



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: 8th March 2018

COUNCIL

Monday 26 February 2018

Summaries of the answers given to the questions received for this meeting are attached.

- 5 **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC** (Pages 3 - 20)
- 6 **ORAL QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL** (Pages 21 - 36)
- 7 **WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL** (Pages 37 - 52)

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

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

26th FEBRUARY 2018

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Josh King to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder

With reference to the published local plan, can the education portfolio holder explain the planning process used to ensure that the Council fulfils its statutory duty to provide school places, particularly at a secondary level?

Reply:

The draft Local Plan considered the need for education places over the plan period (to 2029/30) on the basis of the GLA's School Roll Projections and identified an adequate supply of sites to meet that need. The Council's Secondary Schools Development Plan illustrates how the existing and proposed school infrastructure can meet the identified need and address the Council's statutory duties under the Education Act 1996. The draft Local Plan has responded to the identified need for secondary provision in draft Policies 27 (Education), 28 (Education Facilities), 29 (Education Site Allocations) and under draft Policy 55 (Urban Open Space). At that point, it is up to the individual trusts, free schools, SFA to make planning applications in the usual way.

Supplementary Question:

Do you agree that academisation of schools in Bromley has made the planning of school places difficult and that a return to the local education authority would allow a more coherent plan to be developed?

Reply:

I would certainly agree that as a result of Bromley's drive towards academisation, Bromley being one of the fastest academising local authorities in the country, we have found certain challenges as a result of that and we will be feeding back to the SFA and partners around some of those challenges and what we have discovered. To suggest that we bring this back in-house is not something that can happen at this point.

**2. From Paul Rudling to the Leader of the Council
(answered by the Environment Portfolio Holder)**

Re Bullers Wood Boys planning application: In light of the Planning Inspector's report which resulted in permission being rescinded by the Development Control Committee on 25th January 2018 what action has the Council taken to mitigate the risks to the Girls attending Bullers Wood Girls using these same roads and pavements.

Reply:

None in this area in recent times.

Although not ideal, there are not regarded as being any obvious, necessary or practical mitigation measures which need to be taken for the smaller cohort of girls walking past this site, nor thankfully, accident statistics to support that is the case either.

The safety issues raised by Independent Traffic Consultants and the Government's Planning Inspectorate refer to the far larger cohort of boys who would be arriving and congregating at the site, in conjunction with the overloaded local road network.

I am reminded by Traffic Engineers that the Planning Inspector's main concerns were related to the Bickley Road exit and the parking of vehicles on street near to the 2 access points. He also raised concerns regarding the lack of footway on the south side of Chislehurst Road but that would not affect the girls accessing their school.

Supplementary Question:

With the safety of schoolchildren in mind, would the Councillor agree with me that the decision made by the Portfolio Holder for Environment in 2011 to allow withdrawal of funding for school crossing patrols was foolhardy, considering that a Freedom of Information request has confirmed that at that time the cost to the Council per pupil was less than £5 per year.

Reply:

No, I would not. We have continued to provide school crossing patrols in association with schools and linked in with their school travel plans. We do have to consider the finances of the Council, however, the school crossing patrols have continued to be jointly provided between the Council and the schools who wish to have them.

**3. From Andrew Ruck to the Leader of the Council
(answered by the Chairman of Development Control Committee)**

The Bullers Boys Development Control Committee meeting on 25th January: The published minutes of the DCC meeting show that a motion to refuse planning permission was not proposed. The motion which was carried was to "not ratify the October 2017 decision". However this does not constitute a motion to refuse planning permission. It therefore seems that the Council has yet to vote to refuse planning permission and yet it has issued a refusal determination notice. How can this be?

Reply:

A motion to ratify had already been rejected and the report made it clear that it was for members of the committee to decide whether to change the decision they had made on 4th October or not.

It was clear that the motion not to ratify the decision would result in the refusal of the application, and this was clarified in the agreement of the Committee to the previously suggested refusal ground set out in the October 2017 Development Control Committee report at the time the motion was voted upon at the meeting. The Planning Officer read out the reason for refusal.

The applicant's agent was advised that a refusal notice would be issued. This notice has since been issued.

Supplementary Question:

On 25th January, who voted to refuse planning permission for Bullers Wood School for Boys?

Reply:

I refer you back to my previous answer. By virtue of the fact that the ratification was not done it follows that the ratification was refused.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Angela Wilkins

I am not a regular Member of Development Control Committee, but I did stand in that evening. I do not agree with Councillor Dean. There were not reasons given for refusal, no vote for refusal was taken. There is legal advice, which I have had sight of over the weekend, that this planning application is undecided and I would ask you therefore to take the matter back to Development Control Committee so that it can be decided.

Reply:

I refer the Member to my previous answer to Mr Ruck as I consider the Committee did make a decision. Further, you are asking me to agree to accept a referral back to the next meeting of Development Control Committee based on legal advice which you have been shown but neither myself nor the Council's Director of Corporate Services, or the Chief Executive, have been party to this advice. At this point therefore I cannot agree to your request, of course, the applicant does have the right of appeal against the decision made by the Development Control Committee on 25 January.

Additional supplementary question from Councillor Nicky Dykes:

I think it is important that we clarify this. Please clarify if there was an actual vote for refusal, because I sat on that Committee and there was not.

Reply:

The legal advice that I have been given is that by virtue of the fact that the decision was not ratified, it is not ratified.

Additional supplementary question from Councillor Will Harmer:

With a planning application, when it is decided, there are three outcomes – it is permission, refusal or deferral. Why does the decision not to grant permission automatically mean refusal?

Reply:

That is the advice that I have been given.

4. From Rhian Kanat to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Please provide details of all TfL grants applied for by the Council to fund road safety, pedestrian walkway and cycling improvements in the Borough in the last 4 years and how such grants were spent.

Reply:

The Borough has bid successfully for funding from a number of TfL funding streams, however some bids were not successful.

TfL funded schemes that have contributed to road safety, pedestrian and cycling improvements in Bromley were made allocations as follows:-

2014/15: £2,554k

2015/16: £2,774k

2016/17: £3,304k

2017/18: £2,805k

Funding was used to facilitate schemes such as road safety education for pre-driving age teenagers, cycle training for all ages, location-specific casualty reduction schemes, improved crossing facilities and new cycle routes. I have included the cost of congestion reduction and parking schemes, as these help make improvements for all road users and reduce what is commonly known as “rat-running” along residential roads.

Bromley has also successfully bid, in terms of pedestrian facilities, for £2.9m of Major Scheme Funding for Bromley North Village and £2.85m for the ongoing public realm works in Beckenham.

The Borough was supportive of a number of Quietways, some of which have not been progressed by TfL, but two of which are well developed for implementation next year. Because it is at an early level, no precise funding can be quoted at this time, but this would represent a significant investment in cycling and walking in the Borough.

The Borough also previously bid for £600k of Cycle to School partnership funding which was not supported by TfL.

Supplementary Question:

Why did the Council not apply for a Liveable Neighbourhoods Grant in October last year?

Reply:

The Liveable Neighbourhoods Grant was a new area where we wanted to understand what would represent a successful bid going forward, plus we were delivering the Beckenham scheme so at that time we did not consider that it was appropriate to put the effort into a bid, however, that is an area that we will be addressing going forward.

5. From Julie Ireland to the Chairman of Development Control Committee

If there were genuine and overriding concerns about road safety on Chislehurst Road, why did the Development Control Committee approve the inclusion of a school on the St Hugh’s playing field site in their Draft Local Plan?

Reply:

The concerns raised about road safety relate to the specific scheme put forward in the planning application considered by the Development Control Committee, and do not preclude a different scheme being granted planning permission. The site allocation does not mean that all other planning considerations are set aside, including road safety.

**6. From Georgette Purdey to the Leader of the Council:
(answered by the Chairman of Development Control Committee)**

Now that there is specific data on pupils applying for Bullers Wood School for Boys and the fact that 176 pupils will live within 1.2 miles of the school, does this not represent a similar material impact to the Traffic Report that led to the recall of the planning decision to the Development Control Committee on 25th of Jan 2018? As

such, will London Borough of Bromley now consider another recall of the planning application in light of this factual data - as opposed to a speculative report on 25/01 - and vote again of the planning permission for Bullers Wood School for Boys? If not, why not?

Reply:

The decision to report back to Development Control Committee the second planning application for St Hugh's Playing Fields was based on a significant planning decision made by a Government Inspector being published prior to the issue of the planning decision on that application. This was a new material planning consideration. The decision has now been issued on that application and therefore reconsideration is no longer possible. However, the applicant has a right of appeal against the decision and has had the ability to appeal since 31 January 2018. The applicant could also submit a new planning application but that is a matter for the applicant to consider.

The refusal was issued on 31st January 2017 and the appeal lodged on 1st August 2017, which was the very last day of the 6 month window for submitting an appeal.

(At this point the time allowed for questions expired, but the Mayor stated that she would allow question time to continue to allow all first questions to be answered.)

7. From Jayne Burman to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder (answered by the Environment Portfolio Holder)

Bullers Wood School for Boys has been proven to be needed to address the current and projected shortfall of secondary school places in the Borough and given the current cohort of applicants it can be determined that 98% live within a 1.2 mile or 22 minute walk of the school. Given that the road safety concerns apply to the same stretch of road that girls walking to Bullers Wood school for girls, why hasn't the Council addressed the pedestrian road safety concerns and proposed or made changes to the roads to solve the problem rather than refuse the school?

Reply:

The planning application considers the road at the time. There are not any obvious, necessary or practical mitigation measures which need to be taken for the smaller cohort of girls walking past the site. Thankfully, accident statistics support this to be the case, and the safety issues raised by Independent Traffic Consultants and the Government's Planning Inspectorate refer to the far larger cohort of boys who would be arriving and congregating at the site, in conjunction with the overloaded local road network.

I am reminded by Traffic Engineers that the Planning Inspector's main concerns were with the Bickley Road exit and the parking of vehicles on-street near to the two access points. He raised concerns regarding the lack of footway on the south side of Chislehurst Road but that would not affect the girls.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Ian F. Payne:

My understanding is that 98% of 170 plus boys would be walking to school. Now we have 170 boys – they will be driven. Is that not going to create a problem for the roads in that area and snarl them up?

Reply:

The decision was made by Development Control Committee. I am not able to explain how they came to their decision – I was not at the meeting.

(With the agreement of Members, the Mayor extended question time for an additional fifteen minutes.)

8. From Rich Wilsher to the Resources Portfolio Holder

The Council is taking part in a Voter ID pilot scheme for the May elections. In answers to questions about this scheme at the last Council meeting you talked of a “communications plan delivering a tailored and comprehensive awareness raising campaign” to encourage voters to bring ID to polling stations. We are now only 2.5 months away from the elections. Please provide full details of that communications plan.

Reply:

With the help and support of the Cabinet Office, we have developed an extensive campaign plan reflecting the needs and preferences of Bromley.

