

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 20 November 2012

Present

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)

Councillors Reg Adams, Nicholas Bennett J.P.,
Peter Fookes, Julian Grainger, Samaris Huntington-
Thresher and Nick Milner

22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillors Ellie Harmer, David Jefferys and Ian Payne. Councillor Nicholas Bennett J.P. attended as alternate for Councillor Jefferys.

Apologies were also received from Councillor Colin Smith as Environment Portfolio Holder and Councillor Peter Fortune as Portfolio Executive Assistant.

23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman and Councillors Reg Adams and Peter Fookes declared personal interests in item 7f by virtue of each living at an address in a road highlighted for potential highway maintenance works.

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

There were no questions to the Committee.

25 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 25TH SEPTEMBER 2012

The minutes were agreed.

Where work had yet to be taken forward on pinch points considered by the Congestion Working Party, Councillor Julian Grainger asked that these are not overlooked where congestion remained an issue. In response it was indicated that reference would be made to the full list of pinch points in case further funding might become available. Members were invited to continue to highlight locations of concern.

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

Three questions had been received from Mr. Colin Willetts for written reply. Details of the questions and replies are at **Appendix A**.

27 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS

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

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

A) BUDGET MONITORING 2012/13

Report ES12138

Based on expenditure and activity levels to 30th September 2012, the 2012/13 controllable budget for the Environment Portfolio was projected to under spend by £255k.

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.

Report ES12138 also outlined expenditure against Member Priority Initiatives for the Environment Portfolio and progress of the selected projects.

Responding to a suggestion from Councillor Grainger, the Chairman felt that the Parking Working Group could consider matters such as demand versus income and peak and off-peak parking times in the context of a projected parking shortfall.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) endorse the latest 2012/13 budget projection for the Environment Portfolio; and

(2) note progress with implementing the Environment projects within the Member Priority Initiatives programme.

B) CAPITAL PROGRAMME - 2ND QUARTER MONITORING 2012/13

Report RES12179

At its meeting on 24th October 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 outlined as were comments on individual schemes in the 2012/13 programme.

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

**C) BRITTENDEN PARADE GREEN STREET GREEN – PROPOSED
MAKING UP**

Report ES12141

A Resolution of Approval was sought under the private Street Works Code in respect of Brittenden Parade. A First Resolution under s.205(1) of the Highways Act 1980 was made by the Portfolio Holder on 5th October 2012.

Consultation results indicated a majority of owners and occupiers of retail and residential premises at Brittenden Parade supporting the making up. The support of one of the residents was conditional upon a future consideration of the control of parking in the street.

The area was currently being considered for a scheme of waiting restrictions for this part of Green Street Green. Following implementation of such a scheme and completion of the Brittenden Parade adoption, the situation in the street would be monitored with a view to introducing restrictions as necessary.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) approve without modification the specification, plan no. ESD/10542-4, sections, estimate and provisional apportionment now submitted by the Director of Environmental Services, in respect of the scheme approved by the Environment Portfolio Holder on 5th October 2012; and

(2) further resolve that the Council bears the whole of the cost of the street works, which will be met from funding provided by Transport for London, under the provisions of s.236(1) of the Highways Act 1980.

**D) CONGESTION RELIEF SCHEME BLACKBROOK LANE/
BICKLEY PARK ROAD**

Report ES12134

Members considered proposals to improve the junction of Blackbrook Lane with Bickley Park Road to reduce traffic congestion.

Drawing VN 50092-ECC-DG-002 showed a layout should a new path for pedestrians be constructed using adjacent land towards Wellsmoor Gardens and Officers were investigating land ownership issues.

Drawing 11252-01 showed an alternative layout, increasing the Bickley Park Road carriageway to provide two slightly narrower lanes northbound and a reduced footway width.

A S106 agreement associated with development at Golf Road would fund the works.

Councillor Grainger felt the scheme at Drawing VN 50092-ECC-DG-002, with the path diverted, would provide an improvement for pedestrians and road users.

Councillor Bennett enquired about any parking restrictions and it was indicated that north bound restrictions might be put forward on the route to Bromley in association with development.

