

LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

MINUTES

of the proceedings of the Meeting of the
Council of the Borough
held at 7.00 pm on 23 February 2015

Present:

**The Worshipful the Mayor
Councillor Julian Benington**

**The Deputy Mayor
Councillor Kate Lymer**

Councillors

Graham Arthur	Charles Joel	Teresa Ball
Douglas Auld	Russell Mellor	Kim Botting
Kathy Bance MBE	Alexa Michael	Kevin Brooks
Nicholas Bennett J.P.	Peter Morgan	Lydia Buttinger
Ruth Bennett	Tony Owen	David Cartwright
Eric Bosshard	Ian F. Payne	Alan Collins
Katy Boughey	Sarah Phillips	Mary Cooke
Stephen Carr	Neil Reddin FCCA	Ian Dunn
Peter Dean	Catherine Rideout	Hannah Gray
Judi Ellis	Charles Rideout	David Livett
Robert Evans	Richard Scoates	Terence Nathan
Simon Fawthrop	Colin Smith	Angela Page
Peter Fookes	Diane Smith	Tom Philpott
Peter Fortune	Tim Stevens	Chris Pierce
Ellie Harmer	Michael Tickner	Michael Rutherford
Will Harmer	Pauline Tunnicliffe	Melanie Stevens
William Huntington-	Michael Turner	Angela Wilkins
Thresher	Stephen Wells	Richard Williams
David Jefferys	Vanessa Allen	

The meeting was opened with prayers

In the Chair
The Mayor
Councillor Julian Benington

59 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Nicky Dykes, Samaris Huntington-Thresher and Keith Onslow. Apologies for lateness

were received from Councillors Peter Dean, Peter Fookes and Michael Rutherford.

60 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Peter Morgan declared an interest as his daughter was a Director of Kier Group plc.

61 To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 8th December 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 8th December 2014 were confirmed.

62 Petitions
Report CSD15020

Two petitions had been received asking the Council to (i) keep the Bromley Museum at the Priory in Orpington with its collection intact and (ii) not sell the Priory building. Both petitions were above the threshold that allowed the lead petitioner to address the Council, but in view of the recent decision by the Executive both petitioners had decided to defer their right to speak.

A third petition that met the threshold for consideration at Council had been received opposing the closure of the public toilets in Beckenham High Street. Ruth Fabricant addressed the meeting in support of the petition.

A motion to take no further action on the petition was moved by Councillor Colin Smith and seconded by Councillor William Huntington-Thresher and **CARRIED.**

63 Questions from members of the public where notice has been given.

Seven questions for written reply had been received from members of the public. These are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

64 Oral questions from Members of the Council where notice has been given.

Twelve questions had been received from members of the Council. These are set out in Appendix B to these minutes.

65 Written questions from Members of the Council

Twenty three questions for written reply had been received. These are set out in Appendix C to these minutes.

66 To consider any statements that may be made by the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holders or Chairmen of Committees.

(A) Leader of the Council

A statement was made by Councillor Stephen Carr on the future of Bromley Youth Music Trust (BYMT). He started by saying that the Council acknowledged that BYMT had a musical track record perhaps second to none across the UK, but in the light of the financial challenges faced by the Council over the last few years and significantly to come in the future, it had to consider all non-statutory spending. BYMT had fully acknowledged the position the Council found itself in, and during recent discussions which culminated today a joint way forward had been found. Bromley Council had agreed to make £153,000 of funding available to BYMT in the civic year 2015/16, as well as maintaining support through the provision of premises which contained twelve classrooms and a large hall at their headquarters in Southborough Lane until at least 2017. The Leader knew that BYMT was highly valued in the borough and the Council wanted to continue to support the work of the Trust, but in the current challenging financial climate it no longer seemed appropriate to do so through the Council's revenue budget. The Council would, however, continue to work with BYMT to help identify and secure income from other sources such as the Arts Council, schools and potential commercial sponsors. The Leader was confident that this joint solution would help BYMT remain a jewel in the crown well into the future.

(B) Portfolio Holder for Environment

Councillor Colin Smith made brief statement on the recent Transport for London (TfL) consultation on the potential extension of the Bakerloo line to Hayes. He referred to an exchange of correspondence with TfL, copies of which had been circulated. He welcomed investment in public transport improvements in south-east London and north-west Kent and explained that the council was broadly supportive of the extension of the Bakerloo line to Lewisham, but not an extension to Hayes which would see the existing national rail lines subsumed by the Bakerloo Line extension and the ultimate loss of direct connectivity to London Bridge, Cannon Street and Charing Cross. However, should it be possible to bring the Bakerloo Line to Bromley town centre via New Beckenham without the loss of any of the existing rail services then the Council could be prepared to support this in principle.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett asked the Portfolio Holder whether he was aware that the West Wickham ward councillors had carried out a survey of all residents in West Wickham, with a result of four to one against the proposal, not just because of the loss of connections but also replacing full size trains with smaller tube trains. He also asked for clarification on the "New Cross option" mentioned in the correspondence with TfL. Councillor Smith agreed that he was aware that colleagues in other wards had carried out similar surveys with similar results. Residents had bought their houses

specifically for the links to central London and they did not want a less reliable and more overcrowded service. It was also important that as Londoners paying the second highest precept in the city it was unfair that TfL was trying to clear track space at London Bridge in favour of travellers from further out at the expense of Hayes Line residents. He confirmed that if the DLR could not be extended to Bromley then the Council would probably support the extension of Overground Services from New Cross to Bromley North.

Councillor Neil Reddin stated that surveys in Hayes and Coney Hall showed similar levels of opposition to the extension to Hayes, although there was some support for the extension as far as Lewisham. Opposition focused on loss of direct services but also the potential development pressure that would result. The incredulity of people in Lewisham to the reluctance of people in Bromley to be on the tube indicated different outlooks in inner and outer London that TfL should take account of. Councillor Smith agreed that Bromley residents did not want an inner London style of living forced upon them.

(C) Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

Councillor Tim Stevens made statement about a raid carried out by Bromley Trading Standards and the Police on the Skunkworks shop in Orpington on Friday 13th February 2015 using new legislation for the first time. The raid was carried out following a number of complaints about the legal highs the shop was selling and related anti-social behaviour. There had been concern about the number of young people found in possession of legal high drugs and medical emergencies relating to their use. A suspected illegal pit-bull terrier and quantities of legal high drugs had been seized. Staff had been questioned and a warning had been issued to the business under the new legislation.

Councillor Stevens thanked Councillor Owen and the Orpington ward councillors for bringing this to his attention and Jo Johnson M.P. who had promised to talk to ministers about tightening up the legislation. He also paid tribute to Rob Vale and the Trading Standards team and the Police licensing officer Jonathan Booth for this outstanding piece of work, which showed that these businesses were not welcome in the borough.

67 Budget (Revenue and Capital) and Council Tax setting - to consider the recommendations of the Executive from the meeting on 11th February 2015

(A) 2015/16 Council Tax

The Director of Finance circulated supplementary information and amended recommendations. There were no changes to the final Mayoral precept accepted by the London Assembly on 23rd February 2015.

On 18th February 2015 the Environment Portfolio Holder had considered a report entitled “Revision to Kerbside Paper Collection Service”. Minutes of the meeting were circulated. Council was requested to approve an allocation of £558k from overall underspends in the Council’s 2014/15 Central Contingency sum for the purchase of three split bodied vehicles as detailed in recommendation 2.4 below.

“The above changes required the following amendments to be made to the recommendations of the Executive:

Amended Recommendation (2.1)

- (g) sets a 1.99% increase in Bromley’s council tax for 2015/16, compared with 2014/15, and a 1.34% reduction in the GLA precept;
- (h) notes the final position on the GLA precept, as accepted by the London Assembly on 23rd February 2015;

Amended Recommendation (2.2)

Council Tax 2015/16 – Statutory Calculations and Resolutions (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).

Subject to 2.1 (a) to (j) above, if the formal Council Tax Resolution as detailed below is approved, the total Band D Council Tax will be as follows:

	2014/15 £	2015/16 £	Increase/decrease (-) %
Bromley	1,010.07	1,030.14	1.99
GLA	299.00	295.00	-1.34
Total	1,309.07	1,325.14	1.23

Amended Recommendation (2.3)

- (iv) to note that the Greater London Authority (GLA) has issued a precept to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council’s area as indicated in the table below.