Our campaign has already started with the Council website being updated, our Customer Contact Centre being fully briefed, posters and leaflets being distributed in prime locations across the borough, social media (both Facebook and Twitter) being used and local press releases being issued. We will build on this in the lead up to the election and publicity will be extended throughout the borough and will include posters in bus shelters and shopping centres, bill boards in railway stations, community facilities, places of worship, full page adverts in local newspapers, mobile ads and so on.

We will be sending posters and leaflets to some 500 community organisations across the borough as well as emailing resources to them with information on how to obtain more if required. In addition, we are working with one of our partners – Community Links – both through the Borough Officers Strategic Partnership Forum and through the associated Communications Leads Group to identify what opportunities there are to spread the word through existing meetings, forums and events with the wide range of community groups with which they work.

We are planning to place a particular emphasis on the hard to reach groups. Using the expertise that Community Links has built up working with these groups we will identify where, in their view, groups may benefit from further face-to-face communication.

We have also persuaded the Cabinet Office to let us provide posters and leaflets to candidates and parties engaged in the election so they can spread the message as well.

We will keep the campaign under constant review to ensure that we are engaging with all the communities in the borough so that every eligible elector is able to identify themselves and vote on 3 May 2018.

Supplementary Question:

All of this sounds very reassuring, but how will the Council gauge empirically or otherwise the success of this pilot scheme?

Reply:

It is worth reflecting that the information that we are requesting that people provide is the same as they would provide if they were collecting a parcel from the post office, and I think you would agree with me that the democracy of this country is more important than the collection of an individual parcel. In terms of identifying whether it is a success or not, that is what the pilot is intended to do. There will be considerable feedback after the election and our input will shape the way that it is spun out across the country. What we do know is that it has been well-established that there has been voting fraud, not just in Labour areas where they have had to re-run the election of Mayors and so on, but elsewhere as well. That is why the pilot is important and the information that we feed back to the Cabinet Office subsequently is going to influence the way that it is rolled out afterwards.

Additional supplementary question from Councillor Peter Fookes:

Would there not be a better way of spending £150,000 of public money, with regard to this issue? I notice that in response to my written question tonight that over 8,000 people registered to vote late in the run-up to the General Election - Why are we not looking at ways of extending the voter registration deadline? I am aware that in certain other countries you can register to vote on polling day itself.

Reply:

We are actually receiving £150,000, not paying it. I think you would accept on behalf of the people you are here to represent that an income of that nature is something worth having, rather than turning away. It is also worth reflecting that 98% of people in this borough are registered and that is something we should be very proud of and one of the reasons why we have been chosen as a pilot.

Additional supplementary question from Councillor Simon Fawthrop:

Would the Portfolio Holder agree that one person committing fraud in the election is one too many because everybody's vote deserves to be a valid vote.

Reply:

Yes.

Additional supplementary question from Councillor Stephen Carr:

I have supported this initiative for a long time and I am delighted that it is happening and Bromley has been given the opportunity to be a pilot in this area. I was very pleased with Councillor Arthur's response outlining the benefit and the help we are getting from our partners. Did he mean, for example, the support from Community Links, when I notice the communication that has come out at 5pm this afternoon to all Members which identifies to those readers of the Bromley Mencap Newsletter, for example, where ID would be needed for members of the public when they go to the polls, and can I be assured that all those partners will be getting similar correspondence? My understanding is that they will be – can that be confirmed?

Reply:

I have not seen that particular response to Bromley Mencap, although I do see that they have sent me something to read. It is something that we should be very proud of that we have over the years developed special language and leaflets which we get approved by Community Links in order to ensure that we can reach these hard to reach groups. It is absolutely essential that we do. There is no reason because if

somebody has a particular learning difficulty they should be excluded from the democratic process. We need to reach these people, and that is what is done.

**9. From Josh King to the Leader of the Council
(answered by the Resources Portfolio Holder)**

Following the collapse of Carillion and the news that another major provider of public services is under financial pressure, can the Leader outline what contingency plans the Council has to ensure continuity of services, particularly those for the vulnerable, such as adult care services and those for children and young people?

Reply:

In the unlikely event of any Council Contractor falling into financial difficulty, the service would be taken back in-house for an interim period and the staff in question employed under TUPE arrangements to ensure the seamless provision of services to Bromley residents, forward planning and the setting aside of financial reserves to adjust to potential shocks of this nature offering a very good reason as to why long term financial planning and the holding of responsible levels of reserves is vital. A strength of this Council's, completely misunderstood and frequently criticised by the party Dr King seeks to represent from May.

Talking of children and young people in particular, and as a relevant point to note, the Council has a proven track record of successfully managing in-sourcing of Council services as was demonstrated by the youth offending service.

Supplementary Question:

When was the last time a contractor was required to be replaced and what did the Council do?

Reply:

If you had given me notice of that question you would have got a precise reply. (The Mayor suggested that a written reply should be provided.)

10. From Andrew Ruck to the Leader of the Council:

A typical school planning application costs £1M of public money. Bullers Boys will now need at least 3. Did the Council do all it could to work with the applicant prior to it being brought to committee to mitigate the cost to the public purse?

Reply:

Yes it did.

The applicant knew from day one that they faced very serious planning issues in terms of congestion and road safety. Planning officers confirm that all reasonable steps were taken to alert the applicant to their ongoing concerns throughout the entirety of the application periods.

Ultimately, only the applicant can decide upon the specific details of the scheme that they wish to seek approval for and on both occasions they chose not to adapt their plans to address the concerns that had been raised.

11. From Rhian Kanat to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder

With no permanent site currently confirmed for Bullers Wood for Boys, Shaw Futures Academy and the new Harris Sydenham School and the Council's recent track record of refusing planning permission for new schools what is the Council's plan to deliver sufficient school places to meet the projected shortfall which on your own figures hits 22 forms of entry by 2022?

Reply:

The first thing to have a look at is the figures for the number of places we are expecting by 2022 – we are expecting to find 12 forms of entry, rather than 22. I think the figures being referred to are LGA figures, and they do not include government centrally funded schools, so for example it does not have Eden Park School in there which was given approval last year.

The Council will continue to work with the Education and Skills Funding Agency to help them provide Bullers Wood for Boys (we are doing an awful lot of work at the moment to try to get a temporary solution open for this week), Shaw Futures Academy (there was quite a bit of opposition to that including from the Liberal Democrats and a lot of local people, but I am sure that they will put in an appeal), and the new Harris Sydenham school (which has not yet applied for planning permission.) If there are any delays to these proposed schools, the Council will work with existing schools to ensure there are sufficient places available, and we will continue to do that over the long term.

Supplementary Question:

What specifically does the Council do to assist applicants with planning permissions for schools?

Reply:

In terms of the Education department, with the Shaw Academy, when that application was going forward, I met with the school leadership team, we tried to put their planning people in touch with the planning department at this local authority and tried to make sure that there was communication with residents and with the Council as well. Moving forward, with the Harris Sydenham, which is the first one that has been approved by the DfE since I have been in this role, I have met a number of times with the Harris Academy people and again we are starting that process to make sure that there is communication all the way through the process.

Additional supplementary Question from Councillor Dykes:

Can he confirm that we have identified sites that we would like for the schools, Bullers Wood being St Hugh's and Shaw on Westmoreland?

Reply:

Both of those sites are in the Local Plan for education. I know that Bullers Wood for Boys is going to push ahead with an appeal – I know that work is going on at the moment. I know that the Shaw Academy Trust is looking for an appeal on the Westmoreland Road site.

12. From Julie Ireland to the Environment Portfolio Holder

What consultation of key road user groups was undertaken in respect of the new proposals for a shared pedestrian cycle path from Bromley South to Shortlands via Queen Anne Avenue?

Reply:

Officers have consulted with the following groups/people - Cycle Touring Club, Bromley Mobility Forum, Disability Voice Bromley, Experts by Experience, Bromley Association of People with Disabilities, London Ambulance Service, Bromley Cyclists, Kent Association for the Blind, London Fire Brigade, Metropolitan Police, London Buses, Licensed Taxi Drivers Association, Southeastern, Transport for London, St. Marks C of E Primary School, Harris Primary Academy School, LBB Road Safety Team and all residents along Valley Road, Hillside Road and Queen Anne Avenue (including any side roads from these).

Consultation started on 20th February.

Supplementary Question:

How come none of the residents I have spoken to over the last two months have been consulted? If the consultation only started on 20th February I am guessing that is going to be your answer?

Reply:

Yes it would be.

(At this point the time allocated for questions expired and the remainder of the questioners received written replies.)

13. From Georgette Purdey to the Leader of the Council:

Can we have full disclosure of the amount of money spent on legal advice to allow the planning consent given in Oct 2017 for Bullers Wood School for Boys to be recalled to the January DCC meeting. Can we also have full disclosure of all exchanges and document pertaining to the precise grounds for returning planning consent to a second meeting once it had been given. If not, why not?

Reply:

Given the sensitive and unusual nature of this matter advice was sought from leading counsel. Counsel's fees are commercially sensitive as independent advice of the highest quality was required. Correspondence in respect of the decision to report back to Development Control Committee is not publicly available as it involves internal discussions between Officers of the Council and the documents are the subject of legal professional privilege.

14. From Jayne Burman to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder

How much public money has so far been spent by the Council on the Bullers Wood School for Boys process?

Reply:

In total, the Council has received a sum of £38,277 relating to the planning application for Bullers Wood School for Boys.

This sum includes pre-application fees of £10,948 to cover its costs of providing that service, and £27,329 for planning application fees.

The planning application fees are set at national level and are intended to substantially cover the Council's planning costs, which in this case would include the cost of a transport consultant, £8,366.

The planning application processing costs are not recorded by timesheets at a case-by-case level but overall costs are monitored in total at service level.

In addition, it has been estimated that the Highway Development Team have spent approximately 72 hours on this application, with an estimated cost of £2,560.

So overall, the Council would have incurred net costs of £2,560.

This excludes legal advice – counsel's fees are commercially sensitive and we do not propose to disclose the fees at this time.

15. From Rich Wilsher to the Resources Portfolio Holder

How many Freedom of Information requests did the Council receive from 1/7/17 - 31/12/17 and how many were answered in the regulatory 20 days?

Reply:

We received 678 new requests of which 459 were answered within 20 working days (68%.) Of those responded to outside the timescale then these would often require the Council seeking clarification applicants or taking time to consider the applicability of permissible exemptions under the Act.

16. From Josh King to the Leader of the Council

Can the Leader provide categorised details of legal expenses and those awarded against the council following cases lost over the last two years in planning cases, industrial tribunals, and freedom of information appeals?

Reply:

Over the past two years the costs awarded against the Council in planning appeals amounts to £268,801. Of that figure, £150,000 was incurred in the defence of the Sundridge Park Manor appeal, a particularly important case to defend given the Manor's key architectural Importance to our Borough's heritage.

