

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 16 April 2013

Present

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

Also Present

Councillor Colin Smith and Councillor John Ince

54 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillor Ian Payne.

Although present during the early and later stages of the meeting, Councillor David Jefferys apologised that he would have to leave part way through to attend another appointment.

55 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations.

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

There were no questions to the Committee.

57 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 5TH MARCH 2013

The minutes were agreed.

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

Three questions were received from Mr Colin Willetts for written reply. Details of the questions and replies are at **Appendix A** along with questions submitted for the Committee's previous meeting and their written replies.

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

A) BUDGET MONITORING 2012/13

Report ES13039

Based on expenditure and activity levels to 31st January 2013, the 2012/13 controllable budget for the Environment Portfolio had been projected to under spend by £6k.

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 ES13039 also outlined expenditure against Member Priority Initiatives for the Environment Portfolio and progress of the selected projects. It also highlighted that the final payment of a European grant had been received for the Commerce project. This, together with the release of provisions made for the project totalled £97k. Subject to Executive approval, it was proposed to transfer this amount to the earmarked reserve, for any possible redundancy costs in future related to TfL funded staff.

In response to a question from Councillor Peter Fookes, it was confirmed that no TfL funded staff were being lost and there was no indication that LIP funding would cease. The proposed transfer of £97k to an earmarked reserve would be held to cover any possible redundancy costs for TfL funded staff should the costs not be able to be contained within LIP resources.

Councillor Julian Grainger questioned whether the projected shortfall for on and off-street parking could be attributed to current economic conditions. He felt the economy was currently stable and he sought evidence that economic conditions might have contributed to the shortfall. It was explained that fewer people overall were parking – less than originally projected. There was also a lower footfall in town centres. The downturn took place in the first year of the recession and parking demand had remained stagnant since then.

On enquiring whether there were shorter parking times or less parking, Councillor Grainger was advised that overall visits had reduced as had revenue from parking tickets.

Concerning rebates and credits of Cr £80k for street lighting electricity, it was indicated to Councillor Jefferys that this was associated with the terms of the street lighting energy contract where an adjustment was made in the following year for the difference between estimated electricity prices used compared to actual prices.

Highlighting the projected surplus within Trade Waste collection income, Councillor Reg Adams was pleased that the price increase from 1st April 2012 had not had a detrimental effect. With the previous year's price

increase for trade waste collections similarly not having a detrimental effect, Councillor Adams highlighted the advantage over two years of raising trade waste collection prices.

In response to a question from the Vice-Chairman, it was indicated that the Street Scene and Green Space review of back-office functions had been implemented as soon as was possible. There were delays in the planned closure of public conveniences as they were not closed until alternative provision was in place.

Referring to Winter Maintenance costs, Councillor Grainger highlighted a projected £100k variance for salt, gritting and snow clearance. Even though it had been a long cold winter, snow had not fallen to the level of recent winters. It was explained that a lot of precautionary salting had been necessary given the frequency of sub-zero temperatures. Councillor Grainger considered that some salting in the Chelsfield area was excessive given the level of salting found on pavements.

The Chairman highlighted a projected £50k surplus from the green garden waste collection service due to its popularity and a higher take-up than originally budgeted.

In view of winter weather being unpredictable in recent years, the Chairman suggested that the Environment budget bears a limited amount towards winter maintenance costs with a remainder (up to £600k) held as central contingency to be drawn upon when necessary. Supporting the idea, Councillor Grainger suggested that a typical level of winter maintenance be determined from experience over recent years and that any maintenance costs above such a level be met from contingency. The Director indicated his support to having a certain level of contingency.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

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

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

(3) request that the Executive approve the transfer of £97k to an earmarked reserve to meet future possible redundancy costs as detailed at paragraph 5.7 of Report ES13039.

**B) CHISLEHURST AND ST. PAULS CRAY COMMONS
CONSERVATORS - NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION AND
ANNUAL REPORT**

Report ES13040

Approval was sought for the re-appointment of two nominees to the Board of the Chislehurst and St Paul's Cray Commons Conservators following expiry of their term of office during April 2013.

The Conservators had also carried a vacancy from 2011 and a further vacancy had been created following a retirement/resignation. Accordingly, Report ES13040 outlined the Trustees appointed by the Board since the previous nominations report to the Committee.

