

## ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 25 September 2012

### Present

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)  
Councillor Ellie Harmer (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Reg Adams, Peter Fookes, Julian Grainger,  
David Jefferys and Sarah Phillips

### Also Present

Councillor Colin Smith and Councillor Peter Fortune

#### 14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors Samaris Huntington-Thresher and Nick Milner. Councillor Sarah Phillips attended as substitute for Councillor Nick Milner.

#### 15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations.

#### 16 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

There were no questions to the Committee.

#### 17 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 3RD JULY 2012

The minutes were agreed subject to concern about wording in the third paragraph of Minute 7C. (*Democratic Services Note: subsequent to the 25<sup>th</sup> September meeting this paragraph was removed from the 3<sup>rd</sup> July minutes with the start of the fourth paragraph at Minute 7C of those minutes amended to read "Responding to enquiries/comment from Councillor Grainger, the Director indicated that proposals for ....."*).

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

A question from Mrs Vikki Hughes for oral reply had been received and three questions from Mr Colin Willetts for written reply had also been received. Details of the questions and replies are at **Appendix A**.

**19 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS**

Decisions of the Portfolio Holder made since the previous meeting of the Committee were noted.

**20 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**A) BUDGET MONITORING 2012/13**

**Report ES12109**

Based on expenditure and activity levels to 31st August 2012, the Environment Portfolio was projected to be balanced at year end.

Details were provided of the 2012/13 projected outturn with a forecast of projected spend for each division compared to the latest approved budget. Background to variations was also outlined.

Councillor Peter Fookes enquired about background to the shortfall in income for on and off street parking. He was advised of contributory factors which included languishing retail activity (impacted by poor summer weather), new parking increases not taking effect until 30<sup>th</sup> April and performance expectations for parking income being set an optimistic level. The Chairman suggested that parking income may have also been affected by the impact of the Olympics.

Councillor Reg Adams was pleased that the net loss of custom for trade waste collections had been less than anticipated following the increase in prices from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012.

Noting that this position indicated a projected £140k surplus against a projected deficit of £150k for trade waste delivered to the depots (an apparent loss of £10k), the Chairman felt that it was necessary for the Waste Minimisation Working Group to look at the trade waste figures in more detail (before recommending price changes for the 2013/14 financial year).

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the latest 2012/13 budget projection for the Environment Portfolio.**

**B) CAPITAL PROGRAMME - 1ST QUARTER MONITORING 2012/13 AND FINAL OUTTURN 2011/12**

**Report RES12151**

At its meeting on 25th July 2012, the Executive agreed a revised Capital Programme for 2012/13 to 2015/16 and changes in respect of the Capital Programme for the Environment Portfolio were highlighted.

Enquiring of progress with works to the Chislehurst road bridge, Councillor Fookes was advised that completion was due early November (on time).

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to confirm the changes agreed by the Executive in July.**

**C) EXTENSION TO CONTRACT FOR PROVISION OF MOBILE PHONE PARKING**

**Report ES12111**

Report ES12111 reviewed the first 2.5 years of the scheme for mobile phone parking payment, going forward into the third and final year of the contract. There was an option to extend the contract at the Council's discretion for a further period not exceeding two years and Report ES12111 set out the reasons for recommending an extension.

Parking payment by mobile phone had proved to be a continuing success with an average 410 transactions per day. This was steadily increasing with a projected 150,000 transactions for 2012/13. Information was provided on the number of transactions, parking income received and a projection for the extension period.

The removal of 23 pay and display machines at specific on-street locations had also taken place throughout the Borough (enabling the machines to be recycled) with a further 18 machines ready to be removed. The Mobile Phone Parking Scheme was advertised at each location where a machine had been removed. Removal of the machines did not affect the public's ability to pay by cash given the provision of at least one machine within the zone.

Mobile phone payment had contributed to the Council being able to reduce cash collection costs by £43k per annum. If mobile phone payment continued to increase, additional savings could be generated from cash collection costs. The expected growth would also enable more pay and display machines to be removed and recycled.

It was reported that Bromley Parking Services and Cobalt Technologies had worked well together in introducing new parking schemes or making adjustments to parking tariffs. There was scope within the current contact to provide other mobile phone parking solutions in future - Bromley Parking Services and Cobalt were keen to explore such ideas.

Officers had maintained a close interest in services provided by other mobile phone parking companies and were not aware of any different services that would warrant a tendering exercise. It was felt that there were clear advantages to continuing with the contract and the Portfolio Holder was recommended to grant a contract extension for a further two years.