There have been no settled awards of costs against the Council in respect of freedom of information request or industrial tribunals.

Any Council will need to defend decisions made on behalf of residents of the Borough at planning appeals from time to time and also against claims subsequently made in pursuance of them, leading to the need to instruct external counsel to do so.

17. From Rhian Kanat to the Environment Portfolio Holder

The announcement 2 weeks ago that the Council would finally agree to make some road safety improvements in the vicinity of St George's, Bickley Primary and the new

La Fontaine academy rather than defer to La Fontaine's own travel planning is most welcome. However the school started last week and no substantive changes have been made. What is the timetable for those changes and why has it taken so long to get to this point given that La Fontaine were confirmed on this site over a year ago?

Reply:

The Council did not consider siting 3 primary schools in a very small area to be the wisest decision; the decision did not fall to the Council. Prior to La Fontaine opening at the new location, new parking arrangements were introduced in a section of Nightingale Lane, to aid traffic flow in an already congested part of that street. Some additional safety signs are to be introduced to Tylney Road, Nightingale Lane and Bishops Avenue shortly. Further changes are being considered, some will be subject to consultation with residents. Even with knowledge of the pupils' postcodes it is difficult to predict actual travel patterns and we are now observing travel patterns to gauge the need and location for further measures particularly in the Homesdale Road area. We will continue to work with schools through the School Travel Planning process.

18. From Julie Ireland to the Leader of the Council

What are the minimum membership numbers that are required for a residents' association to be considered by Ward Councillors as representative of an area and does that RA need to prove that it genuinely consults with its members on issues before representing their views to ward councillors?

Reply:

Whether a resident is a Member of a Residents Association or otherwise misses the point completely. If a resident of Bickley holds a material planning concern and seeks our advice and possible intervention, the answer is one.

You would need to ask individual Residents Associations yourself as to how, if at all, they structure their internal constitutions.

19. From Rich Wilsher to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder

Why has Bromley not signed up to the London Rogue Landlord Database?

Reply:

The London Rogue Landlord Database was only launched at the end of December and Officers are currently assessing whether to sign up. Having said that, over the past few years we have not received a single complaint about rogue landlords, therefore if or when we do sign up, we currently have nothing to add to the database.

COUNCIL MEETING

26TH FEBRUARY 2018

**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

1. From Colin Willetts to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Could the Portfolio Holder tell us how many environmental reports have been submitted to CSC agent from 22/5/2014 to 31/1/2018 by Councillors (i) Angela Wilkins, (ii) Kevin Brooks, (iii) Kathy Bance, (iv) Vanessa Allen, and (v) Colin Smith?

Reply:

- Angela Wilkins – 27 reports in total (0 via CSC)
- Kevin Brooks – 1 report in total (1 via CSC)
- Kathy Bance – 15 reports in total (12 via CSC)
- Vanessa Allen – 36 reports in total (0 via CSC)
- Colin Smith – 186 reports in total (1 via CSC)

Numbers do not include Waste Services as taken from CONFIRM.

2. From Colin Willetts to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Alleyways –

(i) Who is the owner of the alley adjacent 43 Ravensbury Road?

Reply:

We maintain the alleyway through to Clarendon Green. We have recently completed a repair to a cycle barrier in this footpath.

(ii) When is the fencing scheduled for repair alley adjacent 52 Curtismill Way?

Reply:

We have made contact with Mr Willetts as he was able to supply us with a letter from a previous Area Manager apparently confirming that LBB have taken responsibility for the maintenance of this fence in the past. The local Highway Inspector has subsequently checked the fence line and can only find a small section of minor damage that would not currently qualify for repair. We are proposing Mr Willetts meets with our Highway Inspector to confirm if we are indeed looking at the correct locations he/the resident are concerned about and to confirm then whether a repair is actually required in the view of LBB, we have contacted him directly to make arrangements.

(iii) Could you address serious footway ponding (during heavy rainfall) obstructing safe passage for school children in alley (lead into from 8 Arbrook Close)?

Reply:

The Highway Inspector has investigated on site and is now discussing the issue with our drainage section to look at potential solutions.

3. From Colin Willetts to the Environment Portfolio Holder

(i) All bus stops Chipperfield, when will you be carrying out improvements ref 12597-02?

Reply:

The bus stops near the junction with Petersham Road and outside numbers 297/299 have been passed across to the highways team to be up-graded which should be carried out by the end of March.

(ii) ref 12597-01, factually the existing 17 metre hardstanding is opposite 281- 283! why not address parking either side?

Reply:

The bus stops at the junction with Ravenscourt Road and opposite numbers 281/283 have been improved. Parking controls were not considered necessary at this time.

Why has white line not been remarked at rear vehicle entrance Leasons School?

Reply:

When the development works are completed the Council will look to install suitable road markings.

(iii) when will you be addressing disability access obstructions (lamp column/bin) at junction Petersham Drive?

Reply:

The current location of the lamp column adjacent to the bus stop near the junction with Petersham Drive would appear to be an obstruction to passengers boarding and alighting and we have therefore arranged for the column to be relocated clear of the stop. Although we do not have a date this could take up to 3 months.

4. From Adam Bambrough to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Please could the Council share the results of their recent road safety tests on Village Way and explain why a pedestrian crossing has been ruled out when such crossings are installed across the borough in areas that share an equally low footfall in off peak times?

Reply:

A pedestrian crossing is being proposed for Village Way near to Whitmore Road, but not a controlled crossing. The proposed crossing will take the form of a pedestrian refuge island. The type of crossing considered at any location will depend amongst

other things on the volume of traffic, number of pedestrians crossing through the day, presence of driveways, junctions, bends and trees, accident data, 85th percentile speed of traffic and proximity to bus stops. Thus each request for a crossing is considered on a case by case basis.

The results of the road safety tests are shown in the table below. A speed survey was also undertaken in Village Way. The speed of all passing traffic was recorded over a seven day period from 27/11/17. . The average speed recorded was 27mph. This 85th percentile speed, measured here at 30mph, was relatively low for a busy residential street such as this.

In technical terms it is the PV² calculation that guides the requirement for a crossing. The results for Village Way are also shown in the table below. The PV² value obtained was 60,000,000, this indicates that an uncontrolled crossing point would be best suited to the site. This analysis also confirms my previous replies, that it is the increased number of pedestrians crossing, with the new school, that drove this need, not the traffic on the road.

There is a concern that lowly used zebra crossings might lure pedestrians into a false sense of security if they incorrectly presume all drivers will stop. Thus, a crossing with central refuge, where pedestrians only have to negotiate one stream of traffic at a time and cross a shorter distance can actually be safer. The School Travel Planning process will allow the Council and the School to periodically consider changes in travel patterns.

ROAD NAME Village Way
DATE 21/11/2017
WEATHER Fine/Dry
 PEDS: the pedestrian flow (pedestrians / hour) across a 100m length of road centred on the proposed crossing site
 VEHICLES: the number of vehicles in both directions (vehicles / hour)

TIME	PEDESTRIANS	VEHICLES	V ²	PV ²
07:30-08:30	150	798	636804	95,520,600
08:30-09:30	15	832	692224	10,383,360
12:00-13:00	12	517	267289	3,207,468
13:00-14:00	20	494	244036	4,880,720
15:00-16:00	117	707	499849	58,482,333
16:00-17:00	116	748	559504	64,902,464
17:00-18:00	35	825	680625	23,821,875
4 BUSIEST		AVERAGE	THRESHOLD	CONSIDER
95,520,600		60,681,818	100,000,000	No
64,902,464				
58,482,333				
23,821,875				

5. From Adam Bambrough to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Please could the Council elaborate on the promised consultation process on a refuge in Village Way? How will you determine who should be consulted? When will the process begin and end?

Reply:

The Council will shortly be consulting those residents directly affected by a proposed central refuge located near to their property. When installing a central refuge, people with driveways may be adversely affected as well as those who may lose parking on the approach and exit to the central refuge. These people will be consulted for their views and opinions and be given at least 21 days to respond.

6. From Chloe-Jane Ross to the Resources Portfolio Holder

How much in pounds of the Council "Property investment fund" was invested outside of the borough last year and the year before?

Reply:

During 2016 £19,459K was invested outside the borough and £6,326K in 2017 to purchase investment properties.

7. From Chloe-Jane Ross to the Resources Portfolio Holder

What were the large investments and where, i.e. a shopping centre in Birmingham, land, commercial/residential property etc?

Reply:

The properties purchased in 2016 and 2017 are as follows;

2016 Industrial Warehouse – Brentwood
Offices – Newbury
Industrial Warehouse – Thatcham
Industrial Warehouse – Farnborough
2017 Offices - Ashford

8. From Chloe-Jane Ross to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder

How many Bromley Borough children were provided school places in neighbouring boroughs this year and the year before?

Reply:

The Council plans for school places on the basis of the Education Act 1996 that makes local authorities responsible for securing sufficient school places for children of compulsory school age in their local area. However, the 1990 Greenwich Judgement made it unlawful for a local education authority to give priority in school admissions to its own residents. Parents have a right through the admissions process to state a preference for a school in any borough and their eligibility will be on the basis of each school's admissions policy.

Bromley for many years has been a net importer of pupils from other boroughs at secondary transfer. The most recent data available information from the DfE on cross borough movements indicates that in 2016 there were 742 more pupils coming into the Bromley from other boroughs for their secondary education and 562 for their primary education than Bromley residents crossing into other boroughs.

The number of children transferring to secondary schools in other authorities at Year 7 is:

	Reception	Year 7
2016/17 school year	615 children	630 children
2017/18 school year	605 children	467 children

The number for 2018/19 can be confirmed after National Offer Day on 16 April 2018 (primary) and 1 March 2018 (Secondary).

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

26TH FEBRUARY 2018

QUESTIONS FOR ORAL REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Cllr Michael Rutherford to the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families

Please can the Portfolio Holder outline which schools the 180 pupils who would have attended Bullers Wood for Boys this summer have gone to; and (if appropriate) how larger classes will be accommodated without impacting the quality of education?

Reply:

There are sufficient places available in the borough for the local authority to confirm that every applicant who applied on time through the co-ordinated admissions process will receive an offer of a school place on National Offer Day. We are unable to comment on where applicants will be offered a place in advance of National Offer Day.

All but one Bromley secondary schools are academies which make their own decision about their internal organisation, for example the size of classes. However, the number of applications for a secondary school place would not create any reason for schools to increase class sizes.

2. From Cllr Nicky Dykes to the Chairman of Development Control Committee

Was the planning appeals team given prior knowledge of when the independent inspector would be doing a site visit in relation to the Bullers wood secondary school application?

Reply:

Basically, no. The Planning Inspector's site visit was not an 'accompanied' site visit and the planning appeals team were neither made aware of the date by the Planning Inspector or invited to attend.