A member of the Board had also unexpectedly retired early during 2012, and with no additional nominations, it was proposed that the Board of Conservators be given authority to appoint a suitable new member in due course, should a volunteer with the necessary skills and attributes present themselves. This would need to be ratified via the next annual nominations report during 2014. In this context, the Chairman referred to an additional recommendation which had been tabled. This not only recommended that the Portfolio Holder authorise the Board of Conservators to appoint for the vacancy arising last year, but also for any future vacancies, provided details are reported to Members via the annual nominations report.

The Conservators Annual Report for 2012 was also provided.

RESOLVED that Environmental Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) note and approve the retirement and requests for re-standings set out more specifically at paragraph 3.3 of Report ES13040;**
- (2) approve the new nominees within paragraph 3.3 of Report ES13040;**
- (3) receive and note the Conservators Annual Report for 2012 (Appendix A to Report ES13040); and**
- (4) authorise the Board of Conservators to appoint for the current vacancy referred to at paragraph 3.5 of Report ES13040, and for future vacancies, when a suitable candidate volunteers – reporting such details via the annual nominations report.**

**C) TRAFFIC CONGESTION NEAR THE NUGENT CENTRE -
PROPOSED TRAFFIC SIGNALS**

Report ES13021

Changes were recommended at the entrance to the Nugent Centre and nearby locations to reduce congestion and improve safety.

Traffic had increased since completion of the Nugent Centre and queuing, particularly from vehicles turning right on to Cray Avenue (A224), had delayed traffic. A staggered Pelican crossing south of the exit added to congestion with frequent crossings by shoppers across Cray Avenue. It was recommended that the crossing be removed and traffic signals added with pedestrian facilities at the Nugent Centre entrance. This would enable the “walk with traffic” design to be used, minimising delay as some traffic would be able to proceed while pedestrians were crossing.

Such a signal controlled junction would help control vehicles exiting and entering the retail park. Accidents would be reduced as each movement would have its own movement stage, avoiding give way operation. Additionally, shoppers would be more likely to park in the Nugent Centre car park as there would be a dedicated exit stage.

It was also recommended that the section of bus lane, currently suspended, be permanently removed. Although there might be a slight delay to buses, it was expected that their delays overall (in both directions) should be reduced by the improvements proposed.

At detailed design stage it was reported that there might be some changes, including a possible relocation of the bus stop on the southbound approach to the entrance, and the possible addition of a left turn filter lane into the Nugent Centre bypassing the new traffic signals.

As a next stage, it was also proposed to consider linking the Nugent Centre junction with the Leasons Hill traffic signals and use Urban Traffic Control (UTC) along much of the A224. By UTC, Transport for London could take direct control of any traffic signal, including crossings, when long traffic queues were detected. CCTV was usually required for visibility.

An options report was also proposed for considering improvements to the A224/Leasons Hill/Station Road junction and the A224/Station Approach junction.

Installing a no right turn ban at the A224/Leasons Hill junction during the Chislehurst Road bridge closure improved A224 traffic flow and reduced the number of injury accidents at the junction. It was recommended that the ban remain in place for congestion and safety reasons.

Councillor Grainger asked why a signal controlled junction was preferred to a roundabout, which he felt would keep traffic moving. It was explained that a roundabout had been considered by officers but was not recommended. It would mean the existing pelican crossing would have to remain. The proposed new arrangements included a pedestrian phase in the traffic signals which was considered the best option by officers. Modelling figures for a roundabout would be provided to Councillor Grainger for information. Before arriving at a recommendation, Councillor Grainger indicated that he would

have preferred to have seen more evidence on the roundabout option including associated traffic flow figures.

Councillor Grainger also suggested part time signals but it was thought that these might not have been supported by officers. With a signal controlled junction, the traffic lights would take account of the absence of any traffic queue from the retail park.

As a further alternative to traffic signals, Councillor Fookes suggested banning right turns and providing other entrances/exits to the retail park. However, any banning of right turns could encourage motorists to “u-turn” along the A224 and the provision of other entrances/exits was not advocated. Councillor Grainger suggested a vehicle exit along the wide pedestrian route from Marks and Spencer at the Nugent Centre to Mill Brook Road/St Mary Cray High Street (B258). However, the Head of Traffic and Road Safety anticipated a significant issue with channelling a large amount of traffic along such a route. In addition, the Assistant Director (Transport and Highways) anticipated concerns from Affinity Sutton with traffic passing residential land.