Additional Recommendation (2.4)

- (i) Council approve an allocation of £558k from overall underspends in the Council’s 2014/15 Central Contingency Sum for the purchase of three split-bodied vehicles.”

In addition, the following amendments were moved by Councillor Stephen Carr, seconded by Councillor Colin Smith and **CARRIED**.

“The following changes be made to the recommended budget for 2015/16:

Recommendation 2.1:

- (b) approve the draft revenue budgets for 2015/16 with the following amendments:
 - (i) agree that a sum of £77k be set aside from 2014/15 underspends as an earmarked reserve to contribute towards the funding of Bromley Youth Music Trust in 2015/16 to enable the savings in the 2015/16 and future years budgets to be realised.

Recommendation 2.3:

- iii) that the following amounts be calculated for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act):
 - (a) £560,423k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
 - (b) £431,522k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.”

A motion to receive and adopt the recommendations as amended was moved by Councillor Steven Carr and seconded by Cllr Colin Smith.

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Angela Wilkins and seconded by Councillor Ian Dunn, and a spreadsheet summarising the proposed savings options was circulated.

“After allowing for the report from the Director of Finance the following amendments are proposed to the recommendations of the Executive set out in the Blue Book on pages 55-96.

The following changes be made to the recommended budget for 2015/16:

Recommendation 2.1:

- (b) approve the draft revenue budgets for 2015/16 with the following amendments:
 - (i) that the following revenue savings in 2015/16 do not proceed:
 1. total of £1,865k in 2015/16 as marked Recommendation 1 in the spreadsheet (lines 9,12,15, 21, 28, 29, 30, 37, 46, 48, 51, 53, 54, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 70, 72, 73 and 74);

2. total of £1,283k in 2015/16 as marked Recommendation 2 in the spreadsheet (lines 33, 47, 49, 50, 52, 55, 56, 57, 65 and 76);
3. line 66 of savings options totalling £202k in 2015/16 - cease funding for BME groups. Ethnic Comms Programme/Somali women and men, BACA, Pineapple club (£111k). Keyring service (£91k);
4. line 71 of savings options totalling £230k in 2015/16 – Bromley Youth Music Trust.

(ii) agree the utilisation of funding as follows:

- a sum of £2m is set aside from underspends in 2014/15 as an earmarked reserve to contribute towards the budget shortfall in 2015/16;
- the balance of £1,580k be utilised from general fund balances in 2015/16 to support the revenue budget.

(iii) We note that work is ongoing on proposals for use of at least £3m of the PIL funds namely the Bromley Town Centre Housing Zone Bid. We hope that this is successful and would further urge that every effort is then made to expedite this project as soon as possible.

Bromley needs housing, whether affordable, supported, for purchase or rent, or otherwise e.g. respite/care homes, to reduce the housing register, reduce spend on emergency accommodation, and also to help people who are in substandard or unsuitable housing.

On the basis of the above, Council are requested to agree that the sum of £4.4m of New Homes Bonus set aside to increase the Council's investment Fund in 2015/16 Budget instead be invested in the construction of affordable and social housing.

Recommendation 2.3:

(iii) that the following amounts be calculated for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act):

- (a) £563,776k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
- (b) £434,875k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.”

On being put to the vote, this amendment was LOST.

The following amendment was moved by Councillor David Livett and seconded by Councillor Terence Nathan.

“After allowing for the report from the Director of Finance the following amendments are proposed to the recommendations of the Executive set out in the Blue Book on pages 55-96.

The following changes be made to the recommended budget for 2015/16:

Recommendation 2.1:

- (b) approve the draft revenue budgets for 2015/16 with the following amendments:
 - i. agree a council tax freeze in 2015/16 resulting in reduced income from council tax of £2,511k offset by council tax freeze grant of £1,391k (net loss of income £1,120k);
 - ii. increased income from interest on balances of £659k (from £2,741k to £3,400k);
 - iii. closure of garden satellite sites at start of year £190k (includes additional income of £65k from extra wheelie bin sales) [line 35 of saving options];
 - iv. reduction in basic Member allowances of £57k;
 - v. increase in Mayoral allowance of £6k;
 - vi. committee structure to be re-instated providing a saving of £110k;
 - vii. the 2015/16 Central Contingency Sum be reduced by £110k.
- (e) approve a revised Central Contingency sum of £13,707k to reflect the changes in (b) and (d);
- (g) set a nil variation in Bromley’s council tax for 2015/16 compared with 2014/15 and a 1.34% reduction in the GLA precept.

Recommendation 2.2:

Council Tax 2015/16 – Statutory Calculations and Resolutions (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).

Subject to 2.1 (a) to (j) above, if the formal Council Tax Resolution as detailed below is approved, the total Band D Council Tax will be as follows:

	2014/15 £	2015/16 £	Increase/decrease (-)%
Bromley	1,010.07	1,010.07	0.00
GLA	299.00	295.00	-1.34
Total	1,309.07	1,305.07	-0.31

Recommendation 2.3:

- (ii) calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2015/16 is £126,390k;
- (iii) that the following amounts be calculated for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act):
 - (a) £559,950k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
 - (b) £433,560k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - (c) £126,390k being the amount by which the aggregate at (iii) (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (iii) (b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
 - (d) £1,010.07 being the amount at (iii) (c) above, divided by (i) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.
- (v) that the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2015/16 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
673.38	785.61	897.84	1,010.07	1,234.53	1,458.99	1,683.45	2,020.14

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
196.67	229.44	262.22	295.00	360.56	426.11	491.67	590.00

AGGREGATE OF COUNCIL TAX REQUIREMENTS

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
870.05	1,015.05	1,160.06	1,305.07	1,595.09	1,885.10	2,175.12	2,610.14

- (vi) that the Council hereby determines that its relevant basic amount of council tax for the financial year 2015/16, which reflects a nil increase, is not excessive. The Referendums Relating to Council Tax Increases (Principles) (England) Report 2015/16 sets out the principles which the Secretary of State has determined will apply to local authorities in England in 2015/16. The Council is required to determine whether its relevant basic amount of Council Tax is excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.”

On being put to the vote, this amendment was LOST.

Accordingly, the recommendations of the Executive (as amended) were CARRIED as follows -

(1) Council -

- (a) **approves the schools budget of £99.1 million which matches the estimated level of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG);**
- (b) **approves the draft revenue budgets (as at Appendix 2 to Report FSD15009) for 2015/16 to include the following updated changes -**
- (i) **a sum of £77k be set aside from 2014/15 underspends as an earmarked reserve to contribute towards the funding of Bromley Youth Music Trust in 2015/16 to enable the savings in the 2015/16 and future budgets to be realised.**
- (ii) **additional core grant funding of £202k in 2015/16**
- (iii) **reduction in Discretionary Housing payments funding from £683k in 2014/15 to £509k in 2015/16 (variation of £174k), with a corresponding reduction in the Discretionary Housing Payments in the 2015/16 Budget;**
- (c) **agrees that Chief Officers identify alternative savings within their departmental budgets where it is not possible to realise any proposed savings reported to the previous Executive meeting;**

- (d) approves the following provisions for levies for inclusion in the budget for 2015/16 -

	£'000
London Pension Fund Authority	475
London Boroughs Grant Committee	340
Environment Agency (Flood defence etc)	236
Lee Valley Regional Park	376
Total	1,427

- (e) approves a revised Central Contingency sum of £13,817k to reflect the changes in (b) and (d);
- (f) approves the revised draft 2015/16 revenue budgets to reflect the changes detailed above;
- (g) sets a 1.99% increase in Bromley's council tax for 2015/16, compared with 2014/15, and a 1.34% reduction in the GLA precept;
- (h) notes the final position on the GLA precept, as accepted by the London Assembly on 23rd February 2015;
- (i) approves the approach to reserves outlined by the Director of Finance (see Appendix 4 to Report FSD15009);
- (j) the Director of Finance be authorised to report any further changes directly to Council on 23rd February 2015.
- (2) Council Tax 2015/16 – Statutory Calculations and Resolutions (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) -

Subject to (1) (a) to (j) above, if the formal Council Tax Resolution as detailed below is approved, the total Band D Council Tax will be as follows:

	2014/15 £	2015/16 £	Increase/decrease (-) %
Bromley	1,010.07	1,030.14	1.99
GLA	299.00	295.00	-1.34
Total	1,309.07	1,325.14	1.23

- (3) Council formally resolves as follows:

- (i) it is noted that the Council Tax Base for 2015/16 is 125,130;
- (ii) calculates that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2015/16 is £128,901k;

(iii) that the following amounts be calculated for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act) -

(a) £560,423k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act;

(b) £431,522k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act;

(c) £128,901k being the amount by which the aggregate at (iii) (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (iii) (b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year;

(d) £1,030.14 being the amount at (iii) (c) above, divided by (i) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year;

(iv) to note that the Greater London Authority (GLA) has issued a precept to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below;

(v) that the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2015/16 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
686.76	801.22	915.68	1,030.14	1,259.06	1,487.98	1,716.90	2,060.28

GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
196.67	229.44	262.22	295.00	360.56	426.11	491.67	590.00

AGGREGATE OF COUNCIL TAX REQUIREMENTS

Valuation Bands							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
883.43	1,030.66	1,177.90	1,325.14	1,619.62	1,914.09	2208.57	2,650.28

(vi) that the Council hereby determines that its relevant basic amount of council tax for the financial year 2015/16, which reflects a 1.99% increase, is not excessive. The Referendums Relating to Council Tax Increases (Principles) (England) Report 2015/16 sets out the principles which the Secretary of State has determined will apply to local authorities in England in 2015/16. The Council is required to determine whether its relevant basic amount of Council Tax is excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

(4) Council approves an allocation of £558k from overall underspends in the Council's 2014/15 Central Contingency Sum for the purchase of three split bodied vehicles.

The following Members voted in favour of the motion –

Councillors Graham Arthur, Douglas Auld, Teresa Ball, Nicholas Bennett, Ruth Bennett, Eric Bosshard, Kim Botting, Katy Boughey, Lydia Buttinger, Stephen Carr, David Cartwright, Alan Collins, Mary Cooke, Peter Dean, Judi Ellis, Robert Evans, Simon Fawthrop, Peter Fortune, Hannah Gray, Ellie Harmer, Will Harmer, William Huntington-Thresher, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Kate Lymer, Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael, Peter Morgan, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Ian Payne, Sarah Phillips, Tom Philpott, Chris Pierce, Neil Reddin, Catherine Rideout, Charles Rideout, Michael Rutherford, Richard Scoates, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Melanie Stevens, Tim Stevens, Michael Tickner, Michael Turner, Pauline Tunnicliffe and Stephen Wells.

The following Councillors voted against the motion –

Councillors Vanessa Allen, Kathy Bance, Kevin Brooks, Ian Dunn, Peter Fookes, David Livett, Terence Nathan, Angela Wilkins and Richard Williams.

The Mayor, Councillor Julian Benington, abstained.

(During consideration of this item Council agreed to suspend Council Procedure Rule 8 to allow the meeting to continue beyond three hours.)

(B) Capital Programme

A motion to include new scheme proposals supported by Chief Officers in the Capital Programme and add an additional £15m to the Council's Investment Fund in the 2016/17 Capital Programme to be funded by capital receipts was moved by Councillor Stephen Carr, seconded by Councillor Colin Smith and **CARRIED**.

68 Establishment of Health and Social Care Integrated Commissioning Fund
Report CSD15029

A motion to set aside a sum of £4.5m as an earmarked reserve known as the “Health and Social Care Integrated Commissioning Fund” as recommended by the Executive was moved by Councillor Robert Evans, seconded by Councillor Stephen Carr and **CARRIED**.

69 Refurbishment of Beacon House
Report CSD15027

A motion to add the refurbishment of Beacon House to the Capital Programme as recommended by the Executive was moved by Councillor Stephen Wells, seconded by Councillor Stephen Carr and **CARRIED**.

70 Treasury Management - Annual Investment Strategy
Report CSD15021

A motion to adopt the Treasury Management Statement and Annual Investment Strategy for 2015/16 including the prudential indicators and Minimum Revenue Provision policy statement was moved by Councillor Graham Arthur, seconded by Councillor Stephen Carr and **CARRIED**.

71 2015/16 Pay Award
Report CSD15025

A motion to approve a flat rate pay increase of 1.2% for all staff (excluding teachers) as recommended by General Purposes and Licensing Committee was moved by Councillor Tony Owen, seconded by Councillor Russell Mellor and **CARRIED**.

72 Pay Policy Statement 2015/16
Report CSD15026

A motion to approve the 2015/16 Pay Policy Statement and establish a Chief Executive’s Appraisal and Pay Committee as recommended by General Purposes and Licensing Committee was moved by Councillor Tony Owen, seconded by Councillor Russell Mellor and **CARRIED**.

73 Members' Allowances Scheme 2015/16
Report CSD15022

A motion to approve the Members’ Allowances Scheme and Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Allowances 2015/16 with allowances remaining at the current level, as recommended by General Purposes and Licensing Committee but deleting paragraph 8 and re-numbering the remainder of the scheme accordingly, was moved by Councillor Tony Owen, seconded by Councillor Russell Mellor and **CARRIED**.

74 Local Pension Board
Report CSD15023

A motion to amend recommendation (v) (b) in the report so that Council employees should have the right to elect their representatives on the Pension Board was moved by Councillor Ian Dunn and seconded by Councillor Angela Wilkins. The amendment was **LOST**.

A motion to approve the recommendation from General Purposes and Licensing Committee to establish a Local Pension Board and agree its composition and terms of reference was moved by Councillor Tony Owen, seconded by Councillor Simon Fawthrop and **CARRIED**.

75 Committee Membership

A motion to approve the following changes to committee memberships was moved by Councillor Tony Owen, seconded by Councillor Russell Mellor and **CARRIED**.

- Councillor Douglas Auld to replace Councillor Will Harmer on Executive and Resources PDS Committee.
- Councillor Kathy Bance to replace Councillor Peter Fookes on General Purposes and Licensing Committee.
- Councillor Ian Dunn to replace Councillor Peter Fookes on Executive and Resources PDS Committee.
- Councillor Kevin Brooks to replace Councillor Peter Fookes on Care Services PDS Committee

76 To consider Motions of which notice has been given.

The following motion on the Petts Wood Area of Special Character (ASRC) was moved by Councillor Simon Fawthrop and seconded by Councillor Douglas Auld. The motion had been slightly amended in the first line by Councillor Fawthrop to refer the matter to the Executive.

“This Council recommends to the Executive that the existing statement in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) in relation to the Petts Wood Area Of Special Character (ASRC) should be supplemented with the following updated statement which should also form the basis of any descriptions within the Local Development Framework (LDF) including any future reports to Development Control Committee. This supplement should take place with immediate effect, subject to any statutory or technical considerations, which should be expedited.

1.3 Petts Wood Supplement to the Descriptions in the UDP:

The original plans for Petts Wood date from the late 1920s and early 1930s. While Houses were built over a number of years, in a number of similar though varied styles, the road layout and plot sizes were established in an overall pattern. Today the layout remains largely intact. Within the overall area the Conservation Areas of the Chenies and Chislehurst Road already stand out.

The plots were originally designed on the garden suburb principle by developer Basil Scruby, with large plot sizes spaciouly placed. The characteristics of the Petts Wood ASRC include an open feel, predicated by low boundaries and visible front gardens, set back from the road; there is also spaciousness between the houses which is of a superior standard. This allows many of the trees and greenery which prevails throughout the area to be seen from the street scene giving the area its open and semi- rural feel in line with the garden suburb principle. This open and suburban aspect of the area underlines the special characteristic of the area. Development which erodes this special character will be resisted.

The separation between building and the rhythm and pattern of the houses adds to the special character. In many cases there is a much wider separation between houses than in other parts of the Borough which demands a higher degree of separation between buildings to maintain the special character, the openness and feel of the area. Where there are pairs of houses that complement the rhythm of the street scene there is also a prevailing symmetry between the houses. This symmetry can also be seen between neighbouring pairs. The plots are set out in such a way that the spacious character is one of a clear detached and semi-detached nature.