Supplementary Question:

I think that is actually different to the response that I got in the meeting, which said that they had. Does he not think that it would be prudent for them to at least highlight the fact that there were three sets of emergency works which probably did heavily influence what he saw on that day and did not give a true reflection, and surely, we would want to see a true reflection of the site by an Inspector, so why was that not highlighted to them?

Reply:

I actually agree with you, and it did not happen.

3. From Cllr David Livett to the Leader of the Council

The Leader will be aware that the Pension Fund lost £1.75m from a single transaction after a failure to follow UKIP advice to the Pensions Investment Sub Committee, advice that had received strong cross party support. What action does the Leader propose to take to address the failings highlighted by this loss?

Reply:

Cllr Livett has added his own very positive contribution to the Committee in recent years, despite what follows next as it is not accepted that a loss of any description arose within the context when considering how a pension fund is operated and advised on longer term horizons, rather than short term variations to stock market levels.

I am advised that the matter in question was discussed at the Pensions Investment Sub Committee meeting on 16th May 2017 and the minutes, which were agreed at the subsequent meeting, are publicly available. At that meeting, as indicated in the minutes there was a discussion about the sale of assets with different views expressed but no decision was made at the meeting relating to the final arrangements for a sale.

Any member of that committee acts as a trustee of the pension fund to protect pension fund member interests and council tax payers, and party politics do not play any part in that role. In fact the committee, with Councillor Livett as a member, has raised concerns previously, that politics has no role to play when the committee has discussed the governance of the London CIV, which is a disastrous story in motion.

UK pension Law requires that those charged with governance need to take professional advice in respect of their fiduciary duties towards beneficiaries.

A decision was made to sell global equities to meet the transfer value relating to the transfer of pension fund liabilities for various college staff to the London Pensions Fund Authority. Advice was received from the Council's independent financial advisors and their recommended action was agreed by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of Pensions Investment Sub Committee, under the delegated authority on behalf of Pensions Investment Sub Committee. The advice received and a brief commentary is provided below.

(The Council's independent advisers, Allenbridge, advised that the Council sell global equities (Blackrock) up to the transfer value for the following reasons:

- *The asset allocation strategy has been revised to reduce the council's holding of Global Equities and Diversified Growth Funds;*
- *The allocation for global equities is significantly overweight compared with the existing and future strategic benchmark (81% prior to Blackrock sale when it should be 70% and reducing to 60%) – the significant overweight position highlights a key risk, particularly when retaining a more volatile asset. The actuary recognised the position of the pension fund and the need to reduce the element of higher risk assets;*
- *They viewed equities as having high volatility and with their strong performance there was a greater risk of a price correction which has recently been evident in the financial markets – there are many articles referring to the risk that equities are overpriced but I accept no one can be certain.*

The decision made had to take into account any down side risks that could be realised. If the downside risk was realised I am sure this question would not have been asked. There were many risk factors in the market at the time including uncertainty relating to North Korea.

Being a trustee in a pension fund is not about making short term judgements but it is about making long term decisions, managing risk, being able to meet pension liabilities and achieving a sustainable high funding position.)

What has this approach achieved in recent times?

The longer term approach the Trustees have achieved is remarkable. We should be celebrating that we have achieved the first of its kind in the country in the “gifting” of assets to the pension fund which has led to direct financial savings (£1.5m per annum, which is expected to increase in future years). The Council’s pension fund has received national recognition for being the best performing local government pension fund last year, over 3 years, over 5 years, over 10 years and the second best over a 20 year period – this is what we should be judged on. A high performing fund not only benefits the members and employers of the pension scheme but also keeps costs low for council taxpayers.

Supplementary Question:

He confuses long term performance with a single investment decision. That single investment decision was buy or sell. That was a loss of £1.75m. What we have here is some confusion over the way this Pension Fund is run. It has been successful, but that is very largely due to enormous foreign exchange profits. The Local Government Pension Scheme regulations require that the Council has four members of its Pensions Board, the Council has only two. And has knowingly been in breach of the law since July 2017. Its actions to rectify this have failed, what does he propose to do about it?

Reply:

I suggest that if Councillor Livett thinks that the Council has acted outside of the law in any way he should have an urgent conversation with Mr Bowen because that would be wrong on every level and I would agree with that. The only aspect that I would respectfully disagree with Cllr Livett on, as a fellow old-timer in the city, is that whilst you could have made a short-term trade that would indeed have made more in the short-term, had the market gone the other way and there would have been a loss you would not be having this conversation today. Pension funds do not work on short termism – they work on long ten, twenty, thirty forty year stretches of investment, and that is possibly where we are set to disagree.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Angela Wilkins:

The Pensions Board has not met and it is not constituted. That is in breach of the law. Is the Leader concerned about that and if so what is he going to do about it? Does he think it is appropriate to introduce a question that was never asked of him into his reply in order that he can give a speech and a sermon on how well that pension fund is performing?

Reply:

In response to the second question, absolutely, because Councillor Wilkins answers her question without any big preamble herself. In answer to the first part, I would suggest that if we are acting outside of the law in any way Councillor Wilkins discusses it with Mr Bowen, because that is not my information.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Graham Arthur:

Can I just pick up on something the Leader has said and suggest that Councillor Wilkins looks at this. This is the award that was given to Bromley Pension Fund for being the most outstanding Pension Fund in the country. Is the Leader aware of this, and would he join with me in suggesting that people in the opposition parties should celebrate excellence and not criticise it?

Reply:

Very much so. Furthermore, if I could pay a compliment and give real praise to all Members of the Pension Fund over the last five to ten years of all political parties, achieving awards like this does not happen by chance - it is hard work. Intelligent people making the right decisions. No trader on earth gets every trade right – markets do not work like that. That is a testament to how good our guys are.

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

If he will set out the timeline of actions taken by the Planning Department subsequent to the decision of the Development Control Committee on 4th October 2017 to approve the application for the proposed Bullers' Wood Boys School and, in particular, why the decision had not been implemented prior to the publication of the Inspector's report into the first appeal on December 12th?

Reply:

The reason that the decision had not been issued by 12th December was that the section 106 legal agreement had not been completed by that time. As the report to the 4th October meeting recommended refusal, conditions and heads of term for a section 106 had to be formulated and then worked up with the Developer's agents to enable a planning permission to be issued. The application was also referred to the Mayor of London and the Secretary of State.

The timeline of all this is as follows -

- 4th October 2017 – Development Control Committee resolution to grant planning permission.
- 19th October 2017 – Set of conditions and s106 heads of terms finally agreed between applicant and Council as far as possible.
- 20th October 2017 – Conditions and section 106 heads of terms sent to DCC Chairman for consultation as per committee resolution.
- 7th November 2017 – After internal consultations as to the matters to be secured a draft section 106 for second application provided to developer's solicitor for comment. Also it was confirmed the draft could be sent to the GLA concerning referral to the Mayor.
- 23rd November 2017 – The developer's solicitor was advised that the Mayor and Secretary of State have declined to intervene in the second application.

24th November 2017 – 11th December 2017 - Continued exchanges of emails between the Developer's solicitor and the Council's Legal Section to work up the draft section 106 agreement into an agreed form.

11th December 2017 – The two outstanding details between the Developer's solicitor and the Council's Legal Section concerned the carbon offsetting contribution and the timing of the Highway Works (and in particular whether a signal crossing on Bickley Road could be in place prior to the use of the temporary buildings). The Council's Legal Section, before the issue of the Inspector's decision on 11th December 2017, regarded engrossment of the section 106 to be imminent.

That takes us to 12th December when the decision was received from the Inspector.

Supplementary Question:

Can he tell us what happened between the 20th October, when it was referred to the Chairman, and the 7th November? When did the Chairman come back to him with his approval? What is the normal procedure, when a decision is made by a Committee, that it should take something like nine weeks before it is published?

Reply:

I cannot answer the first part of the question – the Councillor to my right (Councillor Dean) knows the answer to that, but it was replied to in reasonable time. As to whether this is normal, who knows – section 106 agreements are sometimes extremely complicated. It requires two to tango and I think our Legal Section was not at fault – I wish the same could be said about the applicant.

5. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder

How much public money has been wasted in not delivering a new secondary school at Bullers Wood Boys?

Reply:

This does answer Jayne Burman's question from earlier about Council spend on planning decisions on Bullers Wood school for Boys.

In total, the Council has received a sum of £38,277 relating to the planning application for Bullers Wood School for Boys.

This sum includes pre-application fees of £10,948 to cover its costs of providing that service, and £27,329 for planning application fees. The planning application fees are set at a national level and are intended to substantially cover the Council's planning costs, which in this case would include the cost of the transport consultant, £8,366. The planning application processing costs are not recorded by timesheets at a case-by-case level, but overall costs are monitored in total at service level. In addition, it has been estimated that the Highway Development Team have spent approximately 72 hours on this application, with an estimated cost of £2,560.

So overall, the Council would have incurred net costs of £2,560.

Supplementary Question:

I think it was a very disingenuous answer from Councillor Fortune, because I am certain that it was far more than the figures he quoted there, although I accept that he is doing his best to resolve this fiasco, and that is what it is. Would this fiasco not have occurred if this local education authority was still in charge of planning and running school places in this borough? Is it not really down to his government, and your friends in government at the time in the Liberal Democrat party for their fiasco – they have got to take some responsibility as well.

Reply:

I cannot answer a hypothetical question about whether or not if we still had planning for schools in-house it may have been different. I do genuinely take issue with Councillor Fookes' remark about being disingenuous, and I would be very grateful if he would withdraw that remark. (Councillor Fookes stated that he stuck by his statement.)

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

What does he think are the key differences between being a ward councillor and being Leader of the Council?

Reply:

One never stops becoming a ward councillor, no matter what role you move on to fulfil. Clearly being the Leader of the Council holds significantly more responsibility, gives you responsibility for oversight of many of the committees, but interestingly not General Purposes and Licensing, Development Control or the Health and Wellbeing Board, all of which sit outside of the executive function of which I am the chairman.

Supplementary Question:

Do you now concur with your Deputy Leader and the Portfolio Holder for Education, Children and Families that there is a shortage of school places in this borough? That we do have an allocated site on St Hugh's playing fields and you might like to support that campaign? Would you like a free sticker if you are going to say yes?

Reply:

I absolutely do accept that there is a school place shortage in the borough of 12 forms of entry, on this Council's measurement, and, when you add in the GLA's 5% variation, up to 19 forms. I note that I said 2022. In the pipeline we have, potentially, Harris at Sydenham, which offers six forms of entry, possibly more, in the north-west of the borough. We have two applications in the centre of Bromley, the Shaw Academy at Bromley South, offering up to six forms of entry, we have the potential for a school site at Bullers Wood in central Bickley, offering the potential for six forms of entry, and we also have the potential for a long awaited, long rumoured Roman Catholic School in the north of the borough, in the Chislehurst direction, which actually fulfils, if they are all granted, twenty four forms of entry extra before 2022, and on that basis you could actually be running a surplus.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Do you support the creation of the Bullers Wood Boys School on the St Hugh's site, and if not why not?

