
2015	March	14/15	800,293.31	160,058.79	960,352.10	38782.50	5386.46	15.60%
2015	April	15/16	386,025.83	77,205.19	463,231.02	18,428.25	2559.48	7.45%
2015	May	15/16	599,767.05	119,953.40	719,720.45	28,439.00	3949.86	11.57%
2015	June	15/16	700,904.06	140,181.04	841,085.10	33,745.50	4686.88	13.84%
2015	July	15/16	827,576.74	165,515.37	993,092.11	38896.00	5402.22	15.99%
2015	August	15/16	629,330.46	125,866.11	755,196.57	28477.00	3955.14	11.78%
2015	September	15/16	745,281.30	149,056.46	894,337.76	35277.25	4899.62	14.54%
2015	October	15/16	808,626.81	161,725.44	970,352.25	35095.50	4874.38	15.14%
2015	November	15/16	513,447.50	102,689.50	616,137.00	22290.00	3095.83	9.69%