The Chairman invited Councillor John Ince (Cray Valley West), to address the Committee. Councillor Ince opposed retention of the current right turn bans at the nearby A224 /Leesons Hill/Station Road junction (Recommendation 2.5 of Report ES13021). He also spoke on behalf of Councillor Fortune and a number of local residents in this regard. Since introducing right turn bans to ease A224 traffic flow during the Chislehurst Road Bridge closure, Councillor Ince indicated that Broomwood Road had been used to provide access via other residential roads to Leesons Hill. There was also an industrial area along Murray Road off Leesons Hill. If the right turn bans continued and more traffic was also generated along Station Approach, Councillor Ince felt that some controls would be needed along this road. To avoid a right turn ban into Station Road, views received by Councillor Fortune also indicated that motorists turn right into Kent Road and then left along St Mary Cray High Street.

Councillor Ince also suggested that the cycle lanes are removed from the A224 near the Nugent Centre to improve traffic flow. He also referred to two lanes converging into one along the A224.

Noting that an options report was proposed on improvements to the A224/Leesons Hill/Station Road junction and the A224/Station Approach junction, Councillor Ince would be prepared to assess the effects of a new signalised junction at the Nugent Centre, including A224 traffic flow, but he wanted to register his objection to the recommendation at 2.5 of Report ES13021.

In the last three years there were 12 injury accidents at the A224/Leesons Hill/Station Road junction with just one of these occurring since the right turn ban was introduced. Additionally, during the right turn bans, 57 cars per hour were delayed compared with delay to approximately 200 vehicles per hour before the right turn bans. On balance, officers favoured retaining the right turn bans.

Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher supported the proposed removal of the bus lane. Motorists were hesitant on when to lawfully use the bus lane - she had noticed that it was usually empty, even during busy times. She also supported the consideration of other options for the A224/ Leeson's Hill/Station Road junction apart from a right turn ban. Concerning the earlier suggestion of using the wide pedestrian route from Marks and Spencer, Nugent Centre, to Mill Brook Road/St Mary Cray High Street (B258), she cautioned against this in view of the B258 being particularly busy on a Saturday.

Councillor Ince favoured removing the bus lane along the A224 between Carlton Parade and Poverest Road.

Given the views expressed on retaining the right turn bans at the A224/ Leeson's Hill/Station Road junction, the Chairman suggested that Recommendation 2.5 of Report ES13021 reflect a retaining of the bans pending a review of the junction. Members were advised that it would take some time for the new Nugent Centre signals to be installed and this would enable any suggestions for the Leeson's Hill junction to be considered.

As the traffic flow had improved along the A224 and taking account of the wishes of local residents to have the right turn bans lifted at the Leeson's Hill junction, Councillor Grainger recommended a roundabout at the junction. He added that for northbound traffic along the A224, the only significant right turn options available with the current bans were at Kent Road or Main Road. He also felt that the pavement should be aligned along the A224 where, heading southwards, the road reduced to a single lane beyond the Poverest Road junction. Councillor Grainger was also in support of transferring the cycle lane from the road to a shared footway.

Councillor Ince highlighted that the top of Station Approach was prone to congestion and he cautioned against encouraging more traffic along the road by retaining the right turn bans.

For Recommendation 2.3 of Report ES13021, Councillor Grainger suggested that Members in the surrounding area should also be consulted by the Executive Director in addition to the Portfolio Holder and Ward Members.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) agree the proposal to implement Traffic signals at the Entrance/Exit of the Nugent retail park, as detailed in drawings labelled '11239- 01' and that the existing staggered Pelican crossing be removed and a full pedestrian crossing stage be incorporated in the new proposed traffic signals;**
- (2) approve the permanent removal of the bus lane, which is currently suspended;**

(3) delegate authority to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Ward Members, to implement any changes considered necessary at the detailed design stage; and

(4) agree that the scheme construction costs of £80k be met from the Transport for London funding for Congestion Relief Schemes; and

(5) approve retention of the current right turn bans at the nearby junction with Leasons Hill and Station Road pending a review of the junction.

D) SERVICE ROAD TO SHOPS FRONTING SOUTHBOROUGH LANE/THE FAIRWAY, BROMLEY - PROPOSED MAKING-UP UNDER PRIVATE STREET WORKS PROCEDURE

Report ES13036

The service roads on either side of the The Fairway, serving Nos. 187-211 Southborough Lane to the west and 213a-239 Southborough Lane to the east, had not been made-up and adopted. There had been a history of complaints about the condition of the roads, particularly the slab-paved footways which were in a poor condition.