The front building and rear building lines are also of importance in defining the area. The buildings are of a 1930s design, for example some built by the distinguished designer Noel Rees, which adds to the character of the area. Whilst there have been some changes post war this design aspect of the area remains intact and future development should respect this characteristic. The front roof lines are also of a nature which enhances the characteristic of the area being largely untouched by roof extensions and conversions at the front.

The plot sizes and rear gardens are mostly of a size which is commensurate with the Garden Suburb principle and this characteristic also forms part of the amenity value which makes the area special.

When considering future development within the Petts Wood ASRC, the main focus will be on the impact of any proposed development on the ASRC, taking into account the design and spatial standards including the low density of existing development. Proposals which undermine the character, rhythm, symmetry and spatial standards of the area will be resisted. Likewise new dwellings proposed on gardens and infill will also be strongly resisted. In this context special is used in the dictionary sense to

mean distinguished from others of the same category, because it is in some way superior or held in particular esteem.”

The motion was **CARRIED**.

77 The Mayor's announcements and communications.

The Mayor thanked all those who had attended the Boxing Dinner on Friday 23rd January and the BYMT Concert at Langley Park Centre for the Performing Arts on Thursday 12th February. Both events were extremely successful and raised significant sums of money for the Mayor's charities. The Quiz evening on 20th February had also been an enormous success, and the Mayor thanked Councillor Ian Payne for hosting the event.

The Mayor advised Members of the following events -

- A charity preview of Alan Ayckbourn's "A Chorus of Disapproval" at Bromley Little Theatre on Thursday 12th March.
- The House of Commons Dinner with Tour on Friday 13th March.

The Meeting ended at 10.45 pm

Mayor

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

23rd FEBRUARY 2015

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR WRITTEN REPLY

(1) From Colin Willetts, Secretary, Longbury Residents Association, to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

I understand that Councillor Nathan will be using an interpreter during Council meetings, can you tell me the approximate cost per meeting & who will be paying for this service (assuming that LBB is legally obliged to provide this support)?

Reply:

The Council is investigating reasonable adjustments to assist Cllr Nathan, including use of the Infrared Hearing System installed in the Council Chamber and provision of a Speech to Text Report (STTR) service, for which the cost will be about £160.

(2) From John Getgood, Chair, Penge Forum to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

The former Lodge in Penge Recreation Ground has been undergoing refurbishment by the new owner for at least 12 years. Residents have complained on several occasions about the waste of this local resource and the untidy state of the grounds surrounding the Lodge. The situation is clearly unsatisfactory.

Please can you tell me when council officers last visited the Lodge and discussed this situation with the owner?

Reply:

With regard to the property in question, the Council Empty Property Officers are aware of this house and have been in regular contact with the owner. The officers inspected the property last year and noted the continuing renovation works, which are now in the final stages. They found the exterior of the property to be boarded up and this may be considered unsightly but it only remains boarded for security reasons, primarily due to the location and the various vacant periods. The grounds were not considered to be in an untidy site at the time of their visit.

The progress has been slow but the project has had significant delays due to unforeseen circumstances; it being self-funded and the renovation works being carried out to a very high standard.

(3) From John Getgood, Chair, Penge Forum to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

What action, for example, issuing an untidy site notice, would you support to bring this building (the former Lodge in Penge Recreation Ground) back into use at the earliest opportunity?

Reply:

It is considered that success would be very unlikely if this case were taken to the Residential Property Tribunal or to a Public Inquiry. A Compulsory Purchase Order is not considered an option for the Council due to the current financial climate, the high percentage of work currently completed in the house and the compensation that would be involved. The use of a Notice under section 215 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 would not be considered appropriate, having regard to the comments made above in the answer to question (2).

Officers will continue to monitor and stay in contact with the owner, but formal action is not considered appropriate or possible at present.

(4) From John Getgood, Chair, Penge Forum to the Portfolio Holder for Environment

We were promised that the new public park in Kings Hall Road, created following permission being granted for the construction of houses on the former Cyphers' Sports Ground, would be opened to the public last summer, following the installation of park furniture and notices.

We are pleased to see the tennis courts being well used but why has the work on the park not been completed and when do you expect to see members of the public enjoying Bromley's first new park in this area for many years?

Reply:

The works planned for last year were suspended because of a major review of the way ancillary landscape services are procured. Accordingly new contracts have been set up following an extensive packaging, specification and tendering process. As a result of this we are now bulking projects together to take advantage of economies of scale and it is envisaged that any missing park furniture will be in place during late spring.

(5) From Mrs Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

Proposal to 11th February 2015 Executive to close Bromley Museum and sell off the historic Priory building and part of the Priory Gardens. The decision to withdraw this report is welcome. The Blue Plaque erected by LBB in 1999 states:

"The Priory Gardens form part of the commemoration in 1946 by the Orpington Urban District Council to those who gave their lives in the Second World War"

Is this statement untrue?

Reply:

The statement is true.

(6) From Mrs Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

Following the Council's decision to postpone consideration of the item for 3 months, and discuss with local groups, will the people of Orpington and the public be consulted on the final options for the use of the Priory, the future of its Museum collection and their contribution to Orpington Town Centre?

Reply:

Yes

(7) From Mrs Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

When will the Equality Impact Assessment be published and when will a report covering the planning requirements for the sale of the Priory as a Grade 2 * listed building in a Grade 2 listed park in a Conservation Area be prepared by Bromley's Heritage/Planning Section?

Reply:

An Equality Impact Assessment was prepared but in light of the decision to undertake further consultation it was not published. It is envisaged that the further report back to committee in three months' time will set out all of the issues concerning the potential disposal of the Priory.

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

23rd FEBRUARY 2015

QUESTIONS FOR ORAL REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. Question withdrawn.

2. From Cllr David Jefferys to the Portfolio Holder for Environment

Will the Portfolio Holder list the income received in the last two financial years and the projected income for 2025/16 for the collected

- (a) metal cans,
- (b) plastics,
- (c) waste paper,
- (d) glass,
- (e) textiles,

And for cans and plastic, how much is earned per item (or per ten items) collected.

Reply:

Paper income -

2013/14 £958k

2014/15 £847k

2015/16 (projected to be in the region of £3/4m)

Textile income -

2013/14 £107k

2014/15 (projected) £87k

2015/16 (projected) £85k

Glass income (Bring Banks only) -

2013/14 £3k

2014/15 (projected) £4k

2015/16 (projected) £4k

In addition, we have saved £1.4m in terms of avoided landfill tax charges through recycling paper, and £1.06m from green box materials by landfill avoidance. We do not earn anything physically for green box materials per se. The green box value that is released in addition to the landfill tax saving is written into the contract and that pays for the gate fee and the splitting out exercise. It is important to watch this as some of the certain plastics are valuable (up to £300 per ton) but some of the lower grade plastics are borderline useless – it is heresy to say so in some ears, but perhaps the best thing you can do with them is to burn them to produce heat.

Those are the raw numbers, if anyone wants to see more around recycling please let me know. One thing we have to watch very closely as a Council is that the value of collecting green box materials is borderline in pure financial terms. It pays at the moment and we want to continue, but it is fundamentally to reduce the amount we send to landfill.

Supplementary question:

We have an excellent record on recycling in Bromley, but what plans are there to refresh the message about recycling particularly around waste paper. We do need to

go down to fortnightly collection, but we also need to get the message across and drive up collection rates.

Reply:

There are plans for a campaign to boost our collection rates even higher, which are marginally under 50% at present. I anticipate that as Bexley ends its free collection of green garden waste we could be by a small margin the highest recyclers in London by this time next year. A fledgling campaign is already on the drawing board.

3. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Leader of the Council

Which organisations have lost funding from Bromley Council this year?

Reply:

I am assuming that he is referring to the forthcoming year, and I will respond accordingly.

- Bromley MENCAP
- Kids and Crew
- Bromley Gypsy Community Traveller Project
- Mytime
- Somali Well Woman Project
- Somali Community Association
- Bromley Asian Community Association
- Pineapple Club
- Keyring
- Burgess Autistic Trust
- Bromley Shelter
- St Christopher's Fellowship
- CAB
- Bromley Youth Music Trust

Supplementary Question:

Why has it taken until tonight for Members to be informed of those organisations that are going to be losing money from April. The lack of transparency has been appalling this year – goodness knows what it would be like if this Council was on a knife-edge in terms of political control. I really want to see far more transparency.

