



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Graham Walton  
[graham.walton@bromley.gov.uk](mailto:graham.walton@bromley.gov.uk)

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7743

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 27 February 2023

## COUNCIL

**Monday 27 February 2023**

### **4 QUESTIONS** (Pages 3 - 32)

The questions submitted for this meeting and the replies given are attached in the following appendices -

Appendix A - Questions from members of the public for oral reply.

Appendix B - Questions from members of the public for written reply.

Appendix C - Questions from members of the Council for oral reply.

Appendix D - Questions from members of the Council for written reply.

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

This page is left intentionally blank

**Council**

**27 February 2023**

**Questions from Members of the Public for Oral Reply**

**1. From Thomas Murphy to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee**

What specific steps are the Council taking to raise awareness of the new voter ID laws for elections? And would it be possible to have a page on Bromley Council's website outlining the new requirements, with a link to the Voter Authority Certificate application page on gov.uk?

**Reply:**

As there are no scheduled elections in Bromley this year (our next scheduled elections are the GLA elections on 2 May 2024), we are taking a 'soft touch' approach to raise awareness of the new Voter ID requirements.

We are in the process of creating new pages on the Council website outlining the new provisions of the Elections Act 2022 (including the requirement to produce photographic ID at polling stations). This will include a link to the Voter Authority Certificate application page on the new Government online service.

In the meantime, the Electoral Commission launched its public awareness campaign in January 2023 across England (not just in election areas) to ensure voters understand the changes. This includes adverts on national television and radio.

Next year here in Bromley we will undertake an extensive and targeted local awareness raising campaign – this will include updating the Council website, distributing posters and leaflets in prime locations and to local community organisations, using social media (Facebook and Twitter) and issuing timely local press releases.

In addition to these awareness activities, details of the new voter ID requirements will also be included on the poll cards which will be sent to every (eligible) voter in Bromley towards the end of March next year.

**2. From Susan Moore to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee**

The Council will be aware that the new voter ID laws will disproportionately affect young people and ethnic minority voters, who are less likely to have photo ID, what steps are the Council taking to ensure that these specific groups are not disenfranchised during elections?

**Reply:**

Where an individual does not have one of the accepted forms of photographic ID, they can apply for free for a Voter Authority Certificate from Bromley or their local authority.

We are in the process of creating new pages on the Council website outlining the new provisions of the Elections Act 2022 which I referred to in the previous reply, and this will include the requirement to produce photographic ID at a polling station. This will include a link to the Voter Authority Certificate application page on the new Government online service.

We here in Bromley will be undertaking an Equalities Impact Screening and full Assessment on the new measures being introduced through the Elections Act 2022 (including Voter ID) and the impact on any group of voters with one of the nine protected characteristics. This should ensure that any barriers to participation are identified (and where possible, removed) and voters are not disenfranchised or put off voting, whilst ensuring the effective implementation of the changes and maintaining the integrity of the elections.

Bromley was one of five local authorities along with Gosport, Swindon, Watford and Woking selected by the Cabinet Office to conduct Voter ID pilots at the Local elections on 3 May 2018. Following the election, both the Returning Officer's findings and the Electoral Commissions' evaluation indicated that there was no evidence any specific group of people who struggled with the ID requirement or that ID requirements significantly deterred voters from voting.

**Supplementary Question:**

Some other local councils have done calculations on how long it will take to put together all the resources and the time and capacity it will take to produce the ID that people will need. Have Bromley started to do any calculations or started to think about the amount of work and person hours that it will take to deliver ID for people who currently don't have it?

**Reply:**

I don't specifically know the answer to your question but I have every confidence in Carol Ling who is responsible for this part of the Council, and her team, to ensure that this will happen. If you have any further queries or would like some further information I will be happy to email Mrs Ling tomorrow.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Fawthrop:**

Is Cllr Tunnicliffe aware that during the trials that took place in 2018 the turnout was not affected at all by Voter ID, and one of the most remarkable things was that more people spoilt their ballot papers than were turned away and deprived of a vote?

**Reply:**

Yes, I am aware of that and there were very few issues, a matter of a handful. Those voters returned and voted, as far as I am aware.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Graeme Casey:**

Are we aware of how many incidences of voter fraud we have had in Bromley previously, just in the local elections?

**Reply:**

I cannot answer that specifically this evening, but I am happy to come back to you with an answer.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:**

Is Cllr Tunncliffe aware of any incidence of voter fraud in the London Borough of Bromley?

**Reply:**

I am not.

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

Please provide full details of consultations that the Council has undertaken with BVST (as leaseholder), and with other tenants or organisations who currently rent office or other space in Community House, regarding the sale of this building.

**Reply:**

I am advised that the Assistant Director for Integrated Commissioning discussed the plans with two of the key service providers located there on the 29<sup>th</sup> November and 8<sup>th</sup> December.

The Chief Executive and I met with BVST's Chief Executive on 19<sup>th</sup> January and I am advised that conversations remain ongoing.

**Supplementary Question:**

The decision in principle to sell this building was made in December – on the basis of that I would like to ask if it would have been better if Members had been aware that the tenants in Community House do not wish to move to the Direct Line premises. Would it not have been better to have an informed decision made by this Council – Councillors would have been aware in advance, had there been consultation, that the tenants were not prepared to move.

**Reply:**

We had two informed debates, one at the Executive and one at full Council. Members were fully aware of the decision that was being taken and I would remind all concerned that it is not as if the charities that are based there will not have a home – they will stay there as protected tenants if they wish to, even if and when the building is sold. They have a two and a half year protection over the fact that they are trying to turn it into an asset of community value which we wish them the best of luck over. That featured in the conversation with the Chief Executive and I. So, no, apart from the fact that the process was speedy it formed part of the operational

property review – it was a decision taken around many Council properties. Ultimately, as I told the last full Council anyone that wants to move to better, more modern offices will be very welcome if they wish to, but there is no compulsion

#### **4. From Richard Honess to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

What is the criteria for a pothole to be fixed on a residential street?

**Reply:**

A defect measuring 40mm is the level at which we repair, but in the case of, say, a pedestrian crossing, we look at a lower one for pedestrian safety.

**Supplementary Question:**

I have been monitoring a street in my area in St Mary Cray called Elizabeth Way, which has been suffering severe deterioration of the road surface for a while - I think my first report was in July 2021. I have subsequently re-reported that particular street on numerous occasions – at least three or four times since then as the road surface has deteriorated – on Fix My Street. Every time I report it I get the reply that the deterioration does not meet the criteria for fixing. I looked at it today and it certainly has met that criteria on a number of occasions when I have been told it did not. I have also heard rumours that there are plans for that street to be resurfaced – can you confirm whether that street is due for resurfacing and if not, if I put another report on will it be fixed?

**Reply:**

I understand from your ward member that it is on the list. There are thirteen teams out repairing streets – they are doing about seventy a day. This is not quite the time to do most of them because once we get to April and the weather improves the repairs will stay in place. We do have 537 miles of road in Bromley – we are the biggest London Borough, and that would stretch from here to Zurich. It does take some time – this is a national, and an international problem – but I can reassure you that your road is one of the thirty four planned for resurfacing in the coming financial year.

#### **5. From Ju Owens to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement**

Could you please outline how much the Council have spent in the past four years, and on what, funding actions to make Bromley streets safer for women?

**Reply:**

There are a wide range of actions either fully or part-funded by the authority such as our CCTV network and street lighting. Regarding specific projects to make Bromley's streets safer for women, this spend is spread over several service areas and is mainly officer time spent working with partners. Therefore there is no specific budget but it is estimated at about £100,000. Such projects include the Licensing Team

carrying out anti-drink spiking publicity, and publicising Ask Angela and the Community Safety Officers working with churches and Street Pastors and encouraging licensed premises to sign up to the Night Safety Charter.

**Supplementary Question:**

Can you advise whether these measures have been successful and how such success has been measured?

**Reply:**

When we do put in for funding from the Mayor's Office or elsewhere we do not have much feedback because we are considered to have a very safe borough.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:**

Is that £100,00 per year or over four years?

**Reply:**

That is per year.

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

In deciding to put Community House up for sale immediately, what is the Council most interested in:

- a. Obtaining the maximum capital receipt; or
- b. Finding tenants to subsidise the costs of running its new, very large Council offices; or
- c. Ensuring that the social, health, economic and community benefits that are the outputs from Community House can continue and thereby support local residents.

**Reply:**

The answer is A and C in equal measure.

The Council will not be able to continue funding 'C' to the extent we would all prefer to see and do so in future, unless it takes numerous very difficult decisions such as 'A'. Both are inextricably linked.

Thus the decision to do so in December.

**Supplementary Question:**

Given that the decision to sell was made in the context of an assumption that the tenants would move, and given that Cllr Smith has just confirmed that obtaining the maximum capital receipt is one of the priorities of the Council, can he explain why the decision has been made in such a hurry to sell this property with sitting tenants?

**Reply:**

It achieves best value, it helps us to achieve capital income which we need for other projects such as housing. It is an investment property and we deem it the correct

thing to do to sell it now. It is not as if the current tenants are going to be homeless. All that will happen, if and when it is sold, is that it will have different landlords and protected tenancy under the Tenancy Act.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Ms Wilkins:**

My point was that the property is being sold with sitting tenants, which in general lowers the value, so I do not believe my question was properly answered.

**Reply:**

I believe it was clear – I am happy with the answer given.

**7. From Richard Honess to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces**

18 months ago, I asked a question about the upkeep of the Rookery Gardens Estate and was assured by the then RRH Portfolio Holder that the matter would be discussed and actioned. What discussions and actions have subsequently taken place?

**Reply:**

I'm pleased to say that we've taken action since your question in October 2021.

We have reviewed the ownership records to establish the green spaces that we own and officers have made several monitoring visits over and above what is normal for the Council's contract monitoring to ensure our land is being maintained.

Officers continue to work with the housing association that owns the estate, Clarion, to come up with a solution for maintenance on their land.

We are absolutely clear that when it comes to bulky waste for example, that is the responsibility of Clarion and as a responsible social landlord they should accept that responsibility.

**Supplementary Question:**

Yes, it is the bulk waste collection that continues to plague that estate with overflowing rubbish bins and bins that are not big enough. Do you know how long it will take Clarion to resolve these issues and what it is that they are planning to do?

**Reply:**

I cannot answer that today but if you do write to me I will take that up with some of the senior leadership team at Clarion.

**8. From Ju Owens to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement**

When launching their £200 million fund for active travel schemes (<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/200-million-to-improve-walking-and-cycling-routes-and-boost-local-economies>) the Government acknowledged that 1 in 2



women feel unsafe walking after dark in a quiet street near their home, and that all proposals must take this into account. How much of the fund will Bromley Council be applying for and how will you be ensuring women's safety is considered?

**Reply:**

This fund is only provided to local transport authorities outside of London, so unfortunately Bromley is not eligible for it.

**Supplementary Question:**

What plans do you have to both increase active travel in the area of Bromley while taking women's safety into consideration?

**Reply:**

Active travel does not come under my portfolio, but on anything concerning women's safety we will be working cross-portfolio - my fellow portfolio holder is agreeing.

This page is left intentionally blank

**Council**

**27 February 2023**

**Questions from Members of the Public for Written Reply**

**1. From Carrie Heitmeyer to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

How much money has Bromley Council already spent challenging ULEZ expansion, how much will Bromley Council be eligible to pay when it loses its proposed legal action, and how can this be justified when the Council has recently claimed “a budget gap of £29.6million is predicted in three years’ time”?

**Reply:**

The Council has not yet paid any money in seeking legal advice and seeking a Judicial Review. Any legal costs which are incurred, will be shared with the four other authorities joined in the application.

**2. From Laura Vogel to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

On 13 January Bromley Council published a statement in which the Leader claimed ULEZ is “cynical”. How is this statement in keeping with the [Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity](#) which states publicity by local authorities should be “even-handed” and “issued with care during periods of heightened sensitivity”?

**Reply:**

The Council is not in a period of ‘heightened sensitivity’. The quote from Leader of the Council is part of the background as to why the Council, in conjunction with four other local authorities is seeking a Judicial Review of the Mayor of London’s decision. I refer you to Paragraph 20 of the Code.

**3. From Laura Vogel to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

Council Leader Colin Smith has devoted a lot of Council time and resource to campaigning against ULEZ expansion. Does the Council have data on number of Bromley residents affected by ULEZ expansion, and wouldn’t it be better to focus on improving protections for those residents rather than opposing ULEZ?

**Reply:**

The Council and, we believe, the Mayor of London does not hold such information as it would include people working in the borough but whose vehicle is registered to an address in another authority. The Council, which has not received any money for the Principal Road Network from TfL for some years and very little for local schemes believes that if the money to be spent on cameras and signs was reallocated to the boroughs, they could take much more effective action to reduce air pollution.

#### **4. From Gary Kent to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

Please provide details on proposed contract with Alliance Leisure for West Wickham Leisure Centre. Lack of information worries West Wickham residents given the rapidly deteriorating state of repair of this important local facility. Please also provide information on temporary alternative leisure facilities during the redevelopment/refurbishment of the Leisure Centre.

##### **Reply:**

Alliance Leisure Services has been contracted by the London Borough of Bromley to undertake feasibility and survey works for both The Walnuts and West Wickham leisure centres. This work will include: building surveys, high level block plans, research on need, and an extensive consultation process via surveys and focus groups. It is expected that any redevelopment of West Wickham Leisure Centre will be within the existing building envelope. There will be no temporary swimming pool during the works period as it is too costly and would use half the budget available, however, there is the possibility that the operator may be able to offer temporary provision of fitness classes.

#### **5. From Brendan Donegan to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

On 13 January Bromley Council [published a statement](#) claiming the Mayor of London's decision to expand ULEZ is based on "highly questionable, selective and incomplete findings of a research paper commissioned by TfL". Why are the research findings "highly questionable" and do you have any evidence to support your assertions?

##### **Reply:**

The evidence will be part of the Council's legal case and will be published by the court.

#### **6. From Brendan Donegan to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

4,000 Londoners die prematurely due to air pollution every year; in Lewisham, Ella Kissi-Debrah was the first person in the world with air pollution as cause of death. Bromley Council's recent [statement](#) opposing ULEZ expansion claims "Bromley already has amongst the cleanest air in London". Surely this misses the point?

##### **Reply:**

The Council, which has not received any money for the Principal Road Network from TfL for some years and very little for local schemes believes that if the money to be spent on cameras and signs was reallocated to the boroughs, they could take much more effective action to reduce air pollution.

## **7. From Janette Sewell to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety**

Please provide: (a) number of operating HMOs in Bromley that the Council has licensed, (b) number of unlicensed HMOs operating in the borough, (c) number of HMO applications the Council has in progress, listing both applications received before 1 September 2022 and after 1 September separately.

### **Reply:**

- (a) 265
- (b) The Council does not hold this information
- (c) Applications in progress made prior to 01/09/22 = 76,  
Applications in progress made after 01/09/22 = 32

## **8. From Susan Sulis to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

Bromley worked with local landowners to improve an 'Ordinary Watercourse' in Seymour Drive, which had not flooded homes internally. In 2021, 20+ St. Mary Cray homes were flooded internally, when water from Greenbelt farmland owned by a land speculator, overflowed its 'Ordinary Watercourse'. Will Bromley approach the owners to seek improvements?

### **Reply:**

The flooding at Seymour Drive was the result of a severe storm in which the exceeded the capacity of the drainage system. Liability lies with landowners who are responsible for the management Watercourse.

## **9. From Susan Sulis to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee**

The Council's Constitution states that citizens have the right to see non-confidential reports and 'background papers.' When 'background papers', cited as evidence in reports, and relied on to a material extent in preparing reports, are not listed by the report's author, how can citizens enjoy their rights?

### **Reply:**

Background papers are required to be listed in each report (a box is provided in the standard template for this purpose) and should be produced on request. Sometimes there are no background papers, but in most cases there are relevant documents used in preparation of the report which should be listed by the report author, whose contact details are provided on each report. I have asked officers to remind report authors of this requirement.

## **10. From Dermot McKibbin to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

How many households have been rehoused from houses in multiple occupation (hmo's) on the Council's rehousing list, how many of these properties are licensed, what steps does the Council undertake to ensure that rehousing applicants living in hmo's are in fact living in licensed hmo's?

**Reply:**

The Council does not hold this information in a reportable format as it is not part of the statutory returns. However, when an applicant applies for housing support if there are concerns about the status of the property they are currently living in a referral will be made to public protection colleagues for investigation. Any accommodation utilized by the Council would be subject to checks to ensure that the properties meet all required standards including licensing if applicable.

**11. From Dermot McKibbin to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

Please show for all wards in the borough for the 2011 and the 2021 census the number of households renting privately, the number of owner occupiers and the number renting from a housing association. Please show these figures as a percentage of the total households in each ward.

**Reply:**

Please see attached spreadsheets providing data from the census (Appendix 1 – to follow.)

**12. From Richard Gibbons to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

According to Census 2021 there are 135,800 households in LB Bromley. 23% of households do not own or have access to a car or van. Of the remaining 77% of households, how many households do not own or have access to one or more ULEZ-compliant vehicles?

**Reply:**

The Council and, we believe, the Mayor of London does not hold such information as it would include people working in the borough but whose vehicle is registered to an address in another authority.

**13. From Richard Gibbons to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

According to Census 2021 there are 330,000 residents in LB Bromley. 76,600 residents are over 60 years of age and eligible for a 60+/Freedom Pass. How many residents currently have a valid 60+/Freedom Pass?

**Reply:**

No details are held of the number of people with a 60+ Oyster card as these are issued by Transport for London. The number of residents with an Older Person's Freedom Pass is 53,393

# 2011 Census KS402 - Tenure

ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Normis on 31 January 2013]

population  
units      All households  
             Households

## Numbers

Appendix B - Question 11 A

Code	Ward	Total Households	Owned			Shared ownership (part owned and part rented)	Social rented			Private rented			Living rent free
			Total Owned	Owned outright	Owned with a mortgage or loan		Total social rented	Rented from council (Local Authority)	Other	Total Private rented	Private landlord or letting agency	Other	
E05000106	Bickley	5,967	4,787	2,321	2,466	26	417	21	396	681	635	46	56
E05000107	Biggin Hill	3,910	3,438	1,527	1,911	34	180	16	164	224	201	23	34
E05000108	Bromley Common and Keston	6,209	4,543	2,082	2,461	46	975	144	831	587	554	33	58
E05000109	Bromley Town	7,414	4,839	2,039	2,800	71	743	53	690	1,686	1,603	83	75
E05000110	Chislefield and Pratts Bottom	5,830	5,072	2,500	2,572	33	270	36	234	415	370	45	40
E05000111	Chislehurst	6,084	4,863	2,478	2,387	14	433	42	391	694	649	45	80
E05000112	Clock House	6,901	4,659	1,681	2,978	90	867	69	798	1,227	1,160	67	58
E05000113	Copers Cope	8,104	4,954	2,370	2,584	61	748	49	699	2,243	2,125	118	98
E05000114	Cray Valley East	6,693	4,126	1,847	2,279	106	1,653	245	1,408	744	666	78	64
E05000115	Cray Valley West	6,776	3,934	1,715	2,219	100	2,273	308	1,965	413	364	49	56
E05000116	Crystal Palace	6,112	2,129	587	1,542	96	2,029	216	1,813	1,815	1,751	64	43
E05000117	Darwin	2,082	1,726	957	769	17	114	8	106	195	142	53	30
E05000118	Farnborough and Crofton	6,144	5,117	2,903	2,214	15	542	22	520	413	373	40	57
E05000119	Hayes and Coney Hall	6,110	5,393	2,659	2,734	12	189	17	172	474	432	42	42
E05000120	Kelsey and Eden Park	6,382	5,058	2,426	2,632	27	550	50	500	674	633	41	73
E05000121	Mollington and Chislehurst North	4,257	2,356	935	1,421	45	1,359	178	1,181	448	424	24	49
E05000122	Ovington	6,341	4,719	2,597	2,122	74	1,001	130	871	508	462	46	39
E05000123	Penge and Cator	7,672	3,678	1,352	2,326	85	2,289	234	2,055	1,558	1,475	83	62
E05000124	Pettis Wood and Knoll	5,445	4,865	2,575	2,290	8	146	14	132	377	345	32	49
E05000125	Plastow and Sundridge	6,529	4,257	1,841	2,416	46	1,136	113	1,023	1,030	951	79	60
E05000126	Shortlands	4,186	3,314	1,754	1,560	6	261	11	250	567	539	28	38
E05000127	West Wickham	5,714	4,958	2,505	2,453	24	250	11	239	420	375	45	62

## Percentage of All Households

Code	Ward	Total Households	Owned			Shared ownership (part owned and part rented)	Social rented			Private rented			Living rent free
			Total Owned	Owned outright	Owned with a mortgage or loan		Total social rented	Rented from council (Local Authority)	Other	Total Private rented	Private landlord or letting agency	Other	
E05000106	Bickley	100.0	80.2	38.9	41.3	0.4	7.0	0.4	6.6	11.4	10.6	0.8	0.9
E05000107	Biggin Hill	100.0	87.9	39.1	48.9	0.9	4.6	0.4	4.2	5.7	5.1	0.6	0.9
E05000108	Bromley Common and Keston	100.0	73.2	33.5	39.6	0.7	15.7	2.3	13.4	9.5	8.9	0.5	0.9
E05000109	Bromley Town	100.0	65.3	27.5	37.8	1.0	10.0	0.7	9.3	22.7	21.6	1.1	1.0
E05000110	Chislefield and Pratts Bottom	100.0	87.0	42.9	44.1	0.6	4.6	0.6	4.0	7.1	6.3	0.8	0.7
E05000111	Chislehurst	100.0	79.9	40.7	39.2	0.2	7.1	0.7	6.4	11.4	10.7	0.7	1.3
E05000112	Clock House	100.0	67.5	24.4	43.2	1.3	12.6	1.0	11.6	17.8	16.8	1.0	0.8
E05000113	Copers Cope	100.0	61.1	29.2	31.9	0.8	9.2	0.6	8.6	27.7	26.2	1.5	1.2
E05000114	Cray Valley East	100.0	61.6	27.6	34.1	1.6	24.7	3.7	21.0	11.1	10.0	1.2	1.0
E05000115	Cray Valley West	100.0	58.1	25.3	32.7	1.5	33.5	4.5	29.0	6.1	5.4	0.7	0.8
E05000116	Crystal Palace	100.0	34.8	9.6	25.2	1.6	33.2	3.5	29.7	29.7	28.6	1.0	0.7
E05000117	Darwin	100.0	82.9	46.0	36.9	0.8	5.5	0.4	5.1	9.4	8.8	1.4	0.7
E05000118	Farnborough and Crofton	100.0	83.3	47.2	36.0	0.2	8.8	0.4	8.5	6.7	6.1	0.7	0.9
E05000119	Hayes and Coney Hall	100.0	88.3	43.5	44.7	0.2	3.1	0.3	2.8	7.8	7.1	0.7	0.7
E05000120	Kelsey and Eden Park	100.0	79.3	38.0	41.2	0.4	8.6	0.8	7.8	10.6	9.9	0.6	1.1
E05000121	Mottingham and Chislehurst North	100.0	55.3	22.0	33.4	1.1	31.9	4.2	27.7	10.5	10.0	0.6	1.2
E05000122	Orpington	100.0	74.4	41.0	33.5	1.2	15.8	2.1	13.7	8.0	7.3	0.7	0.6
E05000123	Penge and Cator	100.0	47.9	17.6	30.3	1.1	29.8	3.1	26.8	20.3	19.2	1.1	0.8
E05000124	Petts Wood and Knoll	100.0	89.3	47.3	42.1	0.1	2.7	0.3	2.4	6.9	6.3	0.6	0.9
E05000125	Plaietow and Sundridge	100.0	65.2	28.2	37.0	0.7	17.4	1.7	15.7	15.8	14.6	1.2	0.9
E05000126	Shortlands	100.0	79.2	41.9	37.3	0.1	6.2	0.3	6.0	13.5	12.9	0.7	0.9
E05000127	West Wickham	100.0	86.8	43.8	42.9	0.4	4.4	0.2	4.2	7.4	6.6	0.8	1.1



Electoral wards and divisions Code	Electoral wards and divisions	Tenure of household (9 categories) Code	Tenure of household (9 categories)	Observation	%	
E05013987	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	-8 Does not apply	0	0	8019	
E05013987	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	0 Owned: Owns outright	2238	27.90872	8019	
E05013987	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2307	28.76917	8019	
E05013987	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	113	1.409153	8019	
E05013987	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	55	0.685871	8019	
E05013987	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	4 Social rented: Other social rented	631	7.868812	8019	
E05013987	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	2474	30.85173	8019	
E05013987	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	6 Private rented: Other private rented	200	2.494077	8019	
E05013987	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	7 Lives rent free	1	0.01247	8019	
	Beckenham Town & Copers Cope	total	8019			
E05013988	Bickley & Sundridge	-8 Does not apply	0	0	7149	
E05013988	Bickley & Sundridge	0 Owned: Owns outright	2631	36.80235	7149	
E05013988	Bickley & Sundridge	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2754	38.52287	7149	
E05013988	Bickley & Sundridge	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	23	0.321723	7149	
E05013988	Bickley & Sundridge	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	30	0.419639	7149	
E05013988	Bickley & Sundridge	4 Social rented: Other social rented	515	7.203805	7149	
E05013988	Bickley & Sundridge	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	1098	15.35879	7149	
E05013988	Bickley & Sundridge	6 Private rented: Other private rented	96	1.342845	7149	
E05013988	Bickley & Sundridge	7 Lives rent free	2	0.027976	7149	
	Bickley & Sundridge	total	7149			
E05013989	Biggin Hill	-8 Does not apply	0	0	4285	
E05013989	Biggin Hill	0 Owned: Owns outright	1940	45.27421	4285	
E05013989	Biggin Hill	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	1768	41.26021	4285	
E05013989	Biggin Hill	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	22	0.513419	4285	
E05013989	Biggin Hill	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	22	0.513419	4285	
E05013989	Biggin Hill	4 Social rented: Other social rented	181	4.224037	4285	
E05013989	Biggin Hill	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	294	6.881144	4285	
E05013989	Biggin Hill	6 Private rented: Other private rented	56	1.306884	4285	
E05013989	Biggin Hill	7 Lives rent free	2	0.046574	4285	
	Biggin Hill	total	4285			
E05013990	Bromley Common & Holwood	-8 Does not apply	0	0	7589	
E05013990	Bromley Common & Holwood	0 Owned: Owns outright	2252	29.67453	7589	
E05013990	Bromley Common & Holwood	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	3009	39.64949	7589	
E05013990	Bromley Common & Holwood	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	60	0.790618	7589	
E05013990	Bromley Common & Holwood	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	133	1.752537	7589	
E05013990	Bromley Common & Holwood	4 Social rented: Other social rented	945	12.45223	7589	
E05013990	Bromley Common & Holwood	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	1073	14.13889	7589	
E05013990	Bromley Common & Holwood	6 Private rented: Other private rented	117	1.541705	7589	
E05013990	Bromley Common & Holwood	7 Lives rent free	0	0	7589	
	Bromley Common & Holwood	total	7589			
E05013991	Bromley Town	-8 Does not apply	0	0	6718	
E05013991	Bromley Town	0 Owned: Owns outright	1715	25.52843	6718	
E05013991	Bromley Town	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2060	30.66389	6718	
E05013991	Bromley Town	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	111	1.652277	6718	
E05013991	Bromley Town	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	53	0.788925	6718	
E05013991	Bromley Town	4 Social rented: Other social rented	583	8.678178	6718	
E05013991	Bromley Town	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	2022	30.09824	6718	
E05013991	Bromley Town	6 Private rented: Other private rented	170	2.530515	6718	
E05013991	Bromley Town	7 Lives rent free	4	0.059542	6718	
	Bromley Town	total	6718			
E05013992	Chelsfield	-8 Does not apply	0	0	4392	
E05013992	Chelsfield	0 Owned: Owns outright	1692	43.07832	4392	
E05013992	Chelsfield	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	1762	40.57377	4392	
E05013992	Chelsfield	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	20	0.455373	4392	
E05013992	Chelsfield	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	21	0.478142	4392	
E05013992	Chelsfield	4 Social rented: Other social rented	222	5.054945	4392	
E05013992	Chelsfield	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	393	8.948087	4392	
E05013992	Chelsfield	6 Private rented: Other private rented	61	1.388889	4392	
E05013992	Chelsfield	7 Lives rent free	1	0.022769	4392	
	Chelsfield	total	4392			
E05013993	Chislehurst	-8 Does not apply	0	0	6268	
E05013993	Chislehurst	0 Owned: Owns outright	2439	38.91193	6268	
E05013993	Chislehurst	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2390	38.13019	6268	
E05013993	Chislehurst	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	47	0.74984	6268	
E05013993	Chislehurst	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	30	0.478622	6268	
E05013993	Chislehurst	4 Social rented: Other social rented	417	6.65284	6268	
E05013993	Chislehurst	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	825	13.16209	6268	
E05013993	Chislehurst	6 Private rented: Other private rented	120	1.914486	6268	
E05013993	Chislehurst	7 Lives rent free	0	0	6268	
	Chislehurst	total	6268			
E05013994	Clock House	-8 Does not apply	0	0	7467	
E05013994	Clock House	0 Owned: Owns outright	1947	26.07473	7467	
E05013994	Clock House	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2966	39.72144	7467	
E05013994	Clock House	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	83	1.111558	7467	
E05013994	Clock House	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	91	1.218686	7467	
E05013994	Clock House	4 Social rented: Other social rented	781	10.45935	7467	
E05013994	Clock House	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	1483	19.86072	7467	
E05013994	Clock House	6 Private rented: Other private rented	115	1.54011	7467	
E05013994	Clock House	7 Lives rent free	1	0.013392	7467	
	Clock House	total	7467			
E05013995	Crystal Palace & Anerley	-8 Does not apply	0	0	5682	
E05013995	Crystal Palace & Anerley	0 Owned: Owns outright	550	9.67899	5682	
E05013995	Crystal Palace & Anerley	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	1514	26.64555	5682	
E05013995	Crystal Palace & Anerley	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	103	1.812742	5682	
E05013995	Crystal Palace & Anerley	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	204	3.590285	5682	
E05013995	Crystal Palace & Anerley	4 Social rented: Other social rented	1486	25.80077	5682	
E05013995	Crystal Palace & Anerley	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	1741	30.64062	5682	
E05013995	Crystal Palace & Anerley	6 Private rented: Other private rented	98	1.724745	5682	
E05013995	Crystal Palace & Anerley	7 Lives rent free	6	0.105597	5682	
	Crystal Palace & Anerley	total	5682			
E05013996	Darwin	-8 Does not apply	0	0	2287	
E05013996	Darwin	0 Owned: Owns outright	1099	48.05422	2287	
E05013996	Darwin	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	815	35.6362	2287	
E05013996	Darwin	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	12	0.524705	2287	
E05013996	Darwin	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	14	0.612156	2287	
E05013996	Darwin	4 Social rented: Other social rented	99	4.328815	2287	
E05013996	Darwin	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	181	7.914298	2287	
E05013996	Darwin	6 Private rented: Other private rented	67	2.929602	2287	
E05013996	Darwin	7 Lives rent free	0	0	2287	
	Darwin	total	2287			
E05013997	Farnborough & Crofton	-8 Does not apply	0	0	7053	
E05013997	Farnborough & Crofton	0 Owned: Owns outright	3205	45.44166	7053	
E05013997	Farnborough & Crofton	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2621	37.16149	7053	
E05013997	Farnborough & Crofton	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	12	0.17014	7053	
E05013997	Farnborough & Crofton	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	32	0.453708	7053	
E05013997	Farnborough & Crofton	4 Social rented: Other social rented	548	7.769743	7053	
E05013997	Farnborough & Crofton	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	544	7.71303	7053	
E05013997	Farnborough & Crofton	6 Private rented: Other private rented	91	1.290231	7053	
E05013997	Farnborough & Crofton	7 Lives rent free	0	0	7053	
	Farnborough & Crofton	total	7053			
E05013998	Hayes & Coney Hall	-8 Does not apply	0	0	5918	
E05013998	Hayes & Coney Hall	0 Owned: Owns outright	2646	44.71105	5918	
E05013998	Hayes & Coney Hall	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2518	42.54816	5918	
E05013998	Hayes & Coney Hall	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	23	0.388645	5918	
E05013998	Hayes & Coney Hall	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	14	0.236568	5918	
E05013998	Hayes & Coney Hall	4 Social rented: Other social rented	206	3.480606	5918	
E05013998	Hayes & Coney Hall	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	439	7.418047	5918	
E05013998	Hayes & Coney Hall	6 Private rented: Other private rented	69	1.165934	5918	
E05013998	Hayes & Coney Hall	7 Lives rent free	3	0.050693	5918	
	Hayes & Coney Hall	total	5918			
E05013999	Kelsey & Eden Park	-8 Does not apply	0	0	5994	
E05013999	Kelsey & Eden Park	0 Owned: Owns outright	2307	38.48849	5994	
E05013999	Kelsey & Eden Park	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2342	39.07241	5994	
E05013999	Kelsey & Eden Park	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	34	0.567234	5994	
E05013999	Kelsey & Eden Park	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	40	0.667334	5994	
E05013999	Kelsey & Eden Park	4 Social rented: Other social rented	500	8.341675	5994	

E05013999	Kelsoy & Eden Park	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	668	11.14448	5994
E05013999	Kelsoy & Eden Park	6 Private rented: Other private rented	103	1.718385	5994
E05013999	Kelsoy & Eden Park	7 Lives rent free	0	0	5994
	Kelsoy & Eden Park		5994		
E05014000	Mottingham	-8 Does not apply	0	0	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	0 Owned: Owns outright	1050	22.6635	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	1485	32.05267	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	47	1.014461	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	179	3.863587	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	4 Social rented: Other social rented	1109	23.93697	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	658	14.20246	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	6 Private rented: Other private rented	101	2.180013	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	7 Lives rent free	4	0.086337	4633
	Mottingham	total	4633		
E05014001	Orpington	-8 Does not apply	0	0	4729
E05014001	Orpington	0 Owned: Owns outright	1870	39.54324	4729
E05014001	Orpington	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	1509	31.90949	4729
E05014001	Orpington	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	38	0.803553	4729
E05014001	Orpington	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	103	2.17805	4729
E05014001	Orpington	4 Social rented: Other social rented	647	13.68154	4729
E05014001	Orpington	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	492	10.40389	4729
E05014001	Orpington	6 Private rented: Other private rented	65	1.374498	4729
E05014001	Orpington	7 Lives rent free	5	0.105731	4729
	Orpington	total	4729		
E05014002	Penge & Cator	-8 Does not apply	0	0	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	0 Owned: Owns outright	1447	17.21594	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2461	29.28019	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	105	1.249256	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	322	3.831053	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	4 Social rented: Other social rented	2053	24.42594	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	1867	22.21297	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	6 Private rented: Other private rented	145	1.725164	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	7 Lives rent free	5	0.059488	8405
	Penge & Cator	total	8405		
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	-8 Does not apply	0	0	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	0 Owned: Owns outright	3078	44.54414	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2711	39.233	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	25	0.361795	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	31	0.448625	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	4 Social rented: Other social rented	229	3.314038	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	746	10.79595	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	6 Private rented: Other private rented	89	1.287988	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	7 Lives rent free	1	0.014472	6910
	Petts Wood & Knoll	total	6910		
E05014004	Plaistow	-8 Does not apply	0	0	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	0 Owned: Owns outright	1579	28.74044	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	1990	36.22133	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	37	0.673462	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	80	1.456134	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	4 Social rented: Other social rented	803	14.51594	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	813	16.61813	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	6 Private rented: Other private rented	90	1.638151	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	7 Lives rent free	2	0.036403	5494
	Plaistow	total	5494		
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	-8 Does not apply	0	0	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	0 Owned: Owns outright	2347	35.01417	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2435	36.32702	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	26	0.387886	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	47	0.701179	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	4 Social rented: Other social rented	367	5.47516	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	1368	20.40877	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	6 Private rented: Other private rented	109	1.626138	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	7 Lives rent free	4	0.059675	6703
	Shortlands & Park Langley	total	6703		
E05014006	St Mary Cray	-8 Does not apply	0	0	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	0 Owned: Owns outright	2421	31.79669	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2450	32.3089	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	121	1.589178	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	220	2.889414	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	4 Social rented: Other social rented	1393	18.29525	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	885	11.62333	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	6 Private rented: Other private rented	112	1.470975	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	7 Lives rent free	2	0.026267	7614
	St Mary Cray	total	7614		
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	-8 Does not apply	0	0	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	0 Owned: Owns outright	1579	23.17288	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2089	30.65747	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	84	1.232756	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	355	5.209862	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	4 Social rented: Other social rented	1889	27.72234	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	724	10.62518	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	6 Private rented: Other private rented	93	1.364837	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	7 Lives rent free	1	0.014676	6814
	St Paul's Cray	total	6814		
E05014008	West Wickham	-8 Does not apply	0	0	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	0 Owned: Owns outright	2561	44.85999	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2250	39.41146	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	23	0.402873	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	17	0.297775	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	4 Social rented: Other social rented	252	4.414083	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	527	8.231039	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	6 Private rented: Other private rented	78	1.366264	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	7 Lives rent free	1	0.017516	5709
	West Wickham	total	5709		

**Council**

**27 February 2023**

**Questions from Members of the Council for Oral Reply**

**1. From Cllr Sophie Dunbar to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management**

Would the Leader of the Council please confirm what reasonable adjustments have been made under the legislation in the Equality Act 2010 and under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 by the Council since the election in May to accommodate disabled access to all meetings and facilities with specific attention to deaf and hearing impaired persons.

**Reply:**

In terms of access, all committee rooms have adequate access to facilitate disabled access and meetings are supported by attendant staff to assist in any necessary provision. A hearing loop is in place, however it was recently identified that the existing hearing loop did not accommodate the most recent hearing aid technology. To resolve this, additional portable hearing loops which accommodate the latest technology have been installed to complement the existing hearing loops infrastructure.

**Supplementary Question:**

Thank you, these units will make a huge difference to all hearing aid users. When I raised the issue nine months ago, and these units are next day delivery, why did it take so long?

**Reply:**

I am not aware of the specific response but I will follow up with officers and send you a written reply.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:**

How long will the disabled toilets be out of action? They have been out of action for a very long time.

**Reply:**

I do not have the answer available, but there have been problems for some time not just with the disabled toilets in this building, reflecting its age, and that is one of the advantages of relocating to the new site.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Keith Onslow:**

I support Cllr Dunbar's efforts to improve hearing facilities at the Council. Can you confirm that when we move premises state of the art facilities will be made

available? The current facilities in this building are clearly of some age, and it does not make much sense to spend a lot of money on them now, but it will be good to have upgraded facilities at that time.

**Reply:**

I am happy to confirm that we will do so.

**2. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement**

Has LBB received updates on the results of the Bromley Safer Street Survey which ended in Jan or Feb 2021.

We were advised that the local results would be shared via our SNP and the National would be shared by the Police.

**Reply:**

The Bromley Safer Streets Survey was actually a Metropolitan Police consultation on their draft Violence against Women and Girls Action Plan. The results have not been made available but have been incorporated into the final Violence against Women and Girls Action Plan.

**Supplementary Question:**

I did not quite understand the answer. We were told that the results would be circulated through our Safer Neighbourhood Panels – all the Bromley Safer Neighbourhood Panels were supposed to be getting a report that they could share with their residents and that the national one would be delivered and published online. We have not received any feedback whatsoever. This was advertised as an important piece of work around Violence against Women and Girls but it seems to have just happened and there has been no feedback or outcome. Can we ask the Safer Bromley Partnership Board if they can chase up some statistics, particularly those relevant for Bromley.

**Reply:**

I certainly can do that. This has come directly from the Police and has been followed up by officers. The information due to come through to Safer Neighbourhood Panels was about the Street Safe service where people can submit public spaces where they felt unsafe. When I last checked up on that the response was there was not a great deal of input, so there was little in the way of statistics that they could give us. We will look at it again through the Safer Bromley Partnership Board.

**3. From Cllr Tony McPartlan to the Leader of the Council**

The first some of our operational property tenants, such as those at Community House, found out about the potential sale of their premises was by reading Council meeting agenda papers. Does the Leader of the Council think that's right and fair?

**Reply:**

Clearly not, as I have commented on previously. Information flow could and should have been better, both to keep those potentially affected better advised and also to help negate unhelpful scaremongering as to the Council's true intentions.

**Supplementary Question:**

At the last full Council meeting you said that you had received correspondence from current tenants in support of the Community House disposal and move to the Direct Line building. Why does this freedom of information reply say "The Council has not received any correspondence in support of the disposal of Community House." What is inaccurate, this freedom of information response or yourself?

**Reply:**

Me on this occasion. I have spoken with some of the lessees who think it is a good idea – that is a simple fact. There are lessees that do think that moving to Direct Line is a good idea. And I will, through the chair of the BVST, as I cannot divulge private information without the correct permissions, pass that information on to you.

**4. From Cllr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces**

Can the Portfolio Holder quantify how many times refuse or recycling collections have been rescheduled to a later date on the expected day of collection?

**Reply:**

The answer is 17. Just to put that into context, that accounts for just 1% of the waste we collect each year. I will take the opportunity to remind Members that changes to recycling and our waste services do happen around holiday times. Please remind your residents that Easter is coming up, and there will be slight changes to collection services.

**Supplementary Question:**

The experience of residents in Clock House is that this happens frequently. Can the Portfolio Holder comment on the residents' belief that the reason that this is happening is because the wagons do not have sufficient capacity?

**Reply:**

I have never heard of this issue before. I do not believe you have emailed me – members here can testify that if they do email me about any issues in my portfolio I do get back to them quickly. I would encourage you to email me with any issues and I will follow them up.

I am concerned to hear that – this is not what the data is telling us.

## **5. From Cllr Alisa Igoe to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces**

Bromley's 2020 draft AQAP stated "declaration of an AQMA places a statutory duty to monitor and take action to reduce levels of pollutants." In 2020 our AQMA was expanded to cover more than half of the borough due to exceedances of Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). Why was Defra's UK Air Information Resource page not showing it until February 2023, after receiving a complaint, and where is the map?

### **Reply:**

The AQMA has been expanded in line with new WHO guidelines which are very ambitious. Bromley meets all the national air quality guidelines, including NO<sub>2</sub> and our air quality continues to improve.

In relation to your DEFRA question, we are not sure why they have not updated Bromley's information, including the map, but I have been assured by officers that they did send the information on time before the deadline. It appears to be just an administrative error, and officers will continue to follow up with DEFRA.

### **Supplementary Question:**

Since I submitted that question, I have had another look at DEFRA's website and we seem to have the Air Quality Action Plan uploaded, but it is the March 2010 plan. Officers have obviously communicated with them, and they have put something back onto that website, but it is the 2010 plan. It does not show the AQMA of 2020 which covers Crystal Palace to Mottingham down to Cray Valley and across to Chelsfield and back up to West Wickham which is over half the borough.

Why does the AQMA map and the Air Quality Action Plan prepared in 2020 not appear on the DEFRA UK map and why are we not speaking to them about it?

### **Reply:**

As I said, officers are speaking to DEFRA about that. They had a 2007 map originally so we are getting closer, but not we are not there yet. I have been assured by officers that they are following this up. We will continue to push to get the right information published on their website.

### **Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Fawthrop:**

Is the Portfolio Holder aware that, when it comes to air quality, the World Health Organisation set targets in 2021 and we meet 50% of those targets fully. In terms of the other 50%, we are well on the way to meeting interim targets 2 and 4 for other measures, so we meet the targets for ozone and PM<sub>2.10</sub>

### **Reply:**

I was aware of some of those statistics, however I would say that we do need to be careful with this debate and some of those statistics were taken over the Covid period. We should be careful not to over-promise on our air quality. It is very good, but it is important that we use facts in this debate.

## **6. From Cllr Kevin Kennedy-Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families**

Would the Portfolio Holder accept that the few Teaching Assistants paid by Bromley would gain more job satisfaction and be more likely to stay in their position if they received the same financial benefits as those working for our Academy Trusts?

### **Reply:**

The Teaching Assistants and Higher Level Teaching Assistants employed by Bromley Council provide a key role in our work to support children across the Borough. The Council publishes job adverts for schools across the Borough and therefore has evidence that the Bromley rate of pay is competitive and often higher than the starting pay from recent academy advertisements. 25% of academies still follow the Bromley pay awards.

The Teaching Assistants employed by Bromley will receive the imminent 7.75% pay rise, subject to the agreement of full Council this evening, and also benefit from inclusion in the Council's merited rewards scheme. The turnover of Teaching Assistants remains low, at less than 15%.

### **Supplementary Question:**

Bromley still has some Teaching Assistants especially in the SEN area, and this is an extremely important role in protecting our children and shaping their future. There is about to be a rise; you have said in your answer that there are some paid less and some paid more. If, in an individual situation, somebody was being paid lower, would you agree to match-fund at an average or higher than average pay for those staff?

### **Reply:**

If you can send me examples of when that has happened I can forward that to the Director of Education and he can look into it.

## **7. From Cllr Jeremy Adams to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management (answered by the Chairman of the Audit and Risk Management Committee)**

In July 2020, auditors EY warned the Council of, 'significant additional time incurred to complete our work, leading to additional fees'. How much did EY bill Bromley Council in additional fees for 2019-20, and how much has EY billed Bromley Council for audits in subsequent years?

### **Reply:**

Cllr Marlow referred the question to the Chairman of the audit and Risk Management Committee, Cllr Michael Tickner.

In relation to 2019-20, the audit remains incomplete owing to issues concerning asset valuations. The Council has therefore not been notified as to the amount of any additional fees. EY, the external auditor, has stated that a final fee for that

period will be determined shortly. Consequently, confirmed final audit fees for subsequent years are not yet available.

**Supplementary Question:**

Referring to page 31, setting out that we have five vacancies in the Finance Department, two of them for more than six months, how confident is the Chairman that we will avoid additional fees in the future?

**Reply:**

The number of staff in Internal audit has nothing to do with the work of the external auditor. Their work seems to be increasing – the accounts for 2019/20 are expected to be signed off by April this year, but CIPFA, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy, do seem to be issuing more and more guidance and this is just creating more work for accountants. It is not all about headcounts – when it comes to staff it is also about productivity and outcomes, and whether we are getting what we want from the number of staff.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:**

Regarding the link between internal staff and external, does he recall the letter that we were sent by our external auditors referring to the lack of resource in the Finance Team and the delays that there had been in responding to their queries, and does he agree that this lack of resource contributed to the additional time taken for them to sign off the accounts?

**Reply:**

There has been a turnover of staff, particularly in the section that deals with the external auditors, but as I was trying to explain the external auditors are asking more questions, with more detail, for instance wanting a valuation of all the roads that the borough owns, based on how often they need to be repaired. Does it matter? Are the road assets worth nothing or are they worth what it would cost to renew them? Is it worth the staff spending all this time making an evaluation of our public roads which wear out at different rates? All these issues will be discussed at the next Audit and Risk management Committee and I invite any Members interested to come along and hear more detail.

Councillor Marlow reminded members that in a similar question asked some months ago about the number of staff supporting audit the answer he had given was that the number of staff had doubled. Within the last five years – the Director of Finance could correct that if necessary. Before considering any further increase in staff we need to look at productivity and the regulatory environment that we find ourselves in, rather than the default reaction being to hire more staff, albeit we are aware that many local authorities, particularly in inner London, follow that policy.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Tony Owen:**

Give that valuing buildings is a matter of opinion, and we only know their true value when they are sold, does the Chairman think that EY are just making work for themselves which comes to different valuations from the previous auditor, and if



there is a disagreement and PWC were wrong and EY are right, should any additional fees be billed to the previous auditor?

**Reply:**

I know that EY are speaking to the previous external auditor and I do hope that they are sharing information and saving costs to Bromley taxpayers. This is what we are pressing for and to a certain extent our hands are tied because the external auditors are appointed for us through the scheme that we are in and we have to accept what they say. The amount of work is driven by CIPFA who are thinking up all sorts of new guidance every year.

**8. From Cllr Chris Price to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management**

Please can you inform the chamber;

- a) In the current round, how many residents have applied for the household support fund?
- b) Of these, how many were successful?
- c) How many were not?
- d) What is the total spend to date?
- e) How much is still available for residents?
- f) If it is not all spent by the end of March 2023, how much are we expecting to return to the government?

**Reply:**

- (a) 1949. In addition 9,200 school children have received 4x £15.00 food vouchers for the school holidays in the period October 2022 to February 2023
- (b) 743
- (c) 124
- (d) £700,600
- (e) £893,800
- (f) We expect to spend all the funds.

**Supplementary Question:**

These numbers are very low for the number of people coming through, and the money still outstanding is higher than the money we have already spent. We have until the end of this coming month to spend it. Our promotion on this has been irregular, to say the least. The "How to apply" button on the website keeps coming on and going off. Cllr Igoe has been amazing trying to make sure that we get that back on – it was still off over this weekend. This is money that the Conservative Government has given Bromley to give to people who are disadvantaged. I am really concerned that we are going to be handing money back - how are you going to assure me that all of this money is spent and goes to people in need?

**Reply:**

Applications not awarded as yet consist of 478 new cases under investigation and within the 15 working day time limit, 552 cases await further information or clarification from the applicant to enable them to proceed and there are 52 duplicate

applications. The scheme has been publicised through the Bromley website, on social media through our partner organisations and via internal teams. We continue to raise awareness of the scheme. Thank you for raising the issue of the website – I will take that up with Mr Bridgewater.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:**

Will the Portfolio Holder tell me if he has been involved with the Communication Plan for the Household Support Fund? I have been fairly loud emailing when I have noticed that the links are not working and I would like to know if the Portfolio Holder was involved in the Communications Plan.

**Reply:**

I can confirm that I have discussed it with officers but we have generally followed a similar approach for all of these awards introduced since the start of the pandemic.

**9. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces**

Over the past two years how many incidents of fly-tipping have been reported, either directly or through Fix My Street, around the area outside the parade of shops in Newlands Park outside Penge East Station?

**Reply:**

Between January 2021 and January 2023 there have been 41 reports of dumped rubbish on Newlands Park Road by Penge East Station. Of the 41, 40 were received via Fix My Street.

**Supplementary Question:**

Given the continued and consistent fly-tipping over the past few years can you tell me how many fines have been issued or how many prosecutions have begun in relation to the fly-tipping at that location in the last two years?

**Reply:**

I can confirm that there have been none. This question was the first time I was aware of this issue, I have asked officers to follow up; their sense was that it is the nature of the rubbish and it is hard to find out where it has come from. Officers have agreed to look at this area and see what more can be done to track down the criminals, but I do not want to give away too much about this in public.

**10. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement**

A Metropolitan Police gang task group was set up to hopefully route out the known gangs in Bromley. At the time all 4 gangs were believed to be located in Penge. Serious crime and murders are still happening in Bromley so can the police be requested to present the outcomes affecting Bromley borough at a PP&E PDS?

**Reply:**

Yes, this will be built into the annual crime needs assessment review of crime performance within the borough which is reported to the Safer Bromley Partnership and scrutinised by Public Protection and Enforcement PDS Committee.

**Supplementary Question:**

Was that the Metropolitan Gang Task Force? We do need to hear regularly because, going back probably six years, we have had five murders in Penge, three are still unsolved and if you look at the statistics these incidents of knife crime and stabbings have spread from Penge into the rest of Bromley, which I warned at the time if we did not do something about tackling them when we knew where they were. Can we keep these reports coming in because we should not have a Gang Task Group that never reports back.

**Reply:**

Absolutely. There are quarterly reports but they are not very detailed, so that can be one of the things we push for.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Fawthrop:**

Can the Portfolio Holder remind me who has overall responsibility for policing in London?

**11. From Cllr Tony McPartlan to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

Some housing associations are starting to compile damp and mould registers for all their properties as a way of ensuring their tenants live in safe conditions. Will the Council commit to work alongside Pinnacle and do something similar for the properties they manage on our behalf?

**Reply:**

Yes, this is already being undertaken by Pinnacle and also by Mears for More Homes Bromley to identify any issues and an action plan to resolve them as soon as identified.

**Supplementary Question:**

Is this something that we can get reported to Renewal, Recreation and Housing PDS Committee so that we can monitor progress?

**Reply:**

We review these reports via the Operational Board meetings that we have with Pinnacle and Mears so if there are some trends coming out of that there is no reason why that cannot be reported to PDS.

## **12. From Cllr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces**

Does the Portfolio Holder think it acceptable that on a recent clean-up of a street in Clock House residents were able to collect more than 20 bags of litter and composted leaves etc?

### **Reply:**

The Council has collected over 2,000 tonnes of leafing this season and continues to collect from hard-to-reach areas where there are parked cars or where further leaf fall has accumulated.

Likewise, our street cleansing teams deal with over 1,500 enquiries per month as well as attending to scheduled work to ensure litter is removed from the public highway.

I want to put on record my thanks to the volunteers in Clock House. Our Friends groups are key stakeholders in helping us to keep Bromley beautiful, and I would encourage all residents to get involved in one of our Friends groups, whether that is Tree Friends, Street Friends or Park Friends.

### **Supplementary Question:**

Will you investigate scheduled cleaning of gutters and gulleys including requesting access and the moving of parked cars. Do you understand that without this residents will not think they are getting value for money?

### **Reply:**

All streets across Bromley are monitored but if there is a specific issue please email me or report it to a senior officer.

## **13. From Cllr Chris Price to the Portfolio Holder for Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces**

Will the Council commit to building a high quality perimeter fence around Hoblingwell in the coming financial year?

### **Reply:**

The anti-social behaviour at Hoblingwell is very sad. I know that you are aware that I have met with the Friends Group a number of times. I know that the community and the Friends group are super dedicated to the park and I want to do what I can as Portfolio Holder to keep the environment as it is and to stop motorbikes from entering the field. But this must be a joint partnership between the Council and Police – this is really crucial. I have asked officers to look at options that are cost effective while not spoiling the natural beauty of the park. Options continue to be explored but funding and fiscal prudence must be considered when exploring new infrastructure projects.

**Supplementary Question:**

Is that yes, we are going to get a perimeter fence around the park?

**Reply:**

I do not know yet. We are looking at options but I have to weigh up the issue of protecting the park from motorbikes with the issue of Council finances - that has to be an issue for all of us here and the taxpayers of Bromley.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:**

I believe that around £500,000 was found for fixing a bridge in Kelsey Park from the Healthy Bromley Fund – does the Portfolio Holder consider that this fund might be somewhere where the funds to provide fencing for Hoblingwell could also be found from?

**Reply:**

This is a new infrastructure project while that was an old bridge – 50+ years old – so that is the difference. Every time this Council makes a decision to put new infrastructure projects in we have to think about the maintenance and maintaining that new infrastructure. These are decisions that do require additional thinking and ensuring that this is the best use of taxpayer money

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe :**

We got all that money for Hoblingwell – it is an amazing facility there for the community, for children, for cycling. It seems ridiculous not to put a fence around it considering that the bollards get knocked down regularly.

**Reply:**

It is a different field to the tracks on the upper field – what we are talking about now is the lower field.

**14. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

The Council-owned Churchill Theatre is one of the South East's leading live entertainment venues, welcoming over 200,000 people a year and providing a huge benefit to arts and culture in the Borough - over the past decade how much has the Council spent on maintaining the theatre building and how much do officers estimate the works needed to bring the theatre back to an acceptable condition will cost?

**Reply:**

The Council does not hold historic specific repair costs relating to the theatre as the maintenance previously formed part of the overall block contract with Amey. The Churchill Theatre, as has previously been reported, is contained within the operational property review. Work is underway to complete a full feasibility and options appraisal and a report will be provided to members in due course. This work is being undertaken in full liaison with the Theatre.

**Supplementary Question:**

I note that the costs of maintaining the Churchill are not covered in the Operational Property Review and there is reference to a future report. Can you assure me that the Council will do everything in its power to ensure the continued viability and operation of the theatre which many members will agree is the jewel in the crown of Bromley's arts and cultural scene.

**Reply:**

We are working with the theatre to try to work out a sustainable future for it.

**Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Sam Webber:**

Cllr Ireland and I have also met with the Team at Trafalgar. We welcome the ongoing discussions they are having with the Council. We have specific concerns about how run-down the building has become both internally with regard to plumbing and waste water and the mosaic tiling issues on the outside. We would welcome those discussions and the theatre being fully refurbished. If we could be kept involved as appropriate that would be welcome.

**Council**

**27 February 2023**

**Questions from Members of the Council for Written Reply**

**1. From Cllr Tony McPartlan to the Leader of the Council**

The Leader of the Council previously stated that all tenants at Community House could move to our new headquarters at no additional cost. Community House provides service users with a quiet welcoming space and is also home to the South Street Cafe run by the fantastic CASPA charity. How will the Council replicate this at our new, busy HQ?

**Reply:**

The BVST has thus far declined to consider the option of moving to the Direct Line building so no detailed plans to do so have been developed in this regard, as things currently stand.

**2. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

Can you please publish a list of all Assets of Community Value (ACVs) across Bromley with their expiry dates and the holder of the ACV?

**Reply:**

This information is already published on the Council's website and can be accessed via the following link:

[Assets of community value – London Borough of Bromley](#)

**3. From Cllr Alisa Igoe to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee**

Public questions and Members' questions (and responses) at Scrutiny committees are added to the committee webpage within appendices, which at times sit at the very bottom of that committee's webpage, where they can be missed. Could we please follow other Councils excellent example, such as Merton, and attach these questions and answers within the Minutes via a hyperlink?

**Reply:**

We have not received any complaints about questions not being visible, but I have asked the Democratic Services Team to look at how questions and replies are presented.

#### **4. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

Could you please provide figures for how many adults and children have presented to the Council as homeless in the past 12 months, and of these:

- A. How many did so having been evicted under a 'section 21' notice?
- B. How many were currently in arrears in respect of energy bills, rent or council tax?
- C. How many had received support from the Council's hardship fund before becoming homeless?
- D. How many were care leavers previously supported by the London Borough of Bromley?

**Reply:**

- (A) Of the 1669 homeless assessment, 102 were owed a homelessness duty due to eviction under a section 21 notice.
- (B) Of the above 115 provided rent arrears as the main reason for homelessness. 73 were in council tax arrears. We would not hold data on whether a household was in arrears in respect of energy payments.
- (C) Of the above 6 had received hardship payments, 4 received council tax hardship reward and 53 were in receipt of council tax support.
- (D) Of the 1669, 17 were care leavers