Reply:

My position is constant and has been from the first application on 25th January, and if Councillor Dunn listens to the tape he will hear me say that, in principle, the ward councillors have never had an issue with this, and indeed some of the applicant's own team will confirm those very conversations. What we have said throughout is that the traffic and the road safety do not work, that there is a danger caused there and an overloading of congestion on a busy road network, a key arterial road for the borough, and until those road safety measures are mitigated I am opposed to them, because road safety trumps all.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Nicholas Bennett:

Would the Leader of the Council agree with me that it is entirely right that no planning committee should be asked to pre-determine an application, that they should go into a meeting with an open mind to listen to the debate, but it is important, and would he not agree that, for the future of the Council, we should be looking to ensure that planning committees are aware of the strategic objectives of the Council when they make their decisions?

Reply:

I do not oversight of Development Control or planning committees, which are not executive functions. My own view is that, legally, members of planning committees cannot be dictated to as to which way they vote. They need to be left to judge each application on its merits based on the evidence before them. There were clearly Members of the Committee on 4th October, just as there were on 25th January, who had made up their minds in both directions, whether they were for, or against. Whether that is a good thing or a bad thing is to a degree subjective – some people thought that school places should carry prioritisation, others thought that road safety was most important, and that is the current mismatch.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Vanessa Allen:

I am not sure who Councillor Smith is referring to with the predetermination. Those Members who sat through the Local Development Plan Working Group meetings were obviously supporting the school here. I am concerned about the numbers because we have been told about the increased risk of road safety problems. According to the website there are 1,500 girls, and the proposed school is 900. We were given the impression earlier that there were more boys than girls, but that does not appear to be the case. I would like confirmation of why the road safety is being given a higher priority than the numbers would suggest.

Reply:

I am not clear that you can match the numbers up in that way. I can only repeat that I do not have oversight of the Development Control Committee, far from it. When I spoke against the application on 4th October I was roundly ignored and it was approved, so that is how much attention they paid to me. All I would say is that road safety, I believe, is paramount and that the applicant has had two years to present a scheme that works in congestion and road safety terms and they have failed to do so, which is why I continue to support those colleagues who voted against it on the night.

7. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Environment Portfolio Holder

The Neighbourhood Teams are the Council's "Front Line" in ensuring that our Contractors clean our streets and empty our bins properly. There have been

numerous vacancies in the West Neighbourhood Team in recent months. Please provide the number of officer weeks of vacancy at both Neighbourhood Manager and Neighbourhood Officer level for the West Team in 2017 and 2018 year to date.

Reply:

The West Area Team was reorganised on an interim basis when the vacancies of the Neighbourhood Officer 1 and the Neighbourhood Manager (Parks Service) arose. The interim management solution employed for the West Area since 20th August 2017 has been Jim Cowan, Neighbourhood Manager and the Neighbourhood Officer for the West Area has been Laura Bond for waste service related matters and Catherine Heard and Anthony O'Donnell for parks, grounds maintenance and street cleansing matters. The interim officer solution for this area has been in place since July 2017.

The current progression for recruitment is as follows; the vacant Neighbourhood Officer is now filled (vacant for 36 weeks) and the Neighbourhood Manager post (vacant for 26 weeks) is expected to be filled soon as it is being finalised through the collecting of appropriate references.

Supplementary Question:

Your response in December said that a Neighbourhood Officer ought to do about ten inspections a day, so if we have had twenty six weeks of vacancy by my reckoning that is over a thousand inspections that have not been carried out. Is it any wonder that our streets are not as well cleaned as they ought to be?

Reply:

My response in December was that the Area Manager had been acting down to carry out those extra inspections.

Additional Supplementary Question by Councillor Angela Wilkins:

Can I ask whether the other Neighbourhood Offices have experienced the same difficulties – absences of staff for a prolonged period of time.

Reply:

In these cases the employees of the Council have chosen to move on, rather than been absent for illness or anything else. Officers were allocated to individual wards a good period ago – I do not think there is any connection between which wards they represent and those officers who have chosen to move on for career reasons.

Point of Personal explanation:

Councillor Angela Wilkins explained that what she was getting at was that two officer posts had been vacant for a number of months. Some staff had been listed, but they were not dedicated to these wards, and the wards were suffering as a consequence. Was this happening in the other Neighbourhood Offices in the borough?

Councillor Huntington Thresher explained that the Team reacted to cover illness, holidays etc. Where officers moved on for career or other reasons this just happened to be where they moved on. Officers in other areas had not moved on and they had not needed to fill posts in those areas.

8. From Cllr Vanessa Allen to the Resources Portfolio Holder

With reference to the Voter Identification Pilot in Bromley, the Cabinet Office website clearly states that the form of identification to be used will be set by the Council. Why

then have we been saddled with some of the most onerous conditions of any of the five participating councils?

Reply:

I am not sure you have done your homework on this one. The purpose of the pilots is to test a variety of options.

Voters at Bromley will be able to use 24 separate types of photo and non-photo ID. Voters at Gosport, for instance, will be able to use 19 types of photo and non-photo ID. Voters at Woking will be able to use 11 types of ID, but this is limited to photo ID only. Voters at Watford and Swindon are piloting using poll cards with Swindon using enhanced IT to scan those cards, but for the many voters who may turn up without a poll card then at Watford there are only 6 acceptable types of photo and non-photo ID which can be used and at Swindon only 5 types of photographic ID will be accepted.

Bromley has the widest overall range of ID and in common with most of the pilots also includes provision for a Certificate of Identity for those voters who do not have the necessary ID.

Supplementary Question:

Who exactly made the decision for us to participate and for the forms of identification which we require to be produced?

Reply:

It was left to each of the pilots to determine what they were going to do, individually. We have obviously taken a lead in the way that is done currently in other parts of the United Kingdom - in Northern Ireland where it has worked successfully for some time - and we have taken the same sort of ID requirements. I do not believe that the electors of Bromley are any less savvy than the electorate of Northern Ireland. I think that we should have confidence in the way that we are spinning this out in Bromley and we should be very proud of the way it is being done. The Returning Officer is taking the lead on it. It would be helpful as this is spun out in the next two and a half months if a briefing document is given to Members because Members do have a big role to play in this in terms of spreading it out amongst their residents and electors.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Tony Owen:

What is required from Proxy Voters?

Reply:

I am unaware of the answer – we will write with the answer.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Simon Fawthrop:

Can the Portfolio Holder explain why the Labour Party seems so opposed to Voter ID, one would have thought that they would want to make sure that every voter was accurate going to the polls.

Reply:

I feel inadequate to explain how the Labour Party works or thinks, but it is worth reflecting that this has all party support.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Wilkins:

Can the Portfolio Holder explain why letters such as DWP benefits letters and their equivalent have not been included on the list and does this not disadvantage lower paid people who are less likely to have photo ID? My Post Office requires just ordinary ID – not photo ID. I am suggesting that they are less capable of affording things like passports in some circumstances.

Reply:

I am at disadvantage – you are asking a very specific question. Are you suggesting that someone who is unemployed or claiming benefits is less capable?

I think if you ask the majority of people to turn out their pockets they would have the necessary ID on them – it could be a driving licence, other photo ID. Most people would say that they have a passport that they could produce. If somebody does not have any of the requirements they can get a certificate in advance so that they can vote, so nobody is prohibited from voting.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Dunn:

I do not think I heard an answer as to who made the decisions?

Reply:

The Returning Officer.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Payne:

My understanding is that the Cabinet Office asked us if we could do it and we said yes and we are getting on with it. If they have no certification whatsoever they can apply for certification. What is the last point at which they can ask for the certification? I believe it is the day before – is that correct?

Reply:

It is the day before.

(At this point the time allowed for oral replies expired; the remainder of the questions received written replies.)

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

Can the Portfolio Holder advise me as to his understanding of the 56 day prior approval, for certain planning applications?

Reply:

The 56 day 'prior approval' process for Planning applies to a number of different types of prior approval applications. These are applications where the principle of permitting the development is granted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015, however some matters subsequently require the 'prior approval' of the Local Planning Authority. These matters vary in each case, but range from siting and appearance to highways impacts and noise. Such applications are time limited and the legislation sets out that the applicant benefits from an automatic approval should a decision not be delivered to the applicant within the 56 day time frame.

10. From Cllr Ruth Bennett to the Leader of the Council

What financial and other assistance has the Council provided to London South East College for the establishment of an Aerospace and Aviation Technology College at Biggin Hill?

Reply:

At this point in time no financial assistance has been provided to London South East College (LSEC) for the establishment of an Aerospace and Aviation Technology College at Biggin Hill.

The borough has been party to discussions with the College about the Technical College at Biggin Hill over the past twelve months. More recently these have focussed on the possibility of providing a commercial loan facility which the College is currently considering.

Given that no formal decision has been made and that we are also dealing with the business and financial affairs of another organisation then you will appreciate that I cannot say too much in Part 1 at this stage.

I am pleased to confirm that the Council will require appropriate security and insurance arrangements, as well that any recommendations eventually arrived at, will be subject to wider Member scrutiny in the usual manner.

11. From Cllr Michael Rutherford to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

In response to the Grenfell Tower disaster last year, the Renewal and Recreation PDS Committee has sought confidence that residents of the London Borough of Bromley are safe at home, regardless of whether they live in public or private sector accommodation. Please can the Portfolio Holder outline the steps the Council has taken to gain assurance that tall buildings are safe, and any further steps that are planned?

Reply:

Social Housing:

Immediate action was taken by senior councillors and officers during the summer 2017 to meet with those housing associations that have tower blocks in Bromley to gain reassurance that these met fire safety standards and had all the necessary risk assessments and procedures in place. All tower blocks underwent full inspections and it has been confirmed that none of the tower blocks were identified as having any high risk factors and none have flammable cladding requiring any remedial work. At this time the leader issued a statement confirming the position. Housing associations also contacted residents directly to provide assurances.

Since this time ongoing monitoring continues to take place in partnership with the fire brigade and GLA to work with all social housing providers in the borough to confirm that all necessary measures are in place to ensure the safety of residents. This work has also included all commissioned accommodation and placements included supported housing, temporary accommodation and care homes.

Private accommodation:

Through a combination of contact with the persons responsible (usually the freeholders and their agents) and visual inspection of buildings, it has been found

that either the buildings do not have cladding or the persons responsible have already addressed the assessing and testing of the cladding materials to the exterior of the buildings. No significant risks have been identified and where necessary the persons responsible have ongoing arrangements in place for the continued investigation and assessments to safeguard residents. The Council is monitoring information and advice that the Government is publishing.

12. From Cllr Nicky Dykes to the Chairman of Development Control Committee

Has the Development Control Committee approved the Council's Local Plan?

Reply:

Yes the Development Control Committee recommended the approval of the submission draft Local Plan to the Executive, it being an Executive function. The Local Plan is currently at Examination stage.