The Council was entitled to make-up the footways for adoption under the provisions of the Private Street Works Code, referred to in the Highways Act 1980 and it was proposed that the Council meet the cost of the works, as enabled by S.236 of the Act, rather than recharge most of the cost to frontage owners.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) approve the layout for the footway in front of Nos. 187-211 Southborough Lane, as shown on drawing No. 11324-01-1;

(2) approve the layout for the footway in front of Nos. 213a-239 Southborough Lane, as shown on drawing No. 11324-01-2; and

(3) make a First Resolution under s.205(i) of the Highways Act 1980 in respect of the footways as follows:

The Council do hereby declare that the footway in front of Nos. 187-239 Southborough Lane is not levelled, paved, metalled, flagged channelled and made good to its satisfaction and therefore resolves 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

Part 1 – From a point in line with the Western flank boundary of No. 187 Southborough Lane to the west, to the western boundary of the highway known as The Fairway to the east.

Part 2 – From the eastern boundary of the highway known as The Fairway to the west, to a point in line with the eastern flank boundary of Nos. 237-239 Southborough Lane, to the east.

E) PARKS AND GREENSPACE FEES AND CHARGES

Report ES13038

Approval was sought to revise the existing charging policy for the Bromley Environmental Education Centre at High Elms (BEECHE) and introduce charges for outdoor fitness trainers using the Borough's parks and open spaces commercially.

Report ES13038 outlined the revised BEECHE charges and reasoning for them. It also outlined proposed annual fees to outdoor fitness trainers, according to the number of clients and either one or two sessions per week. A rationale for the proposed charges was also provided.

Potential income from the revised BEECHE charges, 2013/14 was compared to 2012/13 income. Estimated income from fees/charges to outdoor fitness trainers was also provided although it was not known how many applications would be received.

A system of registration, application and checking would need to be introduced for the fitness trainers. A personal trainer would need to apply and provide accredited Fitness Industry Association (FIA) approved training qualifications, risk assessment, lesson plan, Public liability Insurance document and a signed licence/agreement upon which a permit/licence would be issued. A draft licence was appended to Report ES13038.

Subject to revenue collection being economically viable, Councillor Adams felt that charging trainers was justified given that indoor trainers are charged for similar activity in leisure centres. From example fee ranges highlighted by officer research at Appendix 2 to Report ES13038, Councillor Adams favoured examples 1 or 3. Concerning the draft "*Licence to operate*", he thought this seemed watertight from a Council viewpoint and he also asked whether the Council should be discretionary on the types of parks to use for fitness activities. In response, the Licence document was considered to provide a watertight agreement between fitness operators and the Council, putting the onus on the operator. For a trainer having between four and ten clients at one session per week, it was proposed to charge £250.

Without such licensing in operation, Councillor Adams enquired whether the Council would be liable if a member of the public incurred an injury at a

Council owned park. Should there be unauthorised activity, it was suggested the Council would not be liable. Football teams were expected to pay for public liability insurance.

Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher suggested that enforcing a charging system could cost as much as the revenue obtained. Such a watertight licensing arrangement might also cause difficulties for some trainers and be off-putting. She asked how it was proposed to challenge individuals who might simply be a group of friends training. It was indicated that Ward Security personnel would speak to the individuals; the system was not proposed to be onerous and it was necessary for administration to be cost effective. It was proposed to report back to Members on how the system was working. The Chairman also highlighted a role for the Friends of Parks.

Councillor Grainger sought to understand the benefits trainers might receive from registering rather than operating unlicensed at different locations, including open land. He was also concerned that groups of joggers might be mistaken for trainers and clients.

It was suggested there would be a difference between trainers and others such as joggers and footballers. In particular, trainers could be expected to use equipment such as “step-ups”. For any unlicensed session, it was proposed that Ward personnel would approach the trainer(s) to offer advice on the licensing system and provide leaflets.

A registered trainer would also be expected to have the necessary professional fitness qualifications and a Council licensing system would help to improve the local outdoor fitness offer. People had also been asking for such arrangements.