Noting that hatch marking was worn along Blackbrook Lane, Councillor Bennett felt that the hatching was not worthwhile if vehicles had to travel over it. It was indicated that drivers would travel over the hatching when there were parked vehicles and where the hatching worked the Head of Traffic and Road Safety preferred to see a small amount spent to preserve it. If drivers had to drive over the hatching, it was necessary for drivers to take care.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) approve consultation on a new layout for the junction to improve vehicle traffic flow into and out of Bickley Park Road and Blackbrook Lane;**
- (2) include any required road widening and any footway or path works with the design at Drawing VN 50092-ECC-DG-002 being preferred if a new pedestrian path could be provided;**
- (3) proceed with the design at Drawing 11252-01 if a new path cannot be provided;**
- (4) delegate decisions concerning the details of any design - including the location, design and type of material for any new footway/path - to the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with Ward Members and the Portfolio Holder, having regard to the outcomes of consultation; and**
- (5) the costs of the works be met from Section 106 funding.**

E) ROAD SAFETY SCHEME SEVENOAKS WAY/ MAIN ROAD

Report ES12135

To reduce traffic delays in Main Road at its junction with Sevenoaks Way, Members considered a scheme for adding traffic signals at the junction incorporating crossing facilities for cyclists and pedestrians. Delays also occurred in Sevenoaks Way from regular use of the Pelican crossing 70m north of the junction and it was proposed that signal elements of the crossing be removed.

Councillor Grainger felt that traffic signals would not reflect varying demands at different times of day, suggesting a roundabout instead. As an alternative to turning right from Main Road into Sevenoaks Way during congestion,

Councillor Grainger felt that motorists could travel along Sandy Lane; he also suggested that motorists heading towards Chislehurst could turn left from Main Road into Sevenoaks Way and then right into Broomwood Road. Councillor Grainger also considered the Leasons Hill junction to be the biggest cause of congestion along Sevenoaks Way and felt there would be less funds for any roundabout at that junction with £120k given to a signalised junction with Main Road.

With a roundabout, Members were advised that traffic flow would be across Sevenoaks Way with consequent difficulties for drivers exiting Main Road; this could encourage drivers to proceed via St Mary Cray where there were already delays. Significant use of the existing pelican crossing during morning peak also caused a lot of traffic delay. Removing it and incorporating pedestrian facilities in a signalised junction would improve traffic flow. Concerning the Leasons Hill junction, the current right turn ban on Leasons Hill would be retained in view of the significant improvements created for North/South traffic flow.

The Head of Traffic and Road Safety outlined the advantages of traffic lights for the Main Road junction, the use of which had been modelled. He could not recommend a roundabout for the junction.

Councillor Grainger acknowledged that north bound traffic along Sevenoaks Way would have priority with a roundabout but felt that signals during morning and evening peak times would contribute to congestion. He was concerned that traffic would back up along Sevenoaks Way to the A20 roundabout. Recognising that some motorists currently nudge part way across Sevenoaks Way when exiting right from Main Road, Councillor Grainger suggested that it might be helpful to have measures for guiding motorists to a point half way across the road.

Members were advised that modelling suggested that traffic signals would reduce backup in both directions along Sevenoaks Way. Different options could also be considered for phasing the lights and detailed design of the scheme although it was likely there would be an indicative right turn.

Councillor Fookes felt that a mechanism was necessary to advise the public on detailed aspects of a scheme. Councillor Grainger suggested that the Sevenoaks Way/Main Road scheme would be of interest to non-ward Members as it concerned a primary road in the borough. The Chairman suggested the Communications Working Group consider technology such as Facebook and the Council's website to publicise schemes in "the pipeline" i.e. those schemes agreed for implementation. The Head of Traffic and Road Safety was interested to hear of Members' views on this. Councillor Bennett suggested linking such an approach to the "*Fix my Street*" page of the Council's website. Rather than use the page solely for reporting problems, Councillor Bennett suggested that it be used to provide information on developments affecting any given street. Councillor Grainger felt that it should be easier for residents to make suggestions but was uneasy about publicising any schemes under active consideration. Councillor Adams suggested

publishing, as a minimum, the detail of schemes about to be implemented rather than any long list of schemes. Councillor Nicholas Milner also felt that it was only schemes that had been decided which should be published.

Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher also felt that it was worth considering how information is stored, indicating that decisions should be easily located on the Council website and provided in a separate area.

RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) approve consultation based on a new layout of the junction to reduce traffic delays in Main Road, as shown in drawing number 11245-1;

(2) delegate the decision regarding final detail of the design to the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with Ward Members and the Portfolio Holder, having regard to the outcome of the consultation - this to include any alterations to the Pelican facility 70m away; and

(3) ensure that costs of the above work be met from the TfL LIP formula funding allocation, along with additional Greenway funding.

F) 2013/14 PLANNED HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME

Report ES12113

Members considered the planned highway maintenance programme for 2013/14 and future years.

Councillor Grainger was of the view that the lists appended to Report ES12113 included some sections of highway which he felt did not require attention. Highlighting the footway at Station Approach, Chelsfield (Appendix A) he felt that it was the carriageway rather than footway that required improvement. He also referred to a section of Warren Road requiring attention rather than the whole road. Farrant Way and Warren Drive were also highlighted. Concerning NTL resources, Councillor Grainger suggested that the funding be used to repair concrete crossovers.

Members were advised that the carriageway at Station Approach, Chelsfield was under consideration for attention. The footway on the approach was cracked and old and used by commuters. Concerning Warren Road, the part of the road in most need of attention was its western part where there were issues with jointing. Reference was made to improving this section of the road and carrying out works to the remainder of the road whilst in the location. Concerning concrete crossovers, it was indicated that one-off repairs could be made using resources from the reactive works budget.

Councillor Grainger highlighted that the Station Approach footway had a mastic surface. On Warren Road, although he felt that its non-western part

was not in a good condition he suggested that funds could be used on roads elsewhere which were in a poorer state.

In response to a question from the Chairman it was indicated that kerbstones were not routinely replaced during maintenance unless their condition warranted it. Members were also advised that when carrying out footway works, driveways/crossovers would normally be replaced on a like for like basis except where residents had requested and paid for block paving - approximately one month prior to works starting a letter would be sent to residents offering the provision of block paving.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) agree the schemes listed at Appendix A of Report ES12113 to form the basis of the Council's programme of planned highway maintenance for 2013/14 subject to budgetary provision for the works to be progressed and consideration of PDS Member comments;

(2) note the outline programmes for future years as listed at Appendices B and C;

(3) note the proposed TfL funded programme of works (Principal Roads) at Appendix D;

(4) consider PDS Member comments in relation to –

- **the schemes listed at Appendix E and funding them from the 'one-off spend' programme and**
- **funding the additional schemes listed at Appendix F from the NTL resources and recommending that the Executive agree to release the £483k from the Street Services Reinstatement Fund from 1st April 2013; and**

(5) note the potential impact on the highway asset of any reduction in the planned maintenance budget.

29 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE

A) PARKING SHARED SERVICE

Report ES12110

Members considered a report seeking Executive approval to proceed with a shared parking service with the London Borough of Bexley.

It summarised the outcome of discussions with LB Bexley on creating a shared service and provided an assessment of the likely levels of savings that could be achieved through adopting this approach.

By combining services there was the potential for management costs and other overheads to be reduced without affecting front-line service delivery. Management, back office and ICT functions could be streamlined to enable cashable savings and best practice to be developed across both authorities. Savings were anticipated from April 2013 with further potential savings when contractual obligations for parking enforcement expire and can be aligned into a single shared contract.

A proposed shared service staffing structure was appended to Report ES12110. Elements of the current management structures for delivering parking services in Bromley and Bexley were effectively duplicated. From discussions and research, ongoing financial savings would be generated through a shared parking service under one management structure.

Further efficiency savings from a stand-alone LB Bromley parking service would be unlikely to generate staffing savings of more than 1 fte at current enforcement activity levels. Moreover there would be no additional saving from a shared ICT contract. Joint procurement of parking enforcement could provide some savings but it was unlikely these would be on the scale achievable from a single shared contract.

On 1st June 2009 the Committee previously considered savings through outsourcing Parking Appeals and Debt Recovery ('Report of the Member Parking Working Group' ES09053) but took the view that "*Functions relating to motorists' representations, and debt collection, should continue to be provided as part of the core in-house Parking service*" and that "*the business case for (externalisation) should be examined when the options for the parking enforcement contract are next considered*".