In the first two financial years of operation income from Mobile Phone payment was £225k and receipt of an estimated £300k was expected for

2012/13. With a further two year contract it was anticipated that income received could reach £600k per annum and this was likely to generate additional savings from reduced cash collections.

In discussion Councillor Grainger highlighted what he felt was an inconsistency whereby it was possible to “top up” parking payment by mobile phone but “feeding” a pay and display meter was technically a contravention which was subject to the issue of a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) if undertaken regularly. He also enquired whether pay and display machines indicated certain charges associated with calls from mobile phones to the payment company.

Councillor Fookes suggested that consideration should perhaps be given to dispensing with cash payment for parking. The Head of Parking advised that mobile phone payment currently comprised some four to five percent of total parking transactions. Councillor David Jefferys felt that many residents such as the elderly would want to retain payment options.

The Chairman referred to trying to promote a modal shift on parking payment – if savings could be made it would help to prevent parking charges increasing. Councillor Grainger shared the concerns of Councillor Jefferys and felt that there would be a limit to the take up of mobile phone payment. Councillor Grainger was opposed to payment solely by mobile phone although he felt that further consideration should be given to parking payment by debit card.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:**

**(1) grant the contract extension on mobile phone parking payment for a further two years; and**

**(2) continue the policy of reducing the number of pay and display machines where practical.**

#### **D) TFL FUNDED WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2013/14**

##### **Report ES12116**

In relation to Bromley’s 2013/14 formula allocation from TfL (£2.771m), Portfolio Holder approval was sought for a recommended list of schemes to submit to TfL in early October 2012.

Ring-fenced TfL funding would also be available to support other programmes, including Local Transport Priorities, Principal Road Maintenance, Bridges/Structures and Bromley North Village. As such the Portfolio Holder was also asked to approve a bid for Bridges and Structures and a Programme of Principal Road Maintenance for submission to TfL.

Highlighting the A224 congestion relief scheme (northern section), Councillor Grainger considered the Leasons Hill/Sevenoaks Way junction to be more

significant in contributing to congestion than the Nugent Centre entrance/exit. In response it was indicated that the project was looking to link signals and their junctions along Sevenoaks Way. Studies had shown that the Nugent Centre would be the main traffic blockage. With signals installed at the Nugent Centre junction all signals would then be linked along the Orpington by pass northern section. Improving the Nugent Centre exit would be the major part of the scheme's cost.

Councillor Grainger also referred to opening the north east corner of St Mary Cray High Street for one-way traffic (which would involve opening the rear of the Nugent Centre to the High Street). Members were advised that this had been looked at but rejected for the present time - it would encourage too much traffic on to the minor road.

In connection with Bromley's status as a "*Biking Borough*", Councillor Jefferys was informed that there were a couple of options for proposed junction improvements at Westmoreland Road/High Street. Details would be brought to the Committee for consideration; the outcome of the planning process was also awaited in respect of Site L.

Concerning pedestrian crossings in the context of cycling and walking schemes, Councillor Grainger expressed a preference for refuges. An explanation was also provided on the proposed scheme for Shire Lane involving access to the bus stop by High Elms Country Park. Councillor Grainger also highlighted school travel plan monitoring and review; the Head of Traffic and Road Safety indicated that monitoring would continue and that current monitoring approaches provided information. Most of funding was spent on developing plans; much less time was spent reviewing and there was an emphasis on what would change travel behaviours.

For Congestion Relief, Councillor Reg Adams noted that there were no schemes included for the Penge/Crystal Palace area and he enquired how the congestion relief funding was allocated. In reply, reference was made to outcomes from the former Congestion Working Party and pinch points highlighted in the review. To make a significant impact on congestion officers had looked at key pinch points such as the A224 Orpington by pass. The Penge/Crystal Palace area would be looked at for the future; however, schemes providing maximum benefit would be taken forward. Councillor Fookes suggested that it be would useful to see schemes not included and Councillor Grainger suggested a list identifying pinch points from the Congestion review where work had completed. The Chairman asked the Head of Traffic and Road Safety to circulate the list considered by the Congestion Working Party.

Concerning Road Safety Education, it was explained that "*Smarter Driving*" was aimed mainly at Year 12 students providing them with pre-driver training. It also covered safer driving for adults through the Advance Driving Course. Moped training was also provided for senior school students. Councillor Adams was advised that all types of secondary school could receive relevant training including Academy and Independent Sector schools.