However, in line with removing obstacles for business, Councillor Grainger suggested this might not be achieved by the approach proposed. He also asked why a trainer needed to have Public Liability Insurance cover of £5m for any one incident. Councillor Adams thought £5m seemed to be the insurance sector’s starting point. Councillor Milner saw the proposed system as a measure to manage a demand. He felt the draft licence was not onerous, provided the licensee obtained the necessary insurance cover.

In response to a question from the Vice-Chairman, it was confirmed that officers would seek evidence of CRB checks for trainers and their staff. However, Councillor Grainger questioned why the Council should be concerned about CRB checks if children were not being trained. Given his concern for practicalities such as enforcement and administration costs, Councillor Grainger preferred to support the system on a trial basis only.

The Chairman highlighted that at Goddington Park, runners were assisting in restoring the Pavilion and contributing to the park’s efficient running. He supported the proposed licensing system provided fitness trainers and their clients moved around a park to limit grass damage to an area. Councillor

Fookes also supported charging particularly where operators used a Council park and advertised.

Concerning BEECHE, it was confirmed to Councillor Fookes that the Council was funding the Centre to an amount of between £50k and £60k per year. Councillor Fookes suggested charging academy schools more than the borough's maintained schools.

Councillor Grainger highlighted that most visits to BEECHE were at the weekend. A significant upturn in visits for the Easter weekend was attributed to an Easter Egg Hunt. Total visits to the Centre for 2012/13 amounted to almost 15,000 and there could be up to 60 daily visits on some days. Councillor Grainger suggested that other opportunities could be opened up with marketing.

The Chairman proposed that the recommendations be supported subject to additional wording to Recommendation 2.2 of Report ES13038.

On charges to outdoor trainers, Councillor Grainger suggested charging a trainer with three or less clients; a trainer might have a number of clients but choose to take each client out individually. Moreover, the trainer might continue to advertise. Given a possible transient nature of clients, he also suggested that trainers be charged monthly or quarterly. Councillor Adams endorsed the views of Councillor Grainger provided it was not cost prohibitive to administer/collect fees.

Members were advised that it was not intended to price small operators out of business. The Chairman suggested that the system be reviewed after the first year of operation; an assessment could then be made on whether it would be sensible to charge a trainer with three or less clients.

On VAT, it was confirmed that charges for the BEECHE school were VAT exempt but fitness training charges would be subject to VAT.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) approve the revised charges for BEECHE for implementation from 1st May 2013; and

(2) approve the introduction of charges from 1st May 2013 for outdoor fitness trainers using the Borough's parks and open spaces commercially, subject to:

- **charges being a Bromley Parks Licence or charge;**
- **provision of a suitable increment charge for more than two sessions per week and a maximum charge for trainers with four or more sessions per week; and**
- **the charges being introduced for an initial period of one year and then reviewed.**

F) ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2013/16

Report ES13024

Members considered the draft Environment Portfolio Plan for 2013/16.

Report ES13024 also summarised the recommended priorities for the Plan, providing background on their significance as the key outcomes to be sought in 2013/16.

On expanding take up of the Green Garden Waste (GGW) collection service, the Chairman wanted to see a long-term target figure for the number of residents using the service. He also wanted a date in the plan for introducing a kerbside collection service for textiles. The aim of the GGW collection service was to reduce congestion around waste sites so a high take-up was preferred. The Chairman understood that other outer-London boroughs had high service take-ups so it should be achievable over the longer term. The Portfolio Holder indicated that this would increase incrementally.

Councillor Fookes highlighted an occurrence where notices had been left advising that vehicles were not to be parked in a street pending a thorough clean that was to take place. Vehicles were moved but the cleaning did not take place. He felt that improvements were necessary on informing residents of forthcoming events such as street cleans. The Chairman reminded Members and Officers of his suggestion at the Committee's meeting on 15th January 2013 for the Council's website to indicate when a street was last cleaned (and when future cleaning work was scheduled). He also asked that a specific commitment be made to improve street cleanliness. Councillor Fookes also suggested that the Council's intranet system, "*One Bromley*", indicate in chart form the responsibilities of officers. He also indicated that it was necessary to improve street cleaning in the area he represented. Where waste was being left in an area and in order to assist the successful prosecution of offenders, he advocated the use of CCTV to capture an incident of waste being deposited.