Any potential to generate additional savings through externalisation could be explored particularly activities related to the management of motorists' appeals, representations and the collection of PCN fines with two options outlined to Members for bringing forward this assessment:

- once the shared service had been successfully established; or
- assessed prior to the proposed establishment of the shared service in April 2013.

Pursuing the second option would impact on the work being undertaken to draw up and negotiate the formal shared service Collaboration Agreement as well as the detailed practical work being undertaken to ensure the shared service is established successfully. A view from LB Bexley officers was provided for the meeting indicating that LB Bexley officers were strongly of the opinion that the Parking Shared Service should be established to the original timescales of 1st April 2013 and that opportunities to further externalise services should be pursued after the merger and in a format and timescale to maximise efficiencies.

The anticipated benefits of the business case included:

- Operational cost reductions for both boroughs;
- Greater service resilience – the service would be less vulnerable to staffing changes and would have a reduced exposure to variations in parking activity;
- Pooling of staff capability and resources, increasing the potential opportunities for service improvement benefitting motorists and residents within Bromley and Bexley.

The key principles behind the agreement are that:

- This would be a partnership between both boroughs, with benefits and costs shared, as agreed by both parties;
- Appropriate governance arrangements, formalised in a Collaboration Agreement would ensure democratic accountability;
- There would be a single, joint management structure providing leadership and accountability to both boroughs;
- LB Bromley would act as host borough for the shared service;
- Specialist and support staff would be shared (it is proposed that all staff would be based at Bromley's Civic Centre, with those staff employed by LB Bexley seconded to LB Bromley)
- Service contracts would be harmonised and jointly procured (ICT in April 2013 and Enforcement by April 2016);
- Best practice within each parking service will be deployed to the benefit of both authorities.

A summary of staff responses to consultation and corresponding management comments was also provided to the Committee.

With a staffing structure and formal Collaborative Agreement in place, the shared service would become operational from 1st April 2013. Implementation of the proposals was subject to the L B Bexley also taking a decision to establish the shared Parking service.

In discussion a number of questions were asked and comments made.

Clarification was sought on the risks for Bromley related to non-achievement of income levels for Bexley i.e. that the shared service might not achieve the required levels and that Bromley could be required to compensate Bexley for any potential loss of income. In response it was indicated that officers were undertaking more work on the risks and their scale, being the lead borough on the shared service. Much would be set out in the Collaboration Agreement. The main risk for Bromley was in connection with losing income to Bexley in relation to the speed of decisions concerning appeals and on statutory deadlines and the risk of having to write off appeals. If there were particular difficulties and about 10% of PCNs were not processed on time the risk might equate to about £200k a year. However, the probability of this happening was low. Currently all Bromley appeals are dealt with in less than 2 months, well

ahead of the statutory 6 month deadline. Only 17% of Bromley PCN appeals go to the statutory London Parking Appeals body for adjudication. The risk was considered bearable. More work on this area was being undertaken, but currently it was the officer view that risks were not considered serious and the likelihood of income loss due to Bromley was small. The Chairman suggested that consideration should be given to Bromley charging Bexley an annual premium commensurate to the risk being taken by Bromley within the Shared Service to recompense Bexley if income levels were not achieved if appropriate.

It was also explained that there would be scope to adjust the service based on the number of PCNs in Bromley or Bexley. If there were peaks that were difficult to cope with, there were agency teams that could be used.

Councillor Bennett suggested that there were savings to be made if Bexley's performance could be improved to Bromley's performance level given that some 40% of Bexley's PCNs go to the stage of formal notice (i.e. to the statutory London Appeal body), compared with 17% in Bromley. An enquiry was made on why less PCNs were issued in Bexley. Members were advised that Bexley was a smaller borough and there had been less enforcement activity, and it was indicated that officers would seek to improve the performance of the enforcement contractor. It was also confirmed that the sharing of staffing costs at a 64.5:35.5 split proposed on the relative numbers of PCNs issued would be open to amendment were Bexley to increase their enforcement of parking zones etc.