Reply:

Fortunately I think it will be a long time before this Council is on a political knife edge. I just turn to your comments earlier about the numbers from BYMT that are here. Clearly organisations knew, other people knew what we are proposing, they have been discussed at previous meetings and I am slightly confused by Councillor Fookes' comments.

4. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Leader of the Council

What estimate he has of the cost of new legislation and judicial decisions on the council's budget in each of the past three years?

Reply:

(See appendix 1 - information already circulated.)

A total of £7.4m per annum by the end of this financial year.

Supplementary Question:

Does the Leader agree that, given the number of in-year burdens put on this Council, we need in our budget-setting tonight a reserve which can be used as a contingency for items like this which appear out of the blue from the government or from judicial decisions.

Reply:

We can demonstrate over the last two or three years the prudent approach we have taken in setting our budgets and Councillor Bennett is absolutely right. When we consider our budget later this evening I'm sure that we will be exploring ways to address this in the future.

5. From Cllr Ruth Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Education

What information he has as to the number of children who will be eligible for school in the Borough at the age of 5 in each year until 2020 on the basis of live births and recent inward migration to the borough?

Reply:

The projections we use in Bromley are based on GLA projection figures, together with information on the numbers of live births, the registration of children at GP surgeries, projections in regard to the numbers of children likely to be yielded from major housing developments and information from pre-school providers.

The figures across the borough - there are hotspots in particular locations where there are particular issues - are as follows -

2015/16 - 4,226
2016/17 - 4,209
2017/18 - 4,225
2018/19 - 4,282
2019/20 - 4,317
2020/21 - 4,361

This borough is experiencing considerable inward migration from inner London in terms of families with young children, from immigration from outside the UK and from live births within the borough.

Supplementary Question:

The position is very worrying – how many extra classes will we need to have in place by 2020 and presumably, five years later, secondary classes?

Reply:

The figures that we are currently working on suggest that we will need to have a minimum of seven forms of entry which in most cases represents two primary schools in addition to those already planned and expansions already under way across the borough.

In terms of secondary schools, we would expect to need around twenty seven to thirty new classes across the borough. If there are typically six forms of entry per school this would mean around five new secondary schools.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Tony Owen asked what the methodology was – he was suspicious of long estimates not ending in zero or five, which suggested that arbitrary percentages were being applied.

Reply:

A 3% margin of error is applied to the figures, plus or minus. This is not a science, but more of an art. The projections for live births will vary for after 2019 in that the children are not yet born. The development level yield is based on the number of bedrooms and the number of dwellings that we are likely to be looking at. The figure of 6,421 used for projections beyond the next three years is based on GLA figures. The methods by which we gather information from pre-school providers are more useful but do not work beyond 2019 as the children are not yet born.

This is a projection, not absolute figures, but it is clear that there is a worrying upwards trend which we have seen for at least four years and the rise so far is consistent with our projections.

6. From Cllr Tony Owen to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection

From April onwards, how will the borough deal with shootings and inter racial incidents, such as the recent McDonalds case?

Reply:

I am reliably informed by Bromley Police that they will continue to take incidents of shootings and inter-racial incidents very seriously, and they will deploy the correct response as it is required.

7. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

What progress has been made in making sure that the Council can enforce parking restrictions thus retaining £1 Million a year to the borough's coffers?

Reply:

Depressingly little. Despite lobbying, press interviews, work at London Councils where there is a cross-borough consensus at the borderline insanity of some of these proposals, despite debates in the House of Commons and House of Lords, where I should single out and praise the Liberal Democrat peer Lord Graham Tope, who described some of the ideas emerging from the DCLG as having been made up in the pub on Friday night, which is where they should remain. We are now in a position, despite the helpful exclusion of school crossing patrols, if boroughs can still afford to run their fleets to police them, it is now going back to the House of Lords on 4th March where I hope they will take the last opportunity to throw out the banning of CCTV vehicles. The downside if they don't will be that we will have reduced road safety capability in the borough and people will park dangerously and we will not be able stop them. The bottom line is that everything comes at a price and the price here will be that good car drivers, non-car users and users of public transport will in effect be cross subsidising irresponsible car drivers who disobey the rules and violate social norms. It is fundamentally not right. I would ask all Members to contact your MPs and ask them one last time to prevent this aspect of the legislation becoming part of the Act.

Supplementary Question:

Could the Portfolio Holder say what response he has had from MPs on this matter.

Reply:

To date I have heard from Jim Dowd MP (Lewisham West and Penge) who has said that he will look at it.

8. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Education

If he will give the location of each youth club run by the Council, the hours of operation, the annual running costs of the accommodation (including recharges), the estimated value of the premises, the annual staff costs (including recharges) and the number of different young people using each club each week?

Reply:

The location and hours of operation for each youth club are included in the Bromley Youth Support Programme, Delivery Schedule and Contracts which are available on the Bromley Council website, a copy of which has been put in the Members Room along with the attendance figures.

9. From Cllr Ruth Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

What representations have been made to Affinity Sutton to encourage them to regenerate their estates within the borough?

Reply:

Whilst LBB does not have statutory powers to direct Affinity Sutton to regenerate estates, there are liaison arrangements in place with Affinity Sutton at both officer and Member level, including twice yearly meetings between the respective Chief Executives, Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council. The meetings offer the opportunity to discuss and feed in at both operational and strategic level on issues such as regeneration and management of existing estates and plans for future developments. Where concerns or particular issues have been brought to officer and/or Member attention these will be raised at the meetings for agreed resolution.

10. From Cllr Tony Owen to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

From April onwards, how will the Female Genital Mutilation task and finish group maintain trusted contact with relevant groups?

Reply:

The Bromley FGM Task and Finish group was set up by the Bromley Safeguarding Children's Board (BSCB). It has met 4 times and has completed its brief. The Head of Nursing and Safeguarding for Bromley Clinical Commissioning Group represents the BSCB on the pan London FGM Steering Group and provides a link between London-wide and local activity. Officers from the Council and Bromley Clinical Commissioning Group have long established links with local BME groups which provide a conduit to local communities.

A report on FGM will be considered by the BSCB on 3rd March and the joint Care Services PDS meeting on 26th February will receive a briefing from the CCG's Director of Quality, Governance and Patient Safety.

Supplementary Question:

It seems to me that the links have been withdrawn, and I am not sure how we re-establish these links given that the existing link is going. Most of the things mentioned sounded like pan-London talking shops.

Reply:

Councillor Owen is under the misapprehension that there is one single link person – it is my information that there are several people who make contact with the local BME population, not just one.

11. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Leader of the Council

What efforts have been made to share resources with other public or private sector organisations in the borough?

Reply:

In face of ongoing financial constraints, the Council is committed to working with partners in the public, private and voluntary sector, to ensure that Council services remain effective and efficient. This includes developing shared services with Bexley, Lewisham and Greenwich Councils, and identifying opportunities to commission services from other organisations, where standards of services can be shared and efficiency savings generated.

Officers are also in regular discussions with public sector partners, the police, fire service and health sector, to consider the scope for sharing facilities and reducing costs.

12. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Education

What estimate does he have of the cost of providing alternative school places following the decision last year to refuse planning permission for the temporary buildings at Harris Beckenham site for a primary free school?

Reply:

The estimated final cost of the temporary class, fencing and car parking at the Unicorn school resulting from the decision to provide a bulge class there to take pupils from Harris Beckenham was £353k. This does not include officer time which was very considerable and unplanned for.

Following the loss of the appeal, the Planning Inspector added additional requirements on the local authority which will add further as yet unspecified costs to the overall programme. However, we do have an estimate that this could be £130k over the next six years. All of these costs, both capital and revenue, would have to be met through Revenue Support Grant.

The figure above does not include the cost of expanding the planned works at Unicorn School to take the bulge once the temporary class is removed, and the concomitant risks that will arise from having to take these through planning once again. The overall figure may well therefore be nearer to £500,000 once these costs are taken into account.