On extending the trial use of a private enforcement company to issue fixed penalty notices for littering and dog fouling, Councillor Adams understood that the company had yet to issue a fixed penalty notice for dog fouling. He felt that serious effort was needed in this regard. The Portfolio Holder indicated that the company could be requested to have a focus on securing dog fouling prosecutions. He advocated trialling such an enforcement focus, suggesting a trial in Bromley based on a cross-party approach.

Councillor Grainger had a number of comments. In the context of recycling and waste, he referred to waste carpets being heavy and adding to landfill tax. He suggested that recycling carpet waste be considered. He supported the responsibilities of officers being available on One Bromley, highlighting functions in the Department and not simply job titles. On enforcement against dog fouling, and noting that owners often walked their dog early morning or at dusk, he hoped that enforcement officers would be on patrol during those

times. He also advocated the use of figures instead of, or in addition to, percentages. On highway maintenance, he advocated maintenance works to lengths of roads as necessary and for improving transportation he felt that reducing journey times should apply not just to priority routes but to all routes. He also preferred not to have casualty figures as targets.

Comments made in response to the points raised included those summarised below.

- The road safety targets were a requirement for TfL and were needed to help secure investment in road safety initiatives and schemes. They were also prefaced with “*no more than*”. In reality accidents would continue to occur but the targets for reductions were stretching.
- An aim for improving transportation was to “*improve the road network and journey times for all users*”.
- Performance Indicators NI 168 and NI 169 for highway maintenance were technical definitions which could be provided along with details of the footway surface indicator for town centres.

On improving transportation, Councillor Adams supported lobbying for extensions of the DLR from Lewisham to Bromley but felt that extending Tramlink to Crystal Palace should also be an aim. The Portfolio Holder supported the Crystal Palace link but highlighted the priority of extending the DLR to Bromley. This was the highest aspiration for the borough followed by a Tramlink extension to Crystal Palace and then a link from Beckenham junction to Bromley.

Councillor Adams felt that any Beckenham junction link was some way into the future. On extending Tramlink to Crystal Palace, he suggested the Council could possibly receive support from nearby Local Authorities. Tramlink access to Crystal Palace would benefit many residents in the Borough’s North West who used the Crystal Palace node. The Portfolio Holder referred to Crystal Palace having recently received London Overground; residents from Bromley and beyond would benefit from a DLR extension, particularly in view of issues a Jubilee line proposal would bring. Councillor Adams highlighted that it was TfL money and the Overground had enhanced Crystal Palace so providing further reason to support a Tramlink extension. Councillor Fookes supported comments from Councillor Adams. Councillor Milner saw a DLR extension as a big request compared with a Tramlink extension. He was concerned that the bigger request might jeopardise the smaller request.

Noting commentary reference to improved park security supported by fixed penalty notices for dog related crime and close Police liaison for a joint approach to dangerous dog offences, the Vice Chairman referred to an incident of a dangerous dog killing another dog. She felt that a strong campaign was necessary to illustrate that dangerous dogs were not controllable. It was indicated that work on dangerous dogs was led by officers in the Public Protection Division of Environment and Community Services,

with support from Parks and Greenspace in relation to parks. The Director confirmed that the matter would be taken forward as a cross portfolio issue and officers would look at having a campaign.

On support to schools, developers and businesses for implementing Travel Plans, Councillor Grainger suggested the position on traffic and congestion is monitored before and after Travel Plan implementation. He felt there had been no substantial evidence to justify a need for Travel Plans. Concerning transport interchanges, Councillor Grainger also highlighted interconnectivity and improved parking at stations. Members were advised that Orpington station would have double decked parking. Construction on the second tier would start later in the year and it was intended to improve the entrance to the station from Crofton Road, reducing the impact on local residents. It was confirmed that Network Rail would fund the car park development. The Chairman referred to a forthcoming Public Transport Liaison Committee (scheduled for 25th April 2013) which would provide an opportunity for South Eastern representatives to be present.

On extending the New Beckenham (Lennard Road) car park, Councillor Fookes asked that his opposition to the development be recorded. He explained that the location was an area of green space. For planning considerations, Councillor Grainger highlighted that a double decked extension provided a minimum space. If the Lennard Road car park extension had taken place earlier Councillor Adams indicated that the Copers Cope Controlled Parking Zone might not have been necessary and there might not have been problems with parking in the area.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) endorse the aims, activities and outcome measures proposed in the draft Portfolio Plan appended to Report ES13024, taking into consideration the budget for 2013/14 which had already been agreed and the comments of the Environment PDS Committee; and

(2) delegate the setting of detailed service outcome expectations for 2013/14 to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder and the Chairman of the Environment PDS Committee.