With a reduction in posts to 27.5 fte posts for the proposed new structure, a question was asked on whether the lost posts would be management posts. Members were advised that savings would be achieved through removing duplication and by having a larger organisation it was easier to manage peak demands. The Member also enquired whether there were not anomalies in staff employment for the new structure compared with LBB proposals for localised pay and conditions of service. In response it was indicated that secondment was recommended for LB Bexley employees to work at the Civic Centre. They would continue to be LB Bexley employees with their L B Bexley terms and conditions of employment remaining. Although there would be some staff with LB Bexley terms and conditions and some staff with LB Bromley terms and conditions, it was indicated that the financial and flexibility advantages of the proposed shared service were sufficient to outweigh continued employment of staff by the respective Councils. It was also highlighted that both boroughs would have the protection of being able to change their arrangements if it was decided in the future that a shared service was no longer appropriate for a borough. This would be included in the Collaboration Agreement. Councillor Fookes enquired whether there might be scope to work with other Local Authorities in addition to L B Bexley and Members were referred to other examples of parking shared services including arrangements between Essex County Council and Districts within the County. There were also examples in Wales.

If the parking service were to be externalised in the future, Councillor Adams sought assurance that statutory consultation procedures would be followed. Members were advised that if externalisation was considered to provide advantages, formal consultation would be needed with staff.

Referring to recommendation 2.4 of the report before Members, Councillor Grainger felt that it might be a mistake to consider externalisation while the joint service beds down. It was indicated to Members that the shared service option provided an opportunity to consider externalisation although it was strongly advised that this take place after the shared service had been successfully established. Members agreed to recommend that an assessment of externalisation opportunities should be brought forward once the shared service had been successfully established. In this scenario Members were advised that an assessment of externalisation would be brought to Members. It was indicated that the assessment would be undertaken soon after the shared service had become operational and that there would be a report within six months of implementing the shared service (i.e. in 12 month's time). Councillor Bennett added that if externalisation was to proceed, a shared joint service could be more attractive to an external provider.

Councillor Grainger could not foresee significant differences in the terms and conditions for employment of parking staff between the two authorities and enquired whether L B Bexley staff could be given an opportunity to transfer to L B Bromley. In response it was indicated that the salary differences for some were small. For the Library shared service, the salary differences between employees of the two authorities had proved to be unchallenging in practice and there had been no practical problems. LB Bexley staff could apply for a LB Bromley post (and *vice-versa*) and it was explained that any new employee would be either LB Bromley or LB Bexley staff. Councillor Bennett suggested that if a post became vacant it should then move over to the LB Bromley establishment and Bromley's terms and conditions. This was supported by Councillor Grainger. Councillor Adams understood that for the fraud detection service shared with LB Greenwich, all new staff were employed by LB Greenwich. The Director saw merit in Councillor Bennett's suggestion and Councillor Bennett indicated that terms and conditions of the post could move across to LB Bromley but any new employee for the post could be paid by LB Bexley.

Councillor Grainger also enquired of the period of notice that would be included in the Collaboration Agreement for either authority to withdraw from the arrangement. Members were advised that there would be a clear timescale to protect both authorities. If Members had concern it was indicated that the period of notice required to withdraw from the arrangements could be taken at Member level or delegated to the Chief Executive. Councillor Grainger felt that a decision on any notice for unwinding should be taken at Executive level. The Chairman suggested that if there was a unilateral decision to unwind there would be a cost for the other Council in leaving.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Executive be recommended to -

(i) note the responses received from staff and their representatives with regard to entering into a shared parking service arrangement with LB Bexley;

(ii) approve the proposal for a shared parking service between the London Boroughs of Bromley and Bexley to be established on the basis set out in Report ES12110;

(iii) delegate to the Chief Executive the power to approve the formal Shared Services Collaborative Agreement between LB Bromley and LB Bexley for the provision of parking services; and

(iv) bring forward an assessment of externalisation opportunities once the shared service has been successfully established with a report on options within 12 months (ideally in September 2013);

(2) the General Purposes and Licensing Committee be recommended to agree (subject to comments of the Executive and Resources PDS Committee and agreement of the Executive) in accordance with Section 113 of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Council's scheme of delegation, to place such of the Council's employees as may fall within the remit of the scoping of the shared parking service, at the disposal of the London Borough of Bexley. Any such officer shall be treated for the purpose of any enactment relating to the discharge of local authorities' functions as an officer of that other local authority.