Appendix1: Question 4

<u>Description</u>	<u>Net cost to Council after grants</u>		
	<u>2012/13</u>	<u>2013/14</u>	<u>2014/15</u>
<u>Finance</u>	<u>£000</u>	<u>£000</u>	<u>£000</u>
1 Council Tax Support New Burdens			
Impact on grant funding	0	811	-25
Council Tax Support New Burdens - funding	-84	-142	-134
	-84	669	-159
2 Changes to Housing Benefit Subsidy			
LHA Changes	-8	0	0
Welfare Reform Fund	-50	0	0
Recession Funding	0	-84	0
HB Reform Transitional funding	-59	0	0
Local welfare Provision set-up costs	-8	0	0
Local Welfare Provision admin funding	0	-173	-159
Payment to Liberata for implementation	50	250	143
Early Adopter of Benefit Cap	0	-280	0
	-75	-287	-16
3 Local Welfare Provision			
Government Funding	0	-819	-819
Northgate Costs	57	75	71
Welfare Fund Programme Costs	0	442	442
	57	-302	-306
4 LGPS	0	37	26
5 Auto Enrolment	0	0	200

Chief Executives

1 Localism Act 2011			
Additional burden being met within existing resources	0	0	0
2 Immigration Act 2014			
Additional burden being met within existing resources	0	0	0
3 Electoral Registration and Administration Act 2013			
Implementation of Individual Electoral Registration System	0	25	130
Grant funding	0	-25	-130
	0	0	0

ECS

1 Changes in the disposal requirements for detritus	35	135	145
2 Implementation of Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004			
This means that local authorities are expected to undertake a multi-agency review, following a domestic homicide, to assist all those involved in the review process, in identifying the lessons that can be learned with a view to preventing future homicides and violence. (So far we have had only one which has cost £8,000 for the management and conducting of the review plus associated officer time in Public Protection £4,000.	0	12	0
3 Scrap metal dealers – although the fees are supposed to recover the costs	0	0	0
4 Trading standards based legislations which will give additional enforcement responsibilities	0	0	0

T & R

1 **Planning Regulations**

There is a loss of income arising from the changes to Planning regulations where some applications for house extensions now have permitted development rights linked with a Prior Notification Process. This means that in selected cases, much of the work will have to be done but no fee is received. The Council receive on average 100 such cases a year which means a loss of income of £8,600.	0	9	9
---	---	---	---

ECHS

1 **Reforms to the Family Justice System - requires LAs to complete Care Proceedings within 26 weeks.**

1.0 Court Pilot coordinator, 2.0 FTE to undertake connected person assessments within timescales and Increases to Family Group Conferences	9	124	174
Grant received vis SWIF/Monroe and Adoption Grant	-9	-124	-174
Net Expenditure	0	0	0

2 **Changes to the Children Act 1989 Guidance and Regulations Volume 3: Planning Transition to Adulthood - known as Staying Put policy.**

Gross Expenditure	0	0	160
Grant received	0	0	-36
Net Expenditure	0	0	124

3 **Children and Family Bill 2013 Makes changes to fostering and adoption requirements.**

Gross Expenditure	49	171	346
Grant received (2012-13 Adoption Improvement grant £49,197, 2013-14 Adoption reform grant total £697,592 and 2014-15 Adoption Reform Grant £273,154.	-49	-171	-346
Net Expenditure	0	0	0

4 Academies Act 2010			
LACSEG top-sliced from RSG		6,582	6,582
Grant received (Education Services Grant)	0	-2,957	-2,372
Net Reduction in funding	0	3,625	4,210
5 Care Act			
Gross Expenditure (Estimated cost in 2015/16 £2,876k, grant of £2,598k, net position of £278k)	0	0	125
Grant received	0	0	-125
Net Expenditure	0	0	0
6 Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act. (LASPO). Transfers the central bed costs for secure remand to the LA and also requires LA to consider all remanded young people as LAC. Costs;			
Gross Expenditure	4	269	272
Grant received	-4	-74	-61
Net Expenditure	0	195	211
7 Tower Hamlets Judgement - In respect of Connected Persons payments.			
Gross Expenditure	0	0	60
Grant received	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	0	0	60
8 No Recourse to Public Funds – comes under existing legislation however, case law and how immigration claims are processed and the application of the benefits system means the costs of supporting children and families has been passed to the LA.			
Gross Expenditure	148	539	619
Grant received	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	148	539	619

9 Southwark judgement			
Gross Expenditure	100	100	100
Grant received	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	100	100	100
10 Children and Families Act 2014 - SEN Reforms			
Gross Expenditure	0	0	334
Grant received (2014-15 SEN Reform Grant £382k, 2014-15 SEND Implementation (New Burdens) Grant £152k with 2014-15 SEND Implementation (New Burdens) Grant £107k remaining in contingency)	0	0	-534
Net Expenditure	0	0	-200
11 DOLS			
Gross Expenditure (£628k budgeted for 2015/16. No additional grant funding to cover costs)	0	0	163
Grant received	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	0	0	163
12 Welfare Reform (Homelessness)			
Gross Expenditure	0	1,000	2,200
Grant received	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	0	1,000	2,200

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

23rd FEBRUARY 2015

QUESTIONS FOR WRITTEN REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Cllr Simon Fawthrop to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

What is the largest airplane that

- a) can physically land at Biggin Hill Airport by Volume?
- b) is allowed to land at Biggin Hill Airport under the terms of the lease by volume?
- c) land at the airport by noise levels in decibels?

Reply:

- a) I am not clear what is meant by “volume” (noise, number of flights or physical size). The lease allows 125,000 movements per annum so theoretically the Airport could have 125,000 of any one aircraft type landing and taking off while remaining within the terms of the lease.
- b) The largest aircraft permitted in the “List of Approved Aircraft” are Airbus A320 and Boeing 737 500.
- c) The noise levels are covered in the third schedule of the lease as paragraphs (e) (i) and (ii).

Sideline	94 EPNdB
Take-off	89 EPNdB
Approach	98 EPNdB

2. From Cllr Simon Fawthrop to the Portfolio Holder for Environment

What is the frequency of public transport service at Biggin Hill Airport at the following times and the destination of the service (nearest railway station)

- (i) between 6.30am and 7.30am on a weekday morning
- (ii) after 9.00pm on a weekday
- (iii) before 9.00am on a weekend
- (iv) after 8.00pm on a weekend

Reply:

- (i) 6 bus services an hour
- (ii) 4 bus services an hour
- (iii) 6 bus services an hour
- (iv) 6 bus services an hour to 9pm; 4 services an hour thereafter

3. From Cllr Simon Fawthrop to the Portfolio Holder for Environment

What are the quickest journey times by public transport from Biggin Hill Airport to Bromley South and Orpington railway stations?

Reply:

Bromley South – 18 minutes (320 service)
Orpington – 17 minutes (R2 service)

4. From Cllr David Jefferys to the Portfolio Holder for Education

When will building work commence on the Kingswood House Free School site and when will the school open?

Reply:

The works at Kingswood House to provide a permanent facility for Harris Primary Academy Shortlands are being carried out by the EFA. The latest update provided to the LA is that works are due to start during Spring 2015 and be complete by August 2016.

5. From Cllr David Jefferys to the Portfolio Holder for Education

(a) How many pupils admitted to the Harris Kingswood Free school in September 2014 live in Shortlands Ward, and the number and percentage who live more than one mile from the Kingwood site?

Reply:

We do not record pupil place planning data on a ward basis

The number and percentage of pupils who live more than one mile from the Kingwood site?				
	Less Than 1 mile	Between 1 and 1.99 miles	More than 2 Miles	Total
No.	39	9	5	53
Percentage	74%	17%	9%	100%

(b) The same figures for the children offered places for September 2015

Reply:

The data requested will not be available until after National Offer Day on 16 April 2015.

6. From Councillor David Jefferys to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

What plans there are to commemorate the 350th anniversary of the opening of a Bromley College in 2016? If there are currently no plans whether the Portfolio Holder will work with the Trustees to appropriately mark the anniversary of the opening of this architectural gem in the Borough and commemorate the major contribution its residents have made to the life of Bromley over the centuries?

Reply:

I am not aware of plans to mark the 350th anniversary of Bromley College, a Grade 1 Listed Building, but will be pleased to work with the trustees as suggested.

7. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

Can you please advise the number of Bromley residents/families being made homeless through no fault of their own in the last 12 months?

Reply:

2012/13 – formal homeless applications 1146, of which full duty accepted 503
2014/15 (Q1 -3) formal applications 1688 of which full homelessness duty accepted 481

8. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

A lot of time and effort has been spent on preparation of the Ward Profiles. In what ways are LBB making use the profiles and are there plans to tackle any of the negative outcomes?