**13. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Leader of the Council
(answered by the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder)**

How many additional school forms of entry and pupil places will be required by 2022-3 and what steps the Council is taking to ensure it meets its' statutory duty to ensure sufficient places?

Reply:

In addition to the capacity from projects which already have planning consent, at Eden Park High School (8 forms of entry) and the expansion of Bishop Justus (2 forms of entry), the 2017 GLA school roll projections indicate the need for an additional 12 forms of entry by 2022/23. The proposed schools at Harris Sydenham, Shaw Futures Academy and Bullers Wood for Boys would provide 18 forms of entry.

The Council will continue to work with the Education and Skills Funding Agency to help them provide these schools and, if there were delay to these schemes, the Council will work with existing schools to ensure there are sufficient places available in the long term.

14. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Why have residents with parking permits in the proposed Penge CPZ now been informed that they can't use the pay and display bays without being charged further?

Reply:

I understand that the wording of a letter sent to residents was incomplete as it omitted the rules that applied outside the hours of the permits validity, the department has apologised for this. In light of the recent correspondence received from concerned residents I am inclined to make changes to this scheme to try to ensure that no resident feels disadvantaged. You and your colleagues' views were requested on a proposed way forward by email last Friday. I would hope that the precise nature of the new proposals can be communicated to all affected residents by letter within the next two weeks.

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

As the minutes of the February Executive meeting have not been published, please can you repeat your response to Andrew Ruck's question: "Why did Cllr Dean not manage and direct the DCC meeting on 25 January in accordance with the Chief Exec's brief to ratify the decision from October and follow the guidance of the Planning Officer that the decision could be ratified?"

Reply:

The draft minutes have now been circulated to all Councillors and therefore they are available to Cllr Wilkins.

16. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Please explain the difference between using Reserves to fill gaps in the revenue budget, with the use of £17.5 million, representing several years surplus from the Council Tax Collection Fund to partially fill the revenue budget gap of £22.7 million in 2019/20?

Reply:

A collection fund surplus cannot be used to support the revenue budget in the year it arises. The timing of its use is set out in relevant Fund Regulations and is dependent on when it is reported. In practice this means that the transfer from the collection fund will take place in either of the two financial years following the year in which it was generated.

In this case, rather than using in the year it became available, £13.5m of prior year surplus has been set aside in an earmarked reserve so that it can be carried forward into 2019/20 to mitigate against the budget gap over financial years. It has been estimated that a further collection fund surplus of £4m will be available towards the budget in 2019/20.

Reserves are not subject to the same Regulations and can be utilised at any time, subject to the council's approach to reserves as set out in appendix 4 of the 2018/19 Council Tax report.

Neither source of funding will provide ongoing support to the revenue budget and should only be considered as one-off support in the short term.

17. From Cllr Ruth Bennett to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder

Would the Portfolio Holder give a statement on the current situation with regard to the proposed Bullers Wood School for Boys?

Reply:

The Council is in communication with the DfE about the proposed school. A decision is still awaited from the DfE about whether the school will be opening in temporary accommodation for September 2018 entry.

18. From Cllr Nicky Dykes to the Chairman of Development Control Committee

What is the justification for Development Control Committee refusing to ratify previous approval of the Bullers Wood application?

Reply:

The justification for Development Control Committee refusing to ratify previous approval of the Bullers Wood application is as set out in the minutes of the January 2018 meeting.

19. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Environment Portfolio Holder

On what dates and times Parking Enforcement Officers have been in The Mead and Hawes Lane, West Wickham, since 2nd October 2017 and how many tickets have been issued for parking contraventions on each occasion?

Reply:

There has been one patrol which resulted in a penalty charge issued to a vehicle for being parked on the footway in The Mead.

There have been 11 patrols which resulted in 25 penalty charges issued to motorists for parking on single / double yellow lines and on the footway in Hawes Lane.

20. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder

How many police officers and PCSO's have been lost in Bromley since 2010?

Reply:

We asked Bromley Police for the figures that you have requested, and they replied that it is too difficult to break it down into actual numbers for the past 8yrs. In that period of time they have moved from Neighbourhood policing, to the local policing model and they are now beginning the transition to Basic Command Units. Over that period the Borough's working strength has fluctuated in accordance with the Home Office and MPS requirements.

21. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Care Services Portfolio Holder

How is this Council performing in relation to extra care provision and delayed discharges?

Reply:

Against last year, significant improvements have been seen in Bromley's reported Delayed Transfers of Care (DToC) as a result of exemplary integrated working of health and social care to support people who no longer need to remain in hospital. This includes step down beds in ECH which are supporting the overall improved DToC position.

22. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Environment Portfolio Holder

What are your thoughts about the recent extremely serious accident on Elmers End Road, where bollards, a front garden wall and a part of the front of a house were destroyed?

Reply:

This was a dreadful incident which must have caused terrible shock to the residents and neighbours especially since it happened in the early hours of the morning when they were probably asleep.

We have had very little information about this case but we understand it is part of an ongoing Police Investigation. Reports we have seen state that the driver ran away from the scene and we are not aware of the driver being apprehended yet. As a result of the driver decamping we suspect that this incident was a result of some kind of driver error rather than a specific fault on the highway but if the Police investigation suggests that any highway improvements are required we will look into them.

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

26TH FEBRUARY 2018

QUESTIONS FOR WRITTEN REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

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

What steps are being taken to encourage the use of modular home construction to meet housing demand?

Reply:

The Council is actively seeking to encourage the use of modular constructed homes to meet housing need. In January 2018 the Executive approved, subject to full consultation and planning permission, the use of the site at York Rise for the provision of modular constructed homes. The report approved to proceed to formal tender for the provision and management of modular homes for the York Rise site and on a preferred supplier basis for any subsequent sites identified. This report further requested that officers look to identify any other potentially suitable sites for the provision of modular constructed homes to meet housing needs.

2. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder

If he will make a statement on the implications for Bromley parents and young people of the proposals outlined in the Secretary of State for Education's interview in the Sunday Times of 18th February and in particular the abolition of the 50% cap on admission to Church schools, the creation of new Grammar Schools and the opportunities for non-university technical education?

Reply:

Like Cllr Bennett, I read with interest the report of the interview with the Secretary of State. I welcome the emphasis the Government is placing on technical education. Parity of esteem between technical and academic pathways has been much talked about but, until recently, little has been achieved. To that end, Bromley Council welcomes the proposed Shaw Futures Academy which will offer a technical education and widen the choice of secondary education for Bromley children and their parents.

Of course, our secondary school offer in Bromley is enriched by our grammar schools, St Olave's and Newstead Wood Schools. It is entirely fair that, as the Sec of State suggests, selective schools should have the same options and opportunities to develop and expand as every other school. I would like to take this opportunity to applaud the commitment of Newstead Wood School to working with their neighbouring primary schools to help raise the ambitions of our children.

Equally, I welcome the renewed commitment of the Secretary of State to lifting the 50% cap on faith admissions in new schools and we have re-opened discussion with the Roman Catholic Diocese about the opportunities this may create in Bromley.

I have written to the Secretary of State to congratulate him on his appointment and to invite him to visit our schools in Bromley, of which we are justifiably proud.

3. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Environment Portfolio Holder

On what dates and times Parking Enforcement Officers have been in Corkscrew Hill, Courtfield Rise and Addington Road West Wickham, on the occasion of sporting fixtures at Sparrows Den in the past year and how many tickets have been issued for parking contraventions on each occasion?

Reply:

The number of penalty charges issued against sporting days (Saturday or Sunday) for each location from 01.01.2017 and 31.12.2017, (last calendar year) is:

Location	No of penalty charges issued	No issued on sporting days (Saturday or Sunday)
Corkscrew Hill	14	14
Courtfield Rise	2	1
Addington Road	30	30

Support Statistics:

Location	Dates of patrols	No of PCNs and date of issue	Reason for PCN issue
Corkscrew Hill	01.10.17	1 at 11:24 and 1 at 11:28 and 1 at 11:30	Parked on the footway
Corkscrew Hill	29.10.17	10 between 13:26 and 13:46	Parked on the footway
Corkscrew Hill	19.11.17	1 at 11:31	Parked on the footway
Corkscrew Hill	10.02.18	1 at 13:36 and 1 at 13:37	Parked on the footway

Location	Dates of patrols	No of PCNs and date of issue	Reason for PCN issue
Courtfield Rise	04.04.17	1 at 12:02	Parked on the footway
Courtfield Rise	29.10.17	1 at 13:54	Parked on a double yellow line

Location	Dates of patrols	No of PCNs and date of issue	Reason for PCN issue
Addington Road	12.03.17	19 between 10:38 and 11:08	Parked on the footway
Addington Road	19.03.17	11 between 10:43 and 11:07	Parked on the footway

4. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Environment Portfolio Holder

When will the blocked drains outside 118 Oakfield Rd, Penge be dealt with?

Reply:

Penge was part of the cyclical gully cleansing schedule which commenced in April 2017 last year - and the gully outside 118 Oakfield Road was cleansed on 26/06/2017. However, as there was a potential blockage, as highlighted by Cllr Fookes' in his question above, Neighbourhood Management arranged for the location to be visited early on Friday the 23rd February and for all gullies in the road to be assessed and cleansed as necessary, and Neighbourhood Management can confirm that the gully outside 118 Oakfield Road was free flowing with no issues.

5. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Environment Portfolio Holder

When will door to door textile recycling begin in Bromley?

Reply:

Following a Policy Development report to the Environment PDS, door to door textile recycling has been considered, but it was found to be economically unviable. We provide textile recycling bins at the majority of our bring sites and at our waste and recycling centres.

6. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Resources Portfolio Holder

How many people in Bromley missed out on voting at the 2017 General Election because they did not register in time?

Reply:

I find this rather a strange question as of course as the law has made it clear for many decades that it is an Individual's responsibility to ensure that they register to vote.

The Labour government paved the way for the current system of Individual electoral registration in the Political Parties and Elections act 2009 – which was designed to achieve more accurate electoral registers and to counter electoral fraud – although individual voter registration was finally introduced by the coalition government through the Electoral Reform and Administration Act 2013.

The legislation has a cut off point for registration 12 days before an election. This is a statutory time limit and local authorities are unable to extend it and modern electoral law has always included a comparable provision.

Having said that at Bromley we do everything we can to encourage residents to register and exercise their vote including undertaking the Annual Canvass which involves sending multiple forms and undertaking personal visits to non-responding properties, along with a poster and leaflet campaign through the Borough. Bromley also identifies and contacts those properties where a change in residency may have occurred, such as new Council tax payers, to encourage any new residents to register to vote.

This works as Bromley has consistently been in the top 3 councils for Household Enquiry Form responses which means we have one of the most accurate registers in London

We increase publicity around election time and this works as in the period between the general election being called and the statutory cut-off date we registered 8875 new voters on the register.