It was also explained that the “*Car Seats Project*” related to the Car Seat Fitting Centre facilitated by the Bromley Adult Education College at Nightingale Lane. The Project enabled parents to try a brand of child seat before buying and it was advertised at venues such as neo-natal clinics and schools. It also offered a training programme to local retail staff involved in child seat sales, providing advice on the proper fitting of car seats for new born babies.

Under “*Cycling and Walking Schemes*”, the Chairman noted a proposed scheme entitled “*Upgrade Bridleway, 192 Court Road*”. Members were advised that the footpath was not in good condition from Ramsden Road; the Chairman felt that it was necessary to clarify what was meant by 192.

Members were advised that the list of schemes at Enclosure 1 to Report ES12116 was a suggested programme (even though the list might be submitted to TfL). The report indicated that there would be little difficulty in changing the list of schemes following submission or during 2013/14 itself. On proposals for the 2013/14 Principal Road Maintenance Programme, the Head of Traffic and Road Safety indicated that there would be opportunity for the Committee to consider a final Programme later in the year and that the Programme at Enclosure 2B to the report was not therefore final.

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

- (1) the programme of formula funded schemes for 2013/14 at Enclosure 1 be approved for submission to Transport for London;**
- (2) the bid for Bridges and Structures at Enclosure 2A be approved for submission to Transport for London;**
- (3) the programme for Principal Road Maintenance at Enclosure 2B be approved for submission to Transport for London; and**
- (4) the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder, be authorised to make post-submission changes to the programme to reflect any necessary changes to priority, potential delays to implementation following detailed design and consultation, or other unforeseen events.**

#### **E) GREEN STREET GREEN PARKING REVIEW**

##### **Report ES12121**

Portfolio Holder approval was sought for the introduction of a parking scheme in the Green Street Green area.

There is a high demand from shoppers, workers and residents to park on street given a number of small business units in the High Street at Green Street Green. Additionally a number of properties close to the High Street

have limited off street parking facilities and residents can find it difficult to find a suitable parking place.

Following informal consultation with Ward Members, traders and resident groups, a formal consultation was undertaken in August 2012 to assess support for introducing a parking scheme.

Proposals for the scheme as originally drafted were outlined in Report ES12121. At the meeting additional drawings were tabled showing:

- a revised drawing (Drawing Number 11033-05 Revision A) for the Green Street Green Parking Scheme to replace the drawing appended to Report ES12121;
- a proposed parking scheme for "Old" Shire Lane (Drawing Number 11160-01); and
- proposed parking restrictions around the Beechwood Estate (Drawing Number 11033-01-10 Revision C).

Certain details in the text of Report ES12121 were amended by virtue of Drawing Number 11033-05 Revision A. This drawing took account of the outcomes from consultation - which were not available when the report was drafted - along with outcomes of a meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2012 between Councillor Grainger, the Head of Traffic and Road Safety and the Contact Officer for the report.

The Head of Traffic and Road Safety explained that some of the Green Street Green parking was associated with Metrobus staff based at the nearby Metrobus garage. It had been suggested by Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher that officers also look at using "Old" Shire Lane for parking. The proposal for consideration was that free parking spaces be allocated at places along "Old" Shire Lane subject to continued access to the salt depot at the end of the Lane. Concerning proposed parking restrictions for the Beechwood Estate, the Head of Traffic and Road Safety indicated that consultation would be undertaken on the proposals.

Councillor Grainger supported views conveyed prior to the meeting from Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher. It would be helpful to have the additional parking in "Old" Shire Lane and the additional parking indicated on Drawing 11033-05 Revision A. Reference was also made to drawing away Metrobus and Waitrose staff from parking in Laxey and Lezayre Roads.

To prevent any problems for snow clearance vehicles exiting the salt depot along "Old" Shire Lane, the Chairman suggested a restriction preventing overnight parking along the Lane. Councillor Adams suggested that any restriction apply to a period when snow clearance vehicles might be likely to operate and it was confirmed that seasonal restrictions could be looked into.

**RESOLVED** that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) implement parking changes shown on Drawing Number 11033-05 Revision A along with the additional parking and changes for “Old” Shire Lane as shown on Drawing Number 11160-01;**
- (2) undertake a consultation on the proposed parking restrictions around the Beechwood Estate (Drawing Number 11033-01-10 Revision C);**
- (3) delegate the decision on final design of the schemes at (1) and (2) above to the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder and Ward Members; and**
- (4) agree that the Green Street Green and Old Shire Lane schemes be reviewed after six months to determine if they have met their objectives and to discover if parking issues need to be addressed in any roads currently outside of the affected area, and that if a scheme is installed in the Beechwood Estate that this scheme is also reviewed at the same time as the Green Street Green and “Old” Shire Lane schemes.**

**F) BRITTENDEN PARADE, GREEN STREET GREEN - PROPOSED MAKING UP**

**Report ES12128**

Details were provided of the referendum results into the making up of Brittenden Parade.

