



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Keith Pringle  
[keith.pringle@bromley.gov.uk](mailto:keith.pringle@bromley.gov.uk)

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4508

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 9 January 2015

To: Members of the  
**ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)  
Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Kevin Brooks, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Terence Nathan,  
Angela Page, Sarah Phillips, Catherine Rideout, Richard Scoates and  
Melanie Stevens

A meeting of the Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee will be held at Bromley Civic Centre on **TUESDAY 20 JANUARY 2015 AT 7.30 PM**

MARK BOWEN  
Director of Corporate Services

*Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from*  
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>

## A G E N D A

### **PART 1 AGENDA**

**Note for Members:** Members are reminded that Officer contact details are shown on each report and Members are welcome to raise questions in advance of the meeting.

### **STANDARD ITEMS**

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

**2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

**3 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC  
ATTENDING THE MEETING**

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to this Committee must be received in writing four working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure that questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2015.

**4 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON  
4TH NOVEMBER 2014 (Pages 3 - 32)**

## **HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT**

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

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, questions to the Portfolio Holder must be received in writing four working days before the date of the meeting. Therefore please ensure that questions are received by the Democratic Services Team by 5pm on Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2015.

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

The Environment Portfolio Holder to present scheduled reports for pre-decision scrutiny on matters where he is minded to make decisions.

**a BUDGET MONITORING 2014/15** (Pages 33 - 44)

**b CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2ND QUARTER 2014/15**  
(Pages 45 - 50)

**c PARKING CHARGES** (Pages 51 - 64)

### **7 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE**

**a CLOSURE OF BECKENHAM, BROMLEY AND WEST WICKHAM PUBLIC TOILETS** (Pages 65 - 72)

## **POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS**

### **8 METROPOLITAN POLICE ROAD TRAFFIC PRESENTATION**

**9 DRAFT 2015/16 BUDGET** (Pages 73 - 94)

**10 CHISLEHURST ROAD BRIDGE - POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW**  
(Pages 95 - 100)

**11 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME, MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS, AND CONTRACTS REGISTER** (Pages 101 - 108)

.....

## ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 4 November 2014

### Present

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)  
Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Kevin Brooks, Alan Collins,  
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Terence Nathan,  
Angela Page, Catherine Rideout, Richard Scoates and  
Melanie Stevens

### Also Present

Councillor Colin Smith, Councillor Julian Benington and  
Councillor Russell Mellor

#### **25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Councillor Sarah Phillips and Councillor Alan Collins attended as alternate.

#### **26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Collins declared a personal interest at item 6b by virtue of using the Unicorn School Green Garden Waste Satellite Site.

#### **27 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

There were no questions to the Committee.

#### **28 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23RD SEPTEMBER 2014**

The minutes were agreed.

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

In view of the number of questions to the Portfolio Holder, it was agreed to extend the 15 minutes allowed for questions in the Council's constitution, to 30 minutes.

Details of the questions are at **Appendix A** along with replies from the Portfolio Holder.

After a period of 30 minutes it was agreed to proceed with the Committee's substantive business; remaining questions would receive a written response from the Environment Portfolio Holder.

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

**A) BUDGET MONITORING 2014/15**

**Report FSD14068**

Based on expenditure and activity levels to 30th September 2014, the latest overall budget monitoring position for the Environment Portfolio 2014/15 showed an under-spend of £19k, with the controllable budget projected to be balanced at year-end.

Details were provided of the projected outturn with a forecast of projected spend against each relevant division compared to the latest approved budget. Background to variations was outlined.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the latest 2014/15 budget projection for the Environment Portfolio.**

**B) GREEN GARDEN WASTE SATELLITE SITES - REVISED SERVICE**

**Report ES14096**

Members considered a proposed revision to the Green Garden Waste (GGW) Satellite service.

In recent years GGW tonnages collected at satellite sites had reduced. Provisional 2014 tonnages suggest that tonnages might have risen slightly, but were still projected to be lower than tonnages in 2012. GGW tonnages delivered by residents to the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) had also declined since 2010 (although good weather this year had seen a slight rise in tonnages).

With over 15,000 customers having subscribed to the GGW collection service and new customers subscribing monthly, the original objective of the Satellite Sites – to address congestion issues near the HWRC sites – had become less crucial. Improvements to customer areas at the HWRC sites had also helped to address congestion pressures.

Two options were therefore proposed as savings to the GGW Satellite service:

Option 1: Open 3 sites on Saturdays and 2 different sites on Sundays between April and November with an annual saving of £136k;

Option 2: Open 3 sites on Saturdays and 2 different sites on Sundays between April and October with an annual saving of £151k.