We do monitor instances where residents attend polling stations to vote and are unable to do so because they have not ensured they have registered and at the general election 93 individuals out of a polling station electorate of 192,255 (total electorate was 232,436) had not registered to vote.

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

The meeting of the Executive held on February 7th was asked numerous questions by members of the public and an unusually high number of people had made the effort to attend the meeting. As Chair of the Executive, you have it within your power to extend the allocated time for public questions. Given that the meeting did not have a long agenda and ended shortly after 8pm why did you not show respect to Bromley residents and extend the time allowed in order that more questions and responses could be heard?

Reply:

There were indeed numerous questions, but the Council's Constitution allocates 15 minutes for public questions, and this is what was allowed on 7th February.

To that end it is something of a shame that Political Activists from opposition parties choose to pre fill the available slots to pose their wares for self-serving purposes on such occasions, thereby denying others the chance to do so themselves.

You appear to have overlooked the fact that I specifically permitted supplementary questions to be asked to the unanswered oral questions too, which was the first time that offer has ever been made in my 16 years on the Council, such was my alleged "disrespect"

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

A meeting of Constitution Improvement Working Party is overdue. Council passed a resolution in September 2017 requesting a report on improving transparency. There is also the option of making the Contracts Sub Committee into a main Committee. When will a meeting be held to discuss these matters?

Reply:

As you are aware, a meeting of the Constitution Improvement Working Group has been set up for next month.

9. From Cllr Richard Williams to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Can the Portfolio Holder say how many care leavers under the age of 25 have been in arrears for council tax for each of the last 3 financial years?

Reply:

The Authority's council tax database does not indicate the accounts that relate to care leavers, I am therefore unable to advise as to the number that have been in arrears over the past 3 years.

Furthermore, Bromley would be unaware of any care leavers residing outside of the borough who may have council tax arrears.

10. From Cllr Richard Williams to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Can the Portfolio Holder say how many care leavers under the age of 25 in arrears for council tax at any point in the last 3 financial years have had enforcement action taken against them, including how many have had court action taken against them?

Reply:

As advised in my response to the previous question, this information is unable to be obtained from the Authority's council tax database. Bromley would also be unaware of enforcement action taken by other local authorities in respect of sums owing to them.

However, where the Council Tax Section is made aware of enforcement action being taken against a care leaver, consideration would be given to assisting the individual through the discretionary hardship fund, budgeting assistance and/or a sympathetic payment plan.

11. From Cllr Richard Williams to the Resources Portfolio Holder

What would be the actual cost for 2017/18 and the projected cost for 2018/19 of introducing council tax exemption for our care leavers up to the age of 25, taking account any current discounts they may be eligible to? What percentage of the (i) Children's Services budget and (ii) council's budget would they represent?

Reply:

It is not possible from our records to identify the cost of providing council tax exemption for care leavers up to the age of 25 taking into account any current discounts to which they may be entitled. However, below are figures based on the following assumptions:

- all 195 care leavers reside in the borough;
- they all have a council tax liability;
- they receive no other discounts;
- they all live in a band "D" council tax property; and
- there are no care leavers from other local authorities resident in Bromley

On the basis of these assumptions, the potential annual cost for 2017/18 of providing assistance would be £217,706 (after deducting the GLA contribution). This figure would increase to £226,392 in respect of 2018/19.

For 2017/18 this represents 0.66% of the Children's Services budget and 0.15% of the council's budget (Council Tax Requirement budget). For 2018/19 this represents 0.66% of the Children's Services draft budget and 0.15% of the council's draft budget (Council Tax Requirement budget.)

12. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Please provide the number of "Fix My Street" records raised during calendar year 2017 broken down by Ward and subject. Please also provide the percentage completed within the SLA also broken down by Ward and subject.

Reply:

Please see attached data for the calendar year 2017 for FMS reports by ward and subject (Appendix 1.)

We do not have SLA info for wards and subjects but we have included the average time for enquiries to be resolved.

Caveat being there is no set SLA against a subject as issues are diverse and can be complex but we do monitor SLA against enquiry status to ensure that through any enquiry lifespan it is being managed and not forgotten. This SLA covers all enquiries not just FMS and for 2017 for Environmental Services was 96.66%

13. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Environment Portfolio Holder

The 2017/18 budget contained a proposal to set aside an earmarked reserve of £500k for Environmental Initiatives. Please provide a schedule of what this was spent on showing how much was spent on each initiative and in which ward.

Reply:

(See appendix 2.)

14. From Cllr Russell Mellor to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Can the Portfolio Holder advise me as to the sum of the Contingency Reserve as at the commencement of the current financial year, the number of drawdowns during the year, the value of each drawdown together with details and purpose of the drawdowns with final sum as at the date 26 February 2018.

Reply:

Details of the original 2017/18 Central Contingency and the drawdowns allocated during the year are shown in the table below (appendix 3). The drawdowns were approved by Executive or Council or by Portfolio Holders following consideration by the relevant PDS Committees. The detail and purpose of the drawdowns is included in individual reports to those Committees on the dates shown below. There will be further changes to the Central Contingency in the 2017/18 Budget Monitoring report to Executive on 28th March 2018.

15. From Cllr Russell Mellor to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Can the Portfolio Holder advise me within his remit of Contracts, as to the number of Contracts awarded to the Keir Group, or their subsidiaries, and the value of each contract together with the total number of tender invitations submitted during a 4 year period ending on the 26th February 2018.

Reply:

Three contract records have been identified within the specified four year period as being awarded to Kier Group – only one of which is currently active.

Street Environment (Lot 1 - Street Cleansing)

The contract, which runs from 29 March 2012 to 28 March 2019, forms part of the Street Environment Contract (originally let as four lots). It deals with day-to-day routine street cleaning activities and response to service requests incorporating operations such as mechanical and manual sweeping, fly-tipping and fly-poster removal, emptying and replacing street litter bins, weed control, autumn leafing and, in the event of severe winter weather, snow clearance and pavement salting. The value of this contract is £22,476,552.

Street Lighting Maintenance and Improvement Services Contract

The contract (which commenced 1 April 2013) was due to expire 31 March 2023. This contract was for improvements and maintenance of the Borough's lighting stock including street lighting columns, and both lit and unlit signs and bollards and nameplates. However, service issues led to a 'walk away' agreement between LB Bromley and Kier Services Ltd, with the contract becoming dormant on 30 April 2017. The Major Highways contract (with FM Conway Ltd) has been varied to include provision for this service from 1 May 2017 to 31 July 2018. The value of the Street Lighting contract with Kier was £11,887,000.

Street Environment (Lot 3 – Public Convenience Cleansing)

There was a contract with Kier for servicing Public Conveniences, which was let as a five year contract from 29 March 2012 to 28 March 2017. A full Council decision was made on 28th February 2011 to agree closure of public conveniences as part of the Council's savings proposals. A phased closure of the Borough's facilities took place, including town centre conveniences, and was completed by 31st March 2015. This was in conjunction with the expansion of the Council's Community Toilet Scheme as an alternative provision. The value of this contract was £281,983.

This page is left intentionally blank

WARD AND SUBJECT	NUMBER OF REPORTS	AVERAGE TIME TO RESOLVE
BICKLEY	697	14
ABANDONED VEHICLES	79	10
DRAINAGE	8	30
ENFORCEMENT	44	15
GRAFFITI	26	5
HIGHWAYS	124	18
NETWORK MAN	1	72
PARKS	33	11
STREET CLEANSING	215	7
STREET LIGHTING	100	18
STREETWORKS	3	4
TREES	64	32
BIGGIN HILL	669	19
ABANDONED VEHICLES	52	18
DRAINAGE	15	17
ENFORCEMENT	65	40
GRAFFITI	17	5
HIGHWAYS	126	21
NETWORK MAN	2	26
PARKS	52	22
STREET CLEANSING	198	9
STREET LIGHTING	108	24
STREETWORKS	2	6
TREES	32	23
BROMLEY COMMON & KESTON	1420	12
ABANDONED VEHICLES	79	17
DRAINAGE	21	14
ENFORCEMENT	57	14
GRAFFITI	26	3
HIGHWAYS	161	22
NETWORK MAN	2	14
PARKS	149	13
STREET CLEANSING	702	5
STREET LIGHTING	155	18
STREETWORKS	2	3
TREES	66	35
BROMLEY TOWN	1616	14
ABANDONED VEHICLES	89	23
DRAINAGE	37	34
ENFORCEMENT	99	16
GRAFFITI	140	5
HIGHWAYS	268	19
NETWORK MAN	1	28
PARKS	61	13
STREET CLEANSING	694	8
STREET LIGHTING	149	25
STREETWORKS	2	16
TREES	76	28
CHELSEFIELD & PRATTS BOTTOM	914	19

Appendix 1: Council Question 12 from Cllr Dunn (Members written)

ABANDONED VEHICLES	88	21
DRAINAGE	13	32
ENFORCEMENT	83	21
GRAFFITI	17	7
HIGHWAYS	132	27
NETWORK MAN	1	106
PARKS	61	14
STREET CLEANSING	317	11
STREET LIGHTING	125	27
STREETWORKS	3	14
TREES	74	26
CHISLEHURST	1126	18
ABANDONED VEHICLES	95	12
DRAINAGE	18	16
ENFORCEMENT	91	24
GRAFFITI	34	9
HIGHWAYS	273	24
PARKS	53	16
STREET CLEANSING	378	13
STREET LIGHTING	135	17
STREETWORKS	1	37
TREES	48	36
CLOCK HOUSE	1014	12
ABANDONED VEHICLES	67	18
DRAINAGE	19	14
ENFORCEMENT	43	16
GRAFFITI	41	6
HIGHWAYS	124	16
PARKS	20	17
STREET CLEANSING	548	7
STREET LIGHTING	66	21
STREETWORKS	1	11
TREES	85	23
COPERS COPE	862	16
ABANDONED VEHICLES	92	25
DRAINAGE	18	17
ENFORCEMENT	61	18
GRAFFITI	33	6
HIGHWAYS	95	19
PARKS	30	13
STREET CLEANSING	403	9
STREET LIGHTING	67	24
STREETWORKS	4	25
TREES	59	38
CRAY VALLEY EAST	1402	12
ABANDONED VEHICLES	112	29
DRAINAGE	19	17
ENFORCEMENT	68	19
GRAFFITI	21	4
HIGHWAYS	136	19

Appendix 1: Council Question 12 from Cllr Dunn (Members written)