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

Report ES13025

Officers had anticipated a further meeting of the Parking Working Group in September 2013 subject to agreement at the Committee's first meeting for 2013/14.

Members were also handed the following briefing papers for information:

- Traffic and Road Safety Work programme
- Update on Congestion Relief in Bromley and
- Smarter Driving

The papers would be circulated to all Members and any comments were to be provided to the Head of Traffic and Road Safety. The Chairman added that the Work programme and Congestion papers fed into consideration of the annual LIP Programme which was considered by the Committee. The Chairman felt that the papers would be of interest to each Ward Member. Member views were to be provided in advance of officers preparing the annual LIP report which was normally presented to the Committee at its November meeting.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Committee's Work Programme at Appendix 1 to Report ES13025 be agreed;

(2) progress related to previous Committee requests as set out at Appendix 2 to Report ES13025 be noted; and

(3) the Environment Portfolio contracts listed at Appendix 3 to Report ES13025 be noted.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MR COLIN WILLETTS FOR WRITTEN REPLY ON 5TH MARCH 2013

1. With regard to the steep grass banking outside nos 79 - 97 Leasons Hill, nos 147- 173 Leasons Hill and 282 - 304 Chipperfield Road, could the Portfolio Holder tell us i) if the Health and Safety issues have been resolved to allow all the grass banking (top to bottom) to be cut?, ii) if these issues have not been resolved could he tell us when they will be?

Reply

(i) The Landscape Group and LBB are currently jointly reviewing the health and safety control measures.

(ii) These issues should be resolved following a review of the health and safety control measures. This may result in an adjusted maintenance regime from April 2013 and subsequent seasons.

2. Having been informed by Councillor Ince at our LCRA meeting 4/2/13 that a CCTV camera had been installed overlooking Cotmandene Crescent car park it transpired via a later email that this was 'promised' rather than 'installed'. Could the Portfolio Holder tell us when this 'promise' will be fulfilled with an approximate date for installation to counter the ongoing fly tipping problem at this location?

Reply

The contract was put out to tender immediately after the Portfolio Holder gave the go ahead for the scheme, the tenders have been evaluated and the contract awarded.

There is a six week lead in on having the cameras built and the installation will be started as soon as the cameras are received, shortly thereafter. It is anticipated that all of the works should be completed and the system commissioned at the beginning of April.

3. Could the Portfolio Holder tell us if the flank fences forming the boundaries adjoining the public footpaths adjacent at i) 50 Curtismill Way & ii) 52 Curtismill Way & iii) 43 Broomwood & iv) 45 Broomwood Road are the responsibility of the London Borough of Bromley?

Reply

Flank fences that form the boundary to a public footpath would be considered the responsibility of the adjoining owner of the premises. Investigations regarding land ownership of these locations have been made with the Land Registry Office.

**QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MR COLIN WILLETTS
FOR WRITTEN REPLY ON 16TH APRIL 2013**

1. Could the Portfolio Holder have the 96% (overall total estimate) of unnumbered lamp columns in Saxville Road, Pleasance Road, Kelsey Road, Normanhurst Road & Dawson Avenue marked up for identification?

Reply

In view of the lamps' original ID tags having either been stolen or vandalised, numbers will now be stencilled on to the columns for identification purposes.

2. Could the Portfolio Holder assist in cordoning off a missing section of metal railings (leading to a 20 foot drop on to concrete hard standing) 60 yards in, on the left hand side, in LBB road adjacent 1 Whippendell Way, reported as urgent 7/4/13 and further reported to me by Mr Stephen Brown 281 Chipperfield Road on Tuesday evening 7pm 9/4/13 as still a hazard.

Reply

Yes.

3. Having been asked directions to Orpington Library on several occasions (including today 10/4/13 outside of WH Smith), could the Portfolio Holder consider installing Library sign/s at the north/south side entrances to the Walnuts lead from Orpington High Street?

Reply

I have referred your question on to Mr Marc Hume, Director for Renewal & Recreation who holds responsibility for libraries to determine whether he believes, or might have previously heard concerns expressed that such signage is necessary.

I will write to you in due course when I have heard back from him.

The Meeting ended at 9.45 pm

Chairman