**RESOLVED** that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) Approve the layout for Brittenden Parade as shown on drawing no. ESD-10542-3**
- (2) Make a First Resolution under s.205(1) of the Highways Act 1980 in respect of Brittenden Parade as follows:**

***The Council do hereby declare that Brittenden Parade, Green Street Green is not sewered, levelled, paved, metalled, flagged, channelled, made good and lighted to its satisfaction and therefore resolve to execute street works therein, under the provisions of the Private Street Works Code as set out in the Highways Act 1980.***

**Schedule of Works**

***From the junction with Glentrammon Road to the north to a point some 45.0m south where the street terminates outside no. 5 Brittenden Parade, as more particularly shown on drawing no. ESD-10542-3***



## **21 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME AND MATTERS ARISING**

### **Report ES12108**

In considering the Work Programme, the Chairman was keen for the Committee's Working Groups to take forward outstanding matters.

In particular, the Chairman was looking to see the Transport Priorities Working Group begin its review on tram and DLR links into the borough. He indicated that the Working Group should begin this aspect of its work ahead of considering a Borough Transport Policy which could start next year - this would be in advance of the next Local Implementation Plan (LIP) process.

### **APPENDIX A**

#### **QUESTION TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MRS VIKKI HUGHES, WICKHAM COMMON RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION (WCRA) FOR ORAL REPLY**

1. Following an accident the WCRA is re-igniting the appeal for a pedestrian crossing on the A232 Croydon Road, close to Hartfield Crescent. This location is used extensively by school children at peak rush hour, from an estate effectively cut off from Hayes. What, after over 10 years, is the best way to ensure a successful outcome?"

#### **Reply**

Mindful of the history of this site, likewise of the numerous questions and enquiries posed and considered over time, I am by no means clear that there is either a 'best' or indeed any way at all to obtain the outcome you would prefer.

That said, I am also extremely conscious of the tremendous efforts which have been expended by Ward Councillors and Council Officers alike over time to achieve an accommodation with TfL, and were TfL's position on related matters to change, I know that they can be relied upon to update and inform you immediately.

#### **Supplementary Question**

In her supplementary question, Mrs Hughes sought further advice on how to effectively take forward the Residents Association's appeal for a crossing and whether there was any further way to move forward.

#### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder referred to three particular considerations; (i) the need for TfL agreement to a pedestrian crossing as the A232 is a Principal Road maintained by TfL funding; (ii) land either side of the road being City of

London Common Land and (iii) a need for clarity amongst local residents on measure(s) that are wanted.

The Portfolio Holder was keen to help but indicated that it might be necessary to accept that TfL might not be prepared to change their view. TfL focussed analytically with limited funds and there was a rationale and priority for TfL spending on schemes. The local London Assembly Member and Member of Parliament could also be approached.

-----

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

1. With regard to Cotmandene Crescent Car Park, could the Portfolio Holder tell us the cost on each occasion for removal of i) the dumped bagged arisings (and associated rubbish) at the far end of the car park adjacent to the petrol garage via grab lorry? and ii) the cost on each occasion for the removal of dumped bagged rubbish (and associated bric a brac) in front of the recycling banks?

**Reply**

- i) Where a fly-tip is of sufficient quantity for Veolia to be required to attend with the 'grab lorry', a set price per visit of £47.16 is charged. This covers all material to a maximum volume of 10 cubic metres.
- ii) For small quantities of general waste and bric-a-brac, this is cleared by Kier as part of the daily clean of the Bring Sites incorporated in the Street Cleansing Contract, and there is no specific additional cost involved other than possible additional landfill tax.

-----

2. Could the Portfolio Holder tell us how many offenders the Council has taken action against/or prosecuted for illegally fly tipping/dumping rubbish in Cotmandene Crescent car park over the previous six months up until the 25/9/12?

**Reply**

I will provide you with a full answer to this question at the earliest appropriate opportunity.

-----

3. Following my complaints to the local authority regarding illegal flytipping, can the Portfolio Holder confirm that he will be 'giving the go ahead ' for the installation of CCTV (covert or otherwise) to catch & penalise those perpetrators committing this environmental nuisance in Cotmandene Crescent

car park?

**Reply**

I will provide you with a full answer to this question at the earliest appropriate opportunity.

-----

The Meeting ended at 8.46 pm

Chairman