Reply:

Ward Profiles were included into the JSNA this year as additional information on population health and care needs to inform commissioning. This is the main purpose of the JSNA.

Beyond the use in commissioning, the profiles have also been shared with Councillors to highlight and increase their understanding of the level and type of population need in their own area. This may promote discussions with the local community around how to best address identified need.

9. From Cllr Kathy Bance to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

Is it accurate that a £7k invoice to cover the services of the Bromley Winter night shelter for 2014 / 2015 has only been partly paid by LBB at £3k? If so, is this a part payment with the outstanding £4k to be paid at a later date?

Reply:

The funding allocation for the Bromley Night Shelter 2014/15 is £3k once an appropriate invoice has submitted, this will be paid in full.

10. From Cllr Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Penge West Railway Station had been earmarked for step free access. Can you advise when work or consultation is expected to commence?

Reply:

TfL & London Overground Rail Operating Ltd (LOROL) have previously been lobbied by this Council for step free access at Penge West to the southbound platform. Proposals were discussed with them as recently as January 2014 but it was later

confirmed that TfL's Accessibility Implementation Plan did not identify Penge West as a strategic priority, as the neighbouring stations are all step-free (Sydenham, Penge East, Anerley and Crystal Palace). Officers have asked LOROL for clarification on whether this has subsequently changed.

11. From Cllr Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Are there any specific scheduled dates for the company who fine people for dropping litter outside Bromley South Train Station to do any work in Penge and Cator.

Reply:

The Scheduled visits by Street Enforcement officers to Penge High Street / Maple Road and Anerley Road are once a week as of November 2014. These are varied to different days of the week.

37 enforcement investigations have been undertaken in the Penge, Cator and Anerley Areas.

Once a week targeted dog fouling enforcement patrols as of December 2014 in local streets such as Venner road, Maple road, Laurel Grove.

186 site patrols of the local parks in this area ie. Cator Park, Penge Recreation Ground, Betts Park, Royston Field Open Space have been undertaken in the last 6 months.

The Enforcement Officer for this area alone (Penge & Cator) takes up to 50 complaint calls per month.

12. From Cllr Vanessa Allen to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

With a number of new schools being constructed in the Borough and other schools increasing their intake substantially, what provision is being made for school crossing patrols and other road safety measures where appropriate?

Reply:

School Crossing Patrols are jointly funded by the Council and individual schools who chose to operate one.

Should any school (existing or new) wish to operate a School Crossing Patrol they should contact the Council to enable the necessary arrangements to be made.

Council Officers also engage in more targeted work with all schools, promoting road safety and smarter travel initiatives, as well investigate and implement other road safety measures, wherever they are deemed to be necessary.

13. From Cllr Richard Williams to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

How much is owed to Bromley in council tax and what is the largest amount owed by an individual?

Reply:

As at the 31/1/15 £10,198,040.47 remains outstanding in respect of the period 01 April 1993 to 31 March 2014. In addition, £8,036,764.57 is currently due for the financial year 2014/15.

The largest amount owed is £23,484.87 this includes the full liability for 2014/15 and £1,268.90 costs.

Of the above sum, £21,464.99 has been through all stages of recovery up to and including to referral to bailiffs and £2,019.88 (current year) is at Liability Order stage. Not possible to place charge on property as charge payer is not the owner and insolvency practitioners have advised that we will not recover funds by making the liable person bankrupt.

The Authority is now considering instigating committal proceedings.

14. From Cllr Richard Williams to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal & Recreation

As 15% of users to the Upper Norwood library are residents of Bromley would the Council look at contributing to this service?

Reply:

No

15. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Following my question at the November meeting of the E&R PDS, can the Portfolio Holder provide:-

- What is the spend to date on the Adecco Agency Worker contract and the forecast out turn for the end of 2014/15?
- Please provide this spend broken down by month for 2014/15 and for as much of 2013/14 as monthly information is available for.
- Please also provide the number of person days provided under this contract by month for 2014/15 and for as much of 2013/14 as monthly information is available for.
- What percentage of the total paid to date for 2014/15 was retained by Adecco as their fee under this contract?

Reply:

See appendix 1 below.

The answer to the last bullet point is £37,265.77 management fee in the current financial year to January 2015.

16. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

At the full council meeting on 13 October 2014 I asked the following question:

“How many payments on account have been made to housing benefit claimants for each of the last 12 months and what is the percentage of payments on account of all claims for each of these months?”

In reply, the following answer was provided (Council agenda 8 December):

“Unfortunately, information as to the number of Payments on Account is not available. However, I can confirm that the Authority attempts to make the initial payment on new claims as soon as possible.”

Having had two local residents who were entitled to and not given housing benefit payments on account, I remain determined to pursue my original questions. Therefore, at Executive & Resources PDS on 4th February, when Liberata presented their report on Housing Benefit Administration, I asked for an explanation as to why this information was not available.

Having – in vain - asked the question a total of four times at that meeting, I was finally promised that an answer would be provided. It has not.

Members of the E&R PDS will be aware that I have serious concerns about the administration of housing benefit by this authority, and that this matter is now being addressed elsewhere.

In the meantime however, please could the Portfolio Holder assure me that he will now give his personal attention to my questions and ensure that I am promptly given adequate and accurate answers?

Reply:

In respect of Rent Allowance cases the Authority is obliged to make the first payment of Housing Benefit within 14 days of receiving a properly completed claim or “if that is not practicable, as soon as possible thereafter”. This should be either the correct amount of entitlement or if this is not known an estimated amount, which will be adjusted when the correct amount is known. A payment on Account does not need to be made where the claimant has not supplied any requested information and/or documentation they have requested.

The Authority’s application form advises the claimant (Part 15) of the documentation that will be required in order to process their claim. This message is reinforced in the accompanying notes. Obtaining all necessary information at the time of claim minimises the need for a Payment on Account as it enables a full assessment to be made.

Where further information/documentation is required, officers are directed to wherever possible make a provisional award. These vary from Payments on Account in so much that the sum paid is based on the lowest possible entitlement, rather than an estimated amount. In this way it is hoped to avoid creation of overpayments. A customised letter is sent to the claimant confirming that the award is being made on a provisional basis and advising that the claim will be suspended should the information not be provided in the given time.

Unfortunately, once the provisional award is made substantive the Academy benefit system, which is used by a large number of authority's, overwrites the "provisional" marker making it impossible to retrospectively identify the number of provisional awards made.

Following your initial request the Exchequer Services contractor commenced exploring means of extracting the required information from the sections data management system. By interrogation of the usage of the personalised letters detailed earlier, the following statistics have been extracted but 100% accuracy cannot be guaranteed.

	Jan 14	Feb 14	Mar 14	Apr 14	May 14	Jun 14	Jul 14	Aug 14	Sep 14	Oct 14	Nov 14	Dec 14	Jan 15
HB Claims processed	446	365	370	299	299	316	448	479	580	387	383	320	411
Provisional awards	34	32	38	33	28	38	45	43	33	27	35	21	17

You have my assurance that wherever possible you will continue to receive an immediate response to questions raised. Where the information is not readily available every practicable effort will be made to ascertain the answer.

17. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

What are the current electoral registration figures in % terms for each ward in the borough?

Reply:

Details of current registration figures are set out below (as at 2 February 2015)

WARD	ELECTORATE
Bickley	11690
Biggin Hill	7868
Bromley Common & Keston	12161
Bromley Town	12852
Chelsfield & Pratts Bottom	11373
Chislehurst	11899
Clock House	11783
Copers Cope	12026
Cray Valley East	11116
Cray Valley West	12133
Crystal Palace	8512
Darwin	4054
Farnborough & Crofton	11792
Hayes & Coney Hall	12537
Kelsey & Eden Park	12302
Mottingham & Chislehurst North	7340
Orpington	12009
Penge & Cator	12332

Petts Wood & Knoll	10862
Plaistow & Sundridge	11479
Shortlands	7689
West Wickham	12036
TOTAL	237,845

We are unable to provide these figures in % terms for the following reasons:

- % figures could only be produced on publication of the new register on 1 December following the annual canvass when every **household** in the ward/Borough received a Voter Registration form (100%). The number of **responses** to this was reflected as a % of this figure. These % figures could not be calculated at any other time of the year (i.e. through the rolling registration period)
- A new registration system (Individual Electoral registration) was introduced in England and Wales on 10 June 2014 by the UK Government replacing the previous outdated system where a 'head of household' submitted/responded to a Voter Registration form. Under IER people are required to register **individually** through a new process. % figures are no longer applicable

18. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Leader of the Council

What are Bromley doing to commemorate 50 years of the borough in May?