PARKS	122	16
STREET CLEANSING	779	6
STREET LIGHTING	83	19
STREETWORKS	13	14
TREES	49	21
CRAY VALLEY WEST	1034	14
ABANDONED VEHICLES	83	22
DRAINAGE	9	19
ENFORCEMENT	72	17
GRAFFITI	24	7
HIGHWAYS	127	26
PARKS	65	16
STREET CLEANSING	487	6
STREET LIGHTING	125	19
STREETWORKS	3	10
TREES	39	37
CRYSTAL PALACE	1168	13
ABANDONED VEHICLES	84	24
DRAINAGE	10	17
ENFORCEMENT	42	11
GRAFFITI	171	5
HIGHWAYS	69	26
PARKS	111	16
STREET CLEANSING	598	9
STREET LIGHTING	44	26
STREETWORKS	1	9
TREES	38	44
DARWIN	534	20
ABANDONED VEHICLES	27	35
DRAINAGE	5	61
ENFORCEMENT	30	35
GRAFFITI	6	6
HIGHWAYS	141	25
PARKS	47	15
STREET CLEANSING	207	9
STREET LIGHTING	47	31
STREETWORKS	4	10
TREES	20	33
FARNBOROUGH & CROFTON	776	17
ABANDONED VEHICLES	48	30
DRAINAGE	19	16
ENFORCEMENT	69	18
GRAFFITI	18	12
HIGHWAYS	181	17
NETWORK MAN	1	5
PARKS	78	13
STREET CLEANSING	172	8
STREET LIGHTING	115	20
TREES	75	32
HAYES & CONEY HALL	1043	16

Appendix 1: Council Question 12 from Cllr Dunn (Members written)

ABANDONED VEHICLES	53	18
DRAINAGE	16	19
ENFORCEMENT	66	11
GRAFFITI	15	3
HIGHWAYS	198	27
NETWORK MAN	1	11
PARKS	122	13
STREET CLEANSING	345	8
STREET LIGHTING	121	17
STREETWORKS	1	2
TREES	105	30
KELSEY & EDEN PARK	981	15
ABANDONED VEHICLES	79	21
DRAINAGE	18	33
ENFORCEMENT	78	10
GRAFFITI	46	3
HIGHWAYS	131	20
PARKS	37	11
STREET CLEANSING	437	9
STREET LIGHTING	74	25
STREETWORKS	2	29
TREES	79	36
MOTTINGHAM & CHISLEHURST NORTH	370	14
ABANDONED VEHICLES	50	10
DRAINAGE	4	8
ENFORCEMENT	20	10
GRAFFITI	9	4
HIGHWAYS	33	21
PARKS	19	9
STREET CLEANSING	178	12
STREET LIGHTING	34	19
TREES	23	36
ORPINGTON	862	13
ABANDONED VEHICLES	87	16
DRAINAGE	24	31
ENFORCEMENT	57	17
GRAFFITI	59	3
HIGHWAYS	100	22
NETWORK MAN	2	18
PARKS	76	10
STREET CLEANSING	301	6
STREET LIGHTING	109	21
STREETWORKS	6	8
TREES	41	22
PENGE & CATOR	1555	14
ABANDONED VEHICLES	115	20
DRAINAGE	26	35
ENFORCEMENT	62	12
GRAFFITI	59	6
HIGHWAYS	102	26

Appendix 1: Council Question 12 from Cllr Dunn (Members written)

PARKS	70	16
STREET CLEANSING	965	8
STREET LIGHTING	56	17
TREES	100	41
PETTS WOOD & KNOLL	806	16
ABANDONED VEHICLES	47	23
DRAINAGE	16	16
ENFORCEMENT	57	13
GRAFFITI	36	4
HIGHWAYS	184	23
NETWORK MAN	1	55
PARKS	31	13
STREET CLEANSING	228	9
STREET LIGHTING	153	15
STREETWORKS	2	16
TREES	51	33
PLAISTOW & SUNDRIDGE	669	14
ABANDONED VEHICLES	94	16
DRAINAGE	11	20
ENFORCEMENT	42	17
GRAFFITI	10	6
HIGHWAYS	94	22
PARKS	9	5
STREET CLEANSING	315	7
STREET LIGHTING	43	26
STREETWORKS	2	16
TREES	49	26
SHORTLANDS	519	14
ABANDONED VEHICLES	29	12
DRAINAGE	14	11
ENFORCEMENT	41	19
GRAFFITI	9	2
HIGHWAYS	109	21
PARKS	14	10
STREET CLEANSING	216	6
STREET LIGHTING	44	21
STREETWORKS	2	4
TREES	41	34
WEST WICKHAM	763	19
ABANDONED VEHICLES	70	18
DRAINAGE	27	17
ENFORCEMENT	64	16
GRAFFITI	15	17
HIGHWAYS	149	24
PARKS	43	23
STREET CLEANSING	225	8
STREET LIGHTING	83	24
STREETWORKS	4	7
TREES	83	34
Grand Total	20800	15

Appendix 2: Council question 13 from Cllr Dunn

Members' Initiatives 2017/18

	Portfolio	Original Allocation	Balance as at 01.04.17	2017/18 spend to date	Commitments	Uncommitted balance 17/18
		£	£	£	£	£
1	Fly-tipping Scheme	250,000	250,000	30,583	4,794	214,624
2	Mottingham targeted Action Neighbourhood Pilot Project	150,000	106,237	0	5,000	101,237
3						
*	Tree Planting Parks and Highways	250,000	59,768	32,733	26,839	196
6	Friends Groups	250,000	247,500	6,185	56,448	184,867
7	Environmental Initiatives	500,000				
	- Behavioural change regarding recycling		125,000	0	0	125,000
	- Leafing		125,000	0	0	125,000
	- Street Cleasing Enhancement		125,000	0	30,000	95,000
	- Litter bins - emptying of and new ones		125,000	0	0	125,000
	- School Crossing			0	36,000	-36,000
		1,400,000	1,163,505	69,501	159,081	934,924

2017/18 Central Contingency	£'000	Committee	Report Title
Original Contingency Provision	14,957		
Items Carried Forward from 2016/17	447		
Total Contingency Provision	15,404		
2017/18 Drawdowns			
General:			
Allocation of Contractually Committed Inflation	366	n/a	Director of Finance (Delegated Authority)
National Living Wage	60	Executive 22/03/17	Extra Care Housing Contract Award
National Living Wage	852	Executive 06/06/17	Impact of Changes in National Living Wage
Increased Cost of Homelessness / Impact of Welfare Reforms	310	Executive 24/05/17	Homelessness Contingency Drawdown for Early Intervention and Visiting Resources
Increased Cost of Homelessness / Impact of Welfare Reforms	844	Executive 10/01/18	Contingency Drawdown: Homelessness & Temporary Accommodation Pressures
Operational Building Maintenance Programme	125	Executive 22/03/17	Operational Building Maintenance Budgets and Planned Programme 2017/18
SEN Assessments - Transfer to ECHP Plans	115	Executive 19/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18
Library Service - One Off Funding	1,257	Executive 19/07/17	Contract Award for the Provision of Library Services
TFM Contract	100	Executive 23/03/16	Gateway Report Commissioning - Proposed Total Facilities Management Contract
Additional Resources for Environment & Community Services	238	Executive 09/08/17	Additional Resources for Environment & Community Services
IT Mobilisation	62	Executive 09/08/17	Transfer of Remaining ISD Service to BT
Waste4Fuel	47	Executive 19/07/17	Waste Clearance - Cornwall Drive
General Data Protections Regs 2016	495	Executive 06/12/17	The General Data Protection Regulations 2016
Impact of NNDR Revaluation	559	Executive 06/12/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18
Contribution to Investment Fund	3,500	Council 11/12/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18
	8,930		
Grant Related Expenditure:			
SEND Implementation Grant	225	Executive 24/05/17	Drawdown and Carry Forward of Contingency Government (New Burdens) Grant Funding - SEN Reforms
Tackling Troubled Families	201	Executive 07/11/17	Update on Tackling Troubled Families Project - Update on Outcomes
Adult Social Care (IBCF)	4,184	Executive 10/10/17	Improved Better Care Fund (IBCF)
SEN Pathfinder	27	Executive 24/05/17	Drawdown and Carry Forward of Contingency Government (New Burdens) Grant Funding - SEN Reforms
Step Up to Social Work	915	Executive 20/06/17	Release of Government Funding - Step up to Social Work Programme
Flexible Homelessness Support / Homelessness Reduction / IT Upgrade	2,371	Executive 10/01/18	Contingency Drawdown: Homelessness & Temporary Accommodation Pressures
Funded by Grant Income	Cr 7,923		
	0		

2017/18 Central Contingency (cont'd)	£'000	Committee	Report Title
Draw Down of Items Carried Forward from 2016/17			
General:			
Audit - Additional Investigation Works	40	E & R PDS 13/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18 - Drawdown of Carry Forwards from Central Contingency
Debt Management System	25	E & R PDS 13/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18 - Drawdown of Carry Forwards from Central Contingency
Contracts Register /Summaries Database	50	E & R PDS 13/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18 - Drawdown of Carry Forwards from Central Contingency
Biggin Hill Airport - Noise Action Plan	44	E & R PDS 13/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18 - Drawdown of Carry Forwards from Central Contingency
Legal Counsel Costs	50	E & R PDS 13/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18 - Drawdown of Carry Forwards from Central Contingency
Green Garden Waste - Debt Management System	120	Env PDS 12/07/17	Provisional Outturn 2016/17
Local Plan Implementation	37	R & R PDS 05/07/17	Provisional Outturn 2016/17
	<u>366</u>		
Grant Related Expenditure:			
Better Care Fund	185	CS PDS 04/07/17	Care Services Portfolio Budget Monitoring 2017/18
Helping People Home	40	CS PDS 14/11/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18
Preventing Homelessness	152	CS PDS 04/07/17	Care Services Portfolio Budget Monitoring 2017/18
Fire Safety	57	CS PDS 04/07/17	Care Services Portfolio Budget Monitoring 2017/18
Community Housing Fund	62	CS PDS 04/07/17	Care Services Portfolio Budget Monitoring 2017/18
Implementing Welfare Reform Changes	56	CS PDS 04/07/17	Care Services Portfolio Budget Monitoring 2017/18
New Homes Bonus - TCM and Regeneration	329	R & R PDS 05/07/17	Provisional Outturn 2016/17
Planning Strategy & Projects	30	R & R PDS 05/07/17	Provisional Outturn 2016/17
Electoral Services - Cabinet Office Funding (IER)	47	E & R PDS 13/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18 - Drawdown of Carry Forwards from Central Contingency
Debt Management System Project	99	E & R PDS 13/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18 - Drawdown of Carry Forwards from Central Contingency
SEN Reform	21	Executive 24/05/17	Drawdown and Carry Forward of Contingency Government (New Burdens) Grant Funding - SEN Reforms
SEN Pathfinder	14	EC&F Sub 18/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18
Early Years	15	EC&F Sub 18/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18
LA Conversion Academies Sponsor Support	28	EC&F Sub 18/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18
High Needs Strategic Planning Fund	140	EC&F Sub 18/07/17	Budget Monitoring 2017/18
Tackling Troubled Families Funded by Grant Income	595	Executive 07/11/17	Update on Tackling Troubled Families Project - Update on Outcomes
	<u>Cr 1,870</u>		
	<u>0</u>		
Balance in 2017/18 Contingency	6,108		