The cost of operating the sites is highest on Sundays due to additional wage costs for Sunday working. Sunday opening hours are also more limited due to restrictions on HWRC opening hours and the need to empty vehicles ready for normal Monday work. With more sites open on Saturdays, site availability will also be maximised to avoid congestion.

The proposed service change also assumed that the sites would be operated one weekend each January to enable residents to recycle Christmas trees, with three sites open on Saturday and two open on the Sunday.

Where necessary the operating day of a site could also be changed during a particular weekend e.g. switching the day for Charles Darwin from Saturday to Sunday to avoid a Saturday open day at the school. Contingency measures would also be available should fly-tipping increase.

Councillor Mellor (Copers Cope), attending as a visiting Member, referred to a number of comments received from residents in Copers Cope ward. These included concern over the level of consultation. Two elderly residents, without online access, had not been advised of the proposed change. Financial constraints were recognised but it was also necessary to consider the concerns of residents. There was also a view that the HWRCs would not be able to cope with an increased demand. Some pensioners might also find an annual £60 fee for the collection scheme difficult to afford. Based on financial considerations, Councillor Mellor suggested that Option 2 provided a more favourable option, delivering savings to both residents and the Council.

In response to a question from Councillor Benington, also a visiting Member, it was confirmed that a spare vehicle was available for GGW, although for satellite site collections, fewer vehicles would be necessary in future. Councillor Benington highlighted the high level of courtesy and flexibility of staff at the Charles Darwin site.

Members considered the proposed service change, recognising its necessity in view of budget constraints. There had also been a decline in usage of the satellite sites. Comments made by Committee Members included the following:

- the proposals are fair;
- all existing sites will continue to operate - either on a Saturday or Sunday under the new service;
- more promotion of the GGW collection scheme is necessary;
- direct debit payments at £15 per quarter could provide an attractive option;

- increased publicity is necessary before implementing the change, including further promotion of the collection scheme;
- a saving of this level for GGW is preferable to finding an equivalent saving in social care;
- arrangements for Christmas tree disposal need to be publicised in good time with satellite sites open during a weekend after twelfth night.

In response to an observation that the sites for Sunday opening are closest to the HWRCs, Members were advised that more vehicles pass through the centres on Saturday compared to Sunday with traffic tending to flow more smoothly on Sundays.

The Portfolio Holder highlighted that it was possible for householders at smaller properties to share a GGW Wheelie Bin and the cost of the service.

In concluding, it was agreed that Option 1 should be recommended.

**RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree that Option 1 be taken forward for the future operation of the Green Garden Waste Satellite Site service, as outlined at paragraph 3.14 of Report ES14096, with the changes effective from April 2015.**

(Democratic Services Note - following the meeting it was proposed that Shire Lane, Cotmandene Crescent and Norman Park satellite sites would be open on Saturdays between 11am and 4pm, with Biggin Hill and Unicorn School satellite sites open on Sundays. This was subsequently reflected in the decision taken by the Environment Portfolio Holder).

### **C) ON-STREET ENFORCEMENT**

#### **Report ES14027**

Arrangements had been made with Ward Security to continue delivering a littering enforcement service, concurrent with the existing Parks Security service, from 1st January 2015 to 31st March 2020 at net zero cost to L B Bromley. The existing parks security contract would need to be extended and varied.

It was intended to deliver the service on a seasonal basis around peak hours and events, with a focus on the busiest days at town centres. It was proposed to operate the service from a Tuesday to Saturday, capturing market days and rush hours. Two full time Enforcement Officers would work in conjunction with the Parks Security Contract to increase coverage, particularly in winter months when parks are not so busy. The team would also be supplemented in peak seasonal times with two additional officers for 72 days of the year.

The average cost of the service per month was estimated at £10,750, inclusive of administrative support and management supervision, and would

be paid to Ward Security monthly in arrears. Ward Security would invoice L B Bromley for the hours worked; in return L B Bromley would retain income received from FPNs paid. Should the level of income received not equal the cost of labour paid to Ward Security, Ward Security would then provide a credit note to LBB for the difference.

It was also possible to link the processing of FPNs with the parking enforcement system. This would result in Ward Security being able to reduce current supervision and administration costs. Use of electronic handheld devices from existing parking equipment stock would greatly improve the reconciliation process and accuracy of data. A one-off £2k set up cost for four hand held devices would be necessary along with on-going costs of £2.2k for year 1 and £1k per annum from year 2 onwards for licences and stationery. Ward Security would meet these costs from year 2 onwards. L B Bromley would continue to take non- paying offenders through the court process.