Reply:

Although there are some London-wide celebrations, in the present economic circumstances we are not proposing any major celebrations.

19. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

How many people in the borough have been sanctioned?

Reply:

Sanctions are imposed by the Department of Work and Pensions, I am therefore unable to provide the information requested.

20. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

If he will list by Plans Sub-Committee the number of applications since May 2014 which have been recommended for;

- i. approval
- ii. refusal
- iii. and the number in each case where the committee took a contrary view and the number of appeals registered as a result and where available the outcome of the appeal?

Reply:

There were 20 Plans Sub Committees (PSC) from May 2014 up to 5th February 2015 (5 of each number)

There were 316 applications on PSC agendas

5 were withdrawn

Total therefore 311

63 (20%) were subject to overturned recommendations where the Committee took a contrary view to the officer recommendation

43 of those overturned had appeals lodged

16 of those appeals were allowed

9 were dismissed

1 was part allowed and part dismissed

1 was withdrawn

16 are still in progress

21. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

What information he has as to the average number of applications dealt with by a single planning meeting in 2014-5 at the following boroughs:

Bromley

Hillingdon

Kensington and Chelsea

Wandsworth?

Reply:

Based on a sample, in summary -

Hillingdon: 8

Kensington and Chelsea: 15

Wandsworth: 32

Bromley: 17

22. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

If he will list the reasons which require a planning application to be automatically referred to a Planning sub-committee for decision?

Reply:

The Council's constitution sets out planning applications which cannot be approved by the Chief Planner, in summary these are:- Bromley Council proposals; applications for three or more new dwellings; applications for new commercial development; applications submitted by Councillors, MP's, and certain staff; and applications which one or more Councillors formally request are put before a committee.

23. From Councillor Ruth Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

If he will provide in table format the monthly average and annual figures for 2013-4 and up to the latest available date the following information about each library:

- i. Number of visitors
- ii. Number of book issues
- iii. running costs
- iv. Cost per visitor
- v. Cost per book issue?
- vi. What has the percentage increase or decrease in book issues since 2007?

Reply:

- i. Number of visitors. Listed for 2013-14 and have calculated the monthly average for number of visits per month to each library (Spreadsheet - Attachment 1)
- ii. Number of book issues- Listed for 2013-14 and estimated monthly averages calculated (Spreadsheet - Attachment 1)
- iii. Running costs-This was less straight forward as wasn't sure exactly what was required so have include a breakdown of net expenditure from the CIPFA stats, broken down into key areas. If you need me to be more specific, I can ask Tim for exact costs when he is back (spreadsheet - Attachment 2)
- iv. Cost per visitor- taken from the latest CIPFA stats along with Greater London average (spreadsheet - Attachment 2)
- v. Cost per book issue the figures are actually cost per book acquisition, taken from CIPFA stats along with greater London average (spreadsheet - Attachment 2)
- v. % decrease from 2007 for issues.(spreadsheet - Attachment 1)

Question 23: Attachments

1.Number of Visitors & averages		
Visits	2013-14	monthly average
Anerley	54,095	4,508
Beckenham	165,241	13,770
Biggin Hill	222,528	18,544
Burnt Ash	28,332	2,361
Central	468,096	39,008
Chislehurst	84,450	7,038
Hayes	31,650	2,638
Mobile Library	16,566	1,381
Mottingham	41,752	3,479
Orpington	308,966	25,747
Penge	80,989	6,749
Petts Wood	103,309	8,609
Shortlands	32,971	2,748
Southborough	31,454	2,621
St Pauls Cray	41,089	3,424
West Wickham	122,026	10,169
Total	1,833,514	152,793

2.No of Issues & averages		
Issues	2013/14	monthly average
Anerley	28,467	2,372.25
Beckenham	195,764	16,313.67
Biggin Hill	66,226	5,518.83
Burnt Ash	17,948	1,495.67
Central	300,874	25,072.83
Chislehurst	84,754	7,062.83
Hayes	30,343	2,528.58
Mobile	19,388	1,615.67
Mottingham	26,325	2,193.75
Orpington	203,514	16,959.50
Penge	29,874	2,489.50
Petts Wood	94,400	7,866.67
Shortlands	35,804	2,983.67
Southborough	53,976	4,498.00
St Paul's Cray	28,302	2,358.50
West Wickham	108,387	9,032.25
Sub-Total	1,324,346	110,362.17
Callpoint	2,833	236
HLS	0	0
Reading Group Sets	7,008	584
Stack	1,178	98
Web	59,625	4,969
ebooks	9,611	801
Overall Total	1,404,601	117,050

6. % increase or decrease in book issues since 2007		
% change in issues since 2007		
2006/07	2013/14	% Change
2,018,887	1,404,601	-30.43%

Bromley Libraries Financial Information:
 Data sourced from CIPFA Stats Comparative Profiles-2013-14 Actuals and 2014-15
 Estimates

	£ p
4. Bromley cost per visitor	£3.63
Greater London Average cost per visitor	£3.65

5. Bromley cost per book acquisition	£6.74
Greater London Average cost per visitor	£6.78

3. Libraries Running Costs-Net expenditure	
Employees	2,984,470
Premises	1,109,570
Supplies & Services-Materials	538,000
Other Expenditure	1,745,530
Revenue Expenditure	6,377,570
Revenue Income(deduct)	451,850
Net Expenditure	5,925,720

Appendix 1: Reply to question 15

	Net	Vat	Gross
Totals 13/14 (from Apr 22)	5,342,357.81	1,068,473.58	6,410,831.39
Totals 14/15 (to Jan 28)	5,601,470.26	1,120,295.51	6,721,765.77
Forecast Outturn 14/15	6,721,764.31	1,344,354.61	8,066,118.92

Year	Month	Financial Year	Net	Vat	Gross	Total Hours	Days (calculated)
2013	May	13/14	203,615.09	40,723.02	244,338.11	11,749.50	1,631.88
2013	June	13/14	485,181.24	97,036.25	582,217.49	24,360.95	3,383.47
2013	July	13/14	649,936.47	129,987.28	779,923.75	32,285.55	4,484.10
2013	August	13/14	533,740.57	106,748.08	640,488.65	28,357.25	3,938.51
2013	September	13/14	342,265.91	68,453.34	410,719.25	19,222.25	2,669.76
2013	October	13/14	645,397.29	129,079.79	774,477.08	33,912.25	4,710.03
2013	November	13/14	525,439.63	105,088.16	630,527.79	26,752.75	3,715.66
2013	December	13/14	350,424.77	70,085.16	420,509.93	18,433.50	2,560.21
2014	January	13/14	110,864.95	22,173.57	133,038.52	5,031.00	698.75
2014	February	13/14	1,039,068.45	207,814.16	1,246,882.61	51,985.00	7,220.14
2014	March	13/14	456,423.44	91,284.78	547,708.22	23,736.75	3,296.77
2014	April	14/15	142,723.61	28,544.76	171,268.37	7,410.75	1,029.27
2014	May	14/15	911,010.06	182,202.52	1,093,212.58	45,939.75	6,380.52
2014	June	14/15	472,812.99	94,562.82	567,375.81	24,014.25	3,335.31
2014	July	14/15	548,935.86	109,787.17	658,723.03	27,873.00	3,871.25
2014	August	14/15	538,898.90	107,780.01	646,678.91	26,398.75	3,666.49
2014	September	14/15	639,729.98	127,946.25	767,676.23	31,843.25	4,422.67
2014	October	14/15	517,712.33	103,542.69	621,255.02	25,695.25	3,568.78
2014	November	14/15	577,150.79	115,430.33	692,581.12	27,298.25	3,791.42
2014	December	14/15	772,363.93	154,472.34	926,836.27	37,934.00	5,268.61
2015	January	14/15	480,131.81	96,026.62	576,158.43	23,449.25	3,256.84

This page is left intentionally blank