30 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2012/13; HALF-YEAR PROGRESS REPORT

Report ES12143

This item was deferred to the Committee's meeting on 15th January 2013 when the Portfolio Holder would be present.

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

Report ES12140

In considering the Committee's Work Programme it was highlighted that the Council's Street Cleaning contractor would be attending the Committee's next meeting on 15th January 2013.

Councillor Bennett referred to the *Progress Report on the Committee's Previous Requests* (Appendix 2 to Report ES12140) and recommended that this be positioned at the start of an agenda as a "Matters Arising" report.

Councillor Grainger requested that progress against congestion pinch points remain tracked.

The Chairman supported Councillor Bennett's recommendation that publication of Portfolio Holder Decisions with an agenda was unnecessary as they will have been previously circulated to all Members.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Committee's Work Programme at Appendix 1 to Report ES12140 be agreed;

(2) inclusion of Portfolio Holder Decision Statements with future meeting agendas cease as the Statements will have already been circulated separately to all Members; and

(3) the Environment Portfolio contracts listed at Appendix 3 to Report ES12140 be noted.

32 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

33 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF A PART 2 REPORT TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER

A) AWARD OF PARKING ICT CONTRACT

Report ES12139

Members considered the outcome of tendering the Parking ICT contract.

34 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE EXECUTIVE

A) AWARD OF STREET LIGHTING MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENTS CONTRACT AND STREET LIGHTING INVEST TO SAVE INITIATIVE

Report ES12114

Members considered the results of a tender exercise for the Street Lighting Maintenance and Improvements Contract (including street lights, lit signs, bollards, central island posts etc).

In discussion of the item Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP referred to a preference of the Secretary of State for Transport to take measures requiring that unnecessary road signs and poles are removed from the roadside. Councillor Bennett suggested that a letter be sent to the Secretary of State in

support of such measures. In this regard Councillor Bennett proposed the following motion which was agreed:

“That we welcome the concerns of the Secretary of State for Transport on the proliferation of street signs and ask that the Environment Portfolio Holder write to the Secretary of State regarding requirements for parking signs for each space and the siting of road signs to the nearest lighting column rather than at a precise distance from the hazard which will lead to considerable savings over time for all Local Authorities; secondly, it will contribute to improving the ascetic appearance of a street.”

Members were advised that it was understood the Department for Transport was looking into changing regulations and it was expected that in a couple of years there would be new regulations; decluttering was being looked at with measures such as time plates for parking plates.

B) STREET WORKS TENDER (NRSWA)

Report ES12115

Members considered the outcome of a procurement exercise for the Inspection of Street Works Contract 2013 and recommendation for the award of contract.

APPENDIX A

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

1. Following my complaints to the Council and my written question to Environmental PDS Committee 25/9/12 regarding illegal fly tipping/dumped rubbish in Cotmandene Crescent car park, i) can the Portfolio Holder tell me the approximate date the covert CCTV camera was stolen and assuming the camera has been replaced did it/does it have sufficient capacity/quality to 'pan out' across the car park to 'clearly indentify' perpetrators committing this environmental nuisance?

Reply

The camera was stolen around the second week of September and has not been replaced to date. At some point in the not too distant future further surveillance will be undertaken, although I obviously cannot advise publicly when that will be in light of recent events. The camera did have sufficient capacity, although it was of 'fix focus' design as it's intention was to record registration numbers.

2. Further to my written question to the Environmental PDS Committee 25/9/12, i) is the Portfolio Holder now in a position to tell me how many offenders (if any?) the Council has taken action against/or prosecuted for illegally flytipping/dumping rubbish in Cotmandene Crescent car park from April 2012 to 21/11/12?

Reply

Due to the theft outlined above. Three.

3. Further to my written question to Environmental PDS committee 25/9/12, i) could the Portfolio Holder provide the approximate total cost of removing fly tipped bagged arisings/rubbish via the 'grab lorry' in Cotmandene Crescent car park from April 2012 to 21/11/12?

Reply

£3,025.

The Meeting ended at 10.36 pm

Chairman