Ward Security would also be developing an option to take over full management of the service, including collection of income and managing the court process.

Members supported the recommendation to the Portfolio Holder. It was possible to have a break clause in the contract and to be flexible on this.

It was hoped that Enforcement Officers would not over penalise offenders for accidentally dropping litter. Enforcement officers would generally be in uniform to make a challenge but this might not always be the case e.g. challenging for dog fouling offences. Enforcement Officers would also wear body cameras.

**RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve a variation and extension to the existing Parks Security Contract to include the issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices where individuals are in breach of the requirements of the Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act, including offences for littering and dog fouling on the public Highway.**

**D) ORPINGTON RAILWAY STATION: IMPROVED ACCESS AND BUS STOP ENHANCEMENT**

**Report ES14075**

As a condition to planning approval for the Tesco Store, Orpington, £80k has been set aside to enhance bus stops within the Orpington area, the money being held by L B Bromley on behalf of TfL.

It was proposed to use the £80k sum to facilitate changes to the bus stop outside Orpington Station, subject to agreement from TfL. A sum of £50k was also available from the LIP budget for Public Transport Interchange and Access. The existing forecourt taxi stand would be split between the forecourt and Crofton Road, enabling installation of the new bus stop and lay-by, as

well as space for disabled person parking bays as part of the station car park/forecourt scheme.

The existing bus stop next to the carriageway requires buses to stop directly on the main carriageway, often resulting in vehicles queueing to overtake a stationary bus. The new bus stop and lay-by would provide a solution, significantly contributing to a free flow of traffic.

As the new forecourt provides space for no more than five taxis, it was proposed to reposition the existing zebra crossing on Crofton Road to enable a new two vehicle lay-by as an additional Hackney carriage taxi stand. Further on-street parking for five Hackney carriage taxis was also proposed by extending the existing dedicated loading bay on Crofton Road (adjacent to York Rise) and amending the Traffic Management Order to permit: (i) loading Monday to Saturday 8am to 5pm; and (ii) dedication of the bay as a Hackney carriage taxi stand Monday to Saturday 5pm to midnight and all day Sunday.

Members supported the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder.

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

**(1) approve the allocation of £80k of S106 monies towards access and bus stop improvements as part of the Orpington railway station car park and forecourt scheme, subject to TfL agreement;**

**(2) agree that informal consultation proceed based on the proposed changes to Crofton Road identified on drawing number ESD/11745-02; and**

**(3) delegate authority to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services to implement the detailed scheme design following consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder and Ward Members.**

**E) CONGESTION RELIEF SCHEME: HEATHFIELD ROAD / WESTERHAM ROAD, PROPOSED ROUNDABOUT**

**Report ES14092**

An update was provided on progress concerning the proposed congestion relief scheme at the junction of Heathfield Road with Westerham Road. This included summarised results from consultation on the scheme, the consultation having concluded at the end of September 2014. A clear majority of respondents supported the scheme.

The Portfolio Holder was asked to approve the scheme and delegate detailed final design to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services, following consultation with Ward Councillors and the Portfolio Holder. The scheme is low cost for a full sized roundabout and will help address congestion at the location. It will also help reduce the number of speed related personal injury collisions along Westerham Road.



Congestion issues primarily relate to southbound traffic along Heathfield Road. Motorists would most likely continue to use the route to avoid the Keston Mark junction as it provides the most direct route. A further traffic count in Heathfield Road between the end of September 2014 and beginning of October 2014, indicated that the proportion of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) using the road during the count period was less than 1%.

Based on road safety and congestion considerations, officers would continue to lobby TfL for improvements at the Keston Mark junction. A point had been reached in TfL's Programme where the junction would be subject to review. There was some hope that it would be possible to introduce a countdown signal for pedestrians and increase capacity at the junction.

The Chairman highlighted further views of Ward Councillors (in addition to those reported). Councillor Carr, unable to attend the meeting, considered the scheme unnecessary. Cllr Michael favoured the scheme. Considering the junction dangerous and noting a clear majority in support, she felt that HGVs using Heathfield Road should be treated as a separate issue. Councillor Ruth Bennett, in broad agreement with the recommendations, also suggested that traffic considerations for Keston Village be addressed separately.

To avoid an increase in HGVs along Heathfield Road, it was suggested the scheme be implemented following completion of the Cherry Lodge development in Darwin Ward. It was also suggested that sight lines at the roundabout should be particularