

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 18 January 2012

Present

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)
Councillor Ellie Harmer (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Reg Adams, Kathy Bance, Julian Grainger,
David Hastings, Samaris Huntington-Thresher,
David Jefferys and Nick Milner

Also Present

Councillor Colin Smith

55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillor Ian Payne.

56 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations.

57 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

There were no questions to the Committee.

58 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 15TH NOVEMBER 2011

The minutes were agreed.

59 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

Two questions to the Portfolio Holder for oral reply had been received from the Chairman and three questions to the Portfolio Holder for written reply had been received from Mr Colin Willetts.

60 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS

Decisions taken by the Portfolio Holder since the Committee's previous meeting were noted.

61 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

A) BUDGET MONITORING 2011/12

Report ES12013

Based on expenditure and activity levels to 30th November 2011, the controllable budget for the Environment Portfolio was projected to show an underspend of £279k.

Details were provided of the 2011/12 projected outturn with a forecast of projected spend for each division compared to the latest approved budget. Background to the variations was also outlined.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the latest 2011/12 budget projection for the Environment Portfolio.

B) ENFORCEMENT POLICY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Report ES11142

In approving the Environmental Services Enforcement Policy on 28 October 2011, the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio Holder asked that the report be referred to the Environment PDS Committee for consideration.

The Policy is relevant to areas for which the Environment Portfolio Holder has responsibility and through Report ES11142 the Portfolio Holder was being asked to endorse the Enforcement Policy for the Environmental Services Department.

The Enforcement policy seeks to set out how the Council will approach its enforcement responsibilities.

Discussion centred on a suggestion for a last resort of appeal to a Member body in respect of appeals and complaints. There was a clear role for Members in deciding licensing and planning applications. Members were advised that each piece of enforcement legislation tended to have a specific appeals procedure, and more generally reference was made to the Council's complaints and customer feedback procedure. It was confirmed that no instances could be recalled of a complainant under the Public Protection Enforcement Policy procedure appealing to the Chief Executive and there were only a very few complainants to the Chief Officer. In the circumstances the Chairman questioned whether there was a significant problem. It was

recommended that a reference should be included in the Policy to explain that a resident could also contact a local ward Councillor for help in putting a case.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the Enforcement Policy for the Environmental Services Department as set out at Appendix A to Report ES11142, along with a reference to indicate that a resident could also contact a local ward Councillor for help in putting a case.

C) TRADE WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE ANNUAL PRICE INCREASE

Report ES12014

To maintain income targets, allowing for the increase in Landfill Tax, the inflationary increase of contractor collection and disposal payments, and the annual inflation estimate applied to all income budgets, an above inflation increase in prices for 2012/13 may be required for the Council's Trade Waste Collection Service (TWCS).

The Government has also expressed its intention to amend The Controlled Waste Regulations (1992) so that from 1st April 2012 the full costs of waste disposal can be recovered from customers who currently only pay for the collection element of the service. Report ES10193 (January 2011) confirmed that such charges will be applied when and if the revised legislation is enacted which it is anticipated will increase income by £58k above inflation. An increase of 13% on the overall TWCS prices would also be required to achieve the income targets for 2012/13.

However, the Government has not yet confirmed the necessary revision to the regulations and if the legislation is delayed, TWCS prices would need to be uplifted by 17% to increase projected annual income by £90k above the inflation target, matching the budget option put forward.

To maintain income targets, allowing for the annual increase in Landfill Tax, the annual inflationary increase of contractor disposal payments, and the annual inflation estimate applied to all income budgets, an above inflation increase of 7% in the Council's prices for non-household waste delivered to the Household Waste Recycling Centres 2012/13 is also required.

In supporting the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder the Committee felt that the customer drop out rate for the Trade Waste Collection Service should be monitored for the Council's budget next year and for the implications of the service going forward. A Member suggested if above inflation rises were likely to be recommended for 2013/14 their potential impact on small businesses should be an element of future reports.

It was confirmed that fly tipping tonnages had remained stable although a Member suggested that landfill tax could be getting to a point where it is

becoming counter productive leading to fly tipping and the Member suggested that the Government be lobbied on this concern.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree the following:

(1) should the revised legislation be agreed, disposal charges to those Schedule 2 customers re-designated under the changes to the Controlled Waste Regulations (1992) be implemented, along with (i) an increase of 13% in the costs of both collection and container rental for customers utilising the trade waste collection service and/or renting containers from the council and (ii) an increase of £4 for the waste transfer note;

(2) should the Government fail to implement the changes to the Controlled Waste Regulations (1992), an increase of 17% be implemented in the costs of both collection and container rental for customers utilising the trade waste collection service and/or renting containers from the Council along with an increase of £4 for the waste transfer note;

(3) an increase of 7% in Council prices for non-household waste delivered to the Household Waste Recycling Centres 2012/13.

D) PARKING STRATEGY

Report ES12003

The 2009 Parking Working Group asked for a Bromley Parking Strategy to be developed, to update the Parking and Enforcement Plan agreed as part of the Council's first Local Implementation Plan (or LIP) in 2007. The Working Group's view was that, whilst continuing to meet the requirements of the London Mayor and TfL, the Parking Strategy should be a Bromley policy document led by local needs and priorities. A proposed Parking Strategy was now recommended to the Portfolio Holder.

Members were informed that the Parking Working Group had recently recommended revisions to the Strategy and these were tabled for Members.

The Committee supported the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder along with the revisions to the Strategy recommended by the Parking Working Group. It is also desirable to have a full range of parking policies, including policies from the Parking Strategy, included in a new Bromley Transport Policy as the Policy is developed.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) approve the Parking Strategy at Appendix 1 to Report ES12003 subject to the inclusion of the revisions to the Strategy proposed by the Parking Working Group;

- (2) **authorise the Director of Environmental Services to change the factual content of the Strategy as necessary to keep it relevant and up-to-date, with any proposed changes to the policy content or objectives being referred for Member approval in the usual way; and**
- (3) **include the Parking Policies in a new Bromley Transport Policy as the Policy is developed**

E) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF FOOTWAY CROSSOVERS

Report ES11110

A report was presented to review and update the criteria for the approval of footway crossovers.

In introducing the report the Head of Transport Strategy advised that it would be necessary to change the reference to blacktop crossover at paragraph 3.11 of Report ES11110.

In supporting the recommendations it was also agreed that the crossover policy as whole should be reviewed in the next Council year.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the recommendations along with the further wording in italics at (1) below:

- (1) **the revised Policy and Guidelines document attached at Appendix A of Report ES 11110 be approved and brought into immediate effect *subject to a review of the crossover policy as a whole in the next Council year;***
- (2) **that in the case of new crossovers, a non-returnable application fee be set at £100 per application, and that a minimum administration charge of £200 be applied to every installed application, with any administration costs over and above this figure being charged to the applicant; and**
- (3) **that in the case of an application to extend (widen) an existing crossover, a non-returnable combined application and administration fee be set at £100, payable at the time of application.**

F) SOUTHEND ROAD LOCAL SAFETY SCHEME

Report ES12008

Members considered a report outlining proposals to amend the junctions of Southend Road with Foxgrove Road and Brackley Road.

Southend Road has featured for several years as a location with a higher number of injury accidents than average for such a road. There is a history of accidents at the junction with Foxgrove Road and there is also a problem with vehicles speeding along Southend Road.

Introducing the report the Head of Traffic and Road Safety advised that further information indicated that the cost of a four-arm roundabout for the Southend Road/Foxgrove Road junction (option 1) would effectively double in view of the proximity of communication cables. Concerning this junction a Member expressed his support for the scheme at option 2.

A Member enquired why the expense of removing the existing pedestrian island in Southend Road (north of the proposed roundabout with Brackley Road) was necessary. Members were advised that the island was recommended for removal as it was particularly close to the proposed zebra crossing. Later the Member enquired of the width of Southend Road at the location of the proposed zebra crossing and indicated that a refuge could provide a safe haven – including for school children - where it was only necessary to look one way to and from the crossing. He also explained that if a southbound vehicle was waiting at the stop sign (of the roundabout) it could obscure sight lines.

Another Member suggested the inclusion of a refuge in the middle of the zebra crossing.

The Head of Traffic and Road Safety explained that children could misunderstand a refuge and any refuge would have to be narrow; however a refuge would be considered as part of the detailed design with any such minor modifications considered by the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.

With a refuge, as part of the Zebra crossing, it was also explained that visibility would be an issue and motorists might not see children waiting or stepping out; motorists might also be unsure on whether it was necessary to give way.

A further Member felt that if it was necessary to educate children on road safety (there is a nearby school) they should be directed to a zebra crossing so they have one place where they know they can cross safely. Another Member suggested a reduction of the speed limit in this part of the road.

In concluding debate the Chairman suggested moving the zebra crossing slightly northwards and he advocated that this along with other comments concerning a refuge be put to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

The Chairman also suggested reviewing the traffic lights along Southend Road after the London Olympics.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree that:

(1) the remedial measures as outlined in the second option are installed at the junction of Southend Road, Foxgrove Road and Park Road;

(2) a mini roundabout be installed at the junction with Brackley Road as well as a zebra crossing to the north of the junction;

(3) authority to make any minor modifications which may arise as a result of any considerations be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder;

(4) the requirement for the traffic lights along Southend Road be reviewed after the London Olympics in the next Council year.

62 QUESTIONS ON ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO BRIEFING

The Environment Portfolio briefing contained background information which could be useful to PDS Members in their Committee roles; Members had been requested to approach the report authors directly regarding the content.

The Environment Portfolio information briefing comprised three reports:

- *Parking Blue Badges – Tackling Fraud and Abuse* (considered by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee on 14th November 2011);
- *Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) scheme: 2010/11 Annual Report* (for consideration by the Executive on 1st February 2012 and for scrutiny by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee on 25th January 2012); and
- *Carbon Management Programme: Progress Report 2010/2011* (for consideration by the Executive on 1st February 2012 and for scrutiny by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee on 25th January 2012).

There were no questions or comments raised at the meeting concerning the reports.

63 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE

A) STREET LIGHTING INVEST TO SAVE

Report ES12020

Investment in the Council's street lighting stock has not allowed for the routine replacement of life expired lamp columns. Nearly 8,000 lamp columns are

now in need of replacement and Members considered a report to the Executive promoting an invest to save programme to clear the backlog.

Both the Portfolio Holder and Chairman were supportive of the invest to save initiative and it was agreed that the recommendation to the Executive should be supported.

RESOLVED that the Executive be recommended to agree that £7.942m can be drawn down for an invest to save fund to allow the replacement of life expired lamp columns.

64 FUTURE RAIL AND TRAM LINKS TO BROMLEY

Report ES12004

Members received a report providing background information concerning recent developments and studies by TfL which seek to refine options for rail and tram links in south and south-east London, including Bromley. Prior to the meeting an informal presentation on rail extension options for Bromley was given to Members by Transport for London's Head of Transport Planning and Projects.

The Head of Transport Strategy indicated that TfL were looking to move forward in selecting priorities - a number of formerly proposed schemes had been eliminated - and the Portfolio Holder explained that the priority for the borough was a DLR extension into Bromley North from Lewisham. He expressed opposition to any ending of the rail service from Hayes into London and if a business case was made, he felt that further development along the Crystal Palace line was good although it was probably for other boroughs to fund.

The Chairman wanted to take forward key considerations from TfL's informal presentation into a number of Working Group meetings to develop a Transport Statement for the borough.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the report be noted along with comments above from the Portfolio Holder reflecting that -

(a) a DLR, Bakerloo or other connection from Bromley North to Lewisham DLR Station or direct to Docklands is the Council's key priority for improving connectivity to LBB and Bromley town centre

(b) Tramlink extensions to Crystal Palace or Bromley South are to be supported subject to a robust business case and

(c) the extension of the Bakerloo line to Hayes is to be resisted unless direct connections to Charing Cross/Cannon Street and London Bridge can be maintained.

(2) the Transport Statement Working Group be re-convened to review the priorities at (1) (a) to (c) above and to consider the wider development of the Rail and Light Rail Policies for the Statement of Transport Policies for the borough;

(3) the membership of the Transport Statement Working Group to comprise Councillors William Huntington-Thresher, Ellie Harmer, Nick Milner, Nicholas Bennett and David Jefferys.

65 CHILDREN'S TRAVEL TO SCHOOL

Report ES12010

Members considered a report setting out the purpose, function and efficacy of the School Travel Programme. The report would also be considered by the Children and Young People PDS Committee.

A Member questioned whether School Travel Plans had been effective and he questioned the accuracy of the "hands up" survey as a reliable means for collecting data on school travel. He explained that he would like to see all funding for School Travel Plans used instead for road safety schemes. The Head of Traffic and Road Safety saw the use of the hands-up survey as a cost effective means for collecting data, and the Chairman referred to School Travel Plans encouraging action to reduce congestion and improve traffic flow.

In connection with children's travel to school the Portfolio Holder outlined a proposal to use discretionary LIP funding budget of £100k for supporting School Crossing Patrols whilst continuing to look at alternative funding and sponsorship. Significant work had been undertaken with schools and the provision of up to £100k would help reward those schools prepared to fund school crossing patrols. The Portfolio Holder suggested that £2k could be made available for every school operating a school crossing patrol or willing to see one maintained.

Responding to a question on the duration of the proposed arrangement and whether the funding would also apply to those schools having engineering measures rather than a school crossing patrol, the Portfolio Holder explained that not all schools wanted a school crossing patrol. Nevertheless there were real concerns about withdrawal of funding for patrols and a number of schools were prepared to support them. The Portfolio Holder was inclined to provide discretionary LIP funding to help support patrols, for as long as the funding lasts.

A couple of Members indicated their support for the scheme for the coming year but had concerns with the current circumstances regarding committing the Council for the long term. The Chairman reminded members that the LIP programme was approved annually in September so Members would have the opportunity to review the arrangement. Another Member welcomed the proposed scheme hoping that it would be provided for more than a year. The Vice-Chairman also offering her support enquired of the position for academy schools, to which the Portfolio Holder indicated that the offer should be made where possible irrespective of whether a school has academy status. Another Member also indicated his support for the proposal and for it to include academy schools given that crossing patrols were about road safety.

The Head of Traffic and Road Safety reassured Members that engineering measures would only be installed at schools part funding a patrol where there would be additional safety benefit for children and other local residents crossing during or outside of school hours. Members accepted this assurance.

Overall, the Committee endorsed the Portfolio Holder's proposal which would lead to the production of a report for consideration at a Special Portfolio Holder meeting.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the report and success of the scheme be noted;**
- (2) the School Travel Team be congratulated on the awards achieved;**
and
- (3) the proposal to use funds from the discretionary LIP budget of £100k to support School Crossing Patrols was endorsed for approval by the Portfolio Holder.**

66 DRAFT 2012/13 BUDGET

Report ES12019

The Committee was invited to consider the Portfolio Holder's Draft 2012/13 Budget incorporating future cost pressures and initial draft budget saving options which were reported to Executive on 11th January 2012.

Members were requested to consider the initial draft budget saving proposals and to also identify any further action that might be taken to reduce cost pressures facing the Council over the next four years.

The Executive had requested that each PDS Committee consider the initial draft budget savings and cost pressures for their Portfolio with views reported back to the Executive. Outstanding issues and areas of uncertainty remained and any further updates would be included in the 2012/13 Council Tax report to the Executive's next meeting.

A number of comments were made by Members on various issues related to further savings proposals at Appendix 2C to Report ES 12019.

Parking Charges (proposal 2)

In advocating parking charges based on demand, a Member asked whether data was held on the demand for pay and display parking bays according to specific hours of the day. He further enquired if any modelling had been undertaken on raising prices for peak hours and lowering prices at the end of the day. Related to such matters of managing demand and supply, the Assistant Director referred to a report on parking charges scheduled for the Committee's next meeting.

It was confirmed to Members that reasonably good data was held on what people paid. However the way forward focused on simplifying charges rather than having more tariffs for different types of the day which could introduce complexities and be confusing. Varying tariffs could also cause people to change shopping habits. A report on a proposed model of parking charges was scheduled for the Committee's next meeting (subject to Executive/Full Council requiring an increased income budget from parking charges). Concerning the term "harmonisation" this did not reflect the current model of proposed parking charges which it was intended would take account of the needs of specific locations.

Another Member highlighted that there were also cost implications associated with variable parking charges, such as the costs for equipment provision which might weigh against having higher charges in certain areas.

The Chairman referred to the work of the Committee's Parking Working Group which reported in May 2009 and which tended to support the comments of officers above. He commented that different charges could lead to confusion and increased appeals. In practice the Executive would set the Budget headline for parking income and the precise achievement of the budget would be for the Committee to consider.

Highway maintenance (proposals 4 and 6)

Concerning highways maintenance and pot hole repair, a Member suggested that many residents felt that their roads were missing out. As a way to help address this he suggested that there could be more value for money on Planned Maintenance by undertaking works along 40 metre sections of highway rather than renewing whole roads.

Floral bedding in highway amenity areas (proposal 9)

Before making savings, further work was advocated to try and obtain more sponsors for amenities such as flower beds in highway amenity areas.

Concerning any saving related to the removal of winter floral bedding and bulbs in parks and highway amenity areas, it was suggested having more bulbs which are then retained and not disposed of.

Friends Groups (proposal 14)

Members spoke against proposed savings on support to Friends Groups.

A Member suggested that any reduction in support for Friends Groups could have a detrimental financial effect. Friends Groups were able to draw funding into the borough and it was suggested that this could amount to more than the savings proposed. Such views were also supported by another Member, who also referred to the work of the Big Society Working Group commissioned by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee.

A Member felt that support should continue to be provided to Friends Groups to help maintain toilets in public parks and he suggested that there would be more customer complaints if the saving went ahead.

The Portfolio Holder expressed his opposition to any cut backs in support for Friends Groups and explained that he was pushing hard to see this removed from the list of proposed further savings.

Fortnightly paper collections (proposal 17)

A Member expressed her opposition to fortnightly paper collections. Paper bins could be weighty after the first week and if more income could be obtained from the waste paper collected this should be looked at. Another Member highlighted that there were opportunities for residents to take their paper waste to the Council's recycling sites; and the saving of £300k was not an insignificant sum.

The Portfolio Holder advised that, in his view, a fortnightly paper collection should not be considered at the present time. The Government had made funding available for a weekly waste collection and it may be necessary to re-visit the issue after the Council's bid to the Department of Communities and Local Government is known.

A Member also suggested that there might be a possible invest to save opportunity through having more local recycling banks thereby providing residents with closer recycling points. Such an approach might help with any change.

In arriving at key points to put to the Executive the Chairman summarised the view of the PDS as:

- the Committee had concerns regarding rises in car park charges and the potential impact on the local economy;
- the importance of the street scene is to be highlighted;

- significant street scene savings have already been made for the new contract starting April 2012 and the impact of the savings needed to be reviewed;
- for carriageways and footways there is a reluctance to support budget reductions which could lead to an increased degradation of highway assets;
- further work is necessary on the proposals which affected Friends Groups and paper collection;
- On grounds maintenance, residents could be asked to undertake more voluntary input with consideration given to such initiatives as watering of plants and flowers, and that developments are made towards self sufficiency in bedding plants. This option should be trialled for effectiveness before considering the budget saving in the report;
- Increased income generation from advertising should be considered in the next council year.

RESOLVED that the Committee's comments be conveyed to the Executive meeting on 1st February 2012.

67 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME, MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS, AND CONTRACTS REGISTER

Report ES12001

The Committee's work programme, progress on previous Committee requests and a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio were provided.

Concerning the work programme and for the Committee's next meeting on 28th February, Members were advised that there would also be items concerning the Capital Programme, Textile Recycling and a Review of Controlled Parking Zones.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the work programme be agreed subject to the above items being additionally presented to the Committee's meeting on 28th February;**
- (2) progress related to previous Committee requests be noted; and**
- (3) a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio be noted.**

- 68 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000**
- 69 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 15TH NOVEMBER 2011**

The Part 2 Minutes were agreed.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLOR WILLIAM HUNTINGTON-THRESHER TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ORAL REPLY

1. Is the Portfolio Holder aware that a Street Works Permit was granted by the Highway Authority to two mobile telephone companies to erect a mobile telephone mast in Spur Road, Orpington, despite the Planning Authority refusing planning permission for the installation?

Reply

Where telecommunication masts are proposed on the public highway, the utility company will require planning consent from the Planning Authority for the mast and a street works permit from the Traffic Authority for permission to excavate the highway to install underground apparatus and associated cabinets. These two issues are separate and the Traffic Authority is required to consider the permit application based on the London Permit Scheme, and is not allowed to consider planning status to refuse the street works permit application in an effort to prevent the mast being installed. If a utility company installs a mast without planning consent, the Planning Authority would need to use their enforcement powers to resolve.

Supplementary Question

In light of the answer provided by the Portfolio Holder, the Chairman asked whether the Portfolio Holder was willing to write to the Department for Communities and Local Government to highlight the inconsistencies.

Reply

In indicating his willingness to write to the Department, the Portfolio Holder felt that anything the Council can do to ensure that it undertakes due process is good.

2. Will procedures be changed to ensure that this circumstance cannot happen again elsewhere in the borough?

Reply

Procedures have recently been reviewed by our Solicitors, who confirm that planning status cannot be considered when determining a street works permit.

Supplementary Question

In the circumstances, when Planning Permission had been refused and a street works permit requested, the Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder if he was willing ask the Chief Planner and the Chief Legal Officer whether it was likely that a letter could be sent to the utility notifying that enforcement action would be considered if they proceeded with the installation.

Reply

In his reply the Portfolio Holder indicated that he would ask as requested and would have copies of correspondence provided to Committee Members.

QUESTIONS FROM MR COLIN WILLETTS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. Thank you for your reply to our diversion question (3) 15/11/11 re Station Approach, have you made any changes in points i) & ii)? particularly as in-service R11 & R1 upside buses were not running up Station Approach early Saturday afternoon 12/11/11 due to downside nose to tail traffic build up from top of Station Approach to the junction with Cray Avenue.

Following additional resident diversion complaints which appear to have been overlooked and causing some confusion resulting in PCN's being issued:

2. Could the Portfolio Holder include the 150 yard southern section bus lane in Cray Avenue (junction Poverest Road) to be open to all traffic during the Chislehurst bridge closure? Again causing confusion/exasperation with the residents on the northern side of Chipperfield Road is the removal of the bus stop outside Leeson's Primary school which was a pivotal pick up point for the 61's, 273's and R1's.

3. Could the Portfolio Holder have the bus stop outside Leeson's Primary School reinstated urgently (perhaps move slightly down if necessary/or vice versa on the upside route) to enable usage by residents from this part of the estate?

Reply

1. Regarding your questions from 15th November:

i) No action has been taken here, as ongoing observation suggests that further restrictions on Leasons Hill are unnecessary in respect of traffic flow, but would be likely to cause further inconvenience for residents by way of parking displacement being forced into neighbouring residential side streets.

ii) Officers have made recommendations supporting the laying of a yellow line which will remove approximately 5 vehicles from this location to ease congestion, whilst retaining other parking stock to minimise parking displacement being forced into neighbouring residential side streets.

I am not aware of any complaints having been “overlooked”.

2. I am aware of no immediate need to do so at this time.

3. There is a new bus stop in Leasons Hill just to the west of Silverdale Road, which is working well in this location and is only 100 yards from the previous location. The bus stop could not be retained in the previous location due to congestion issues related to the increased volume of traffic on this route since 7th November.

The Meeting ended at 10.26 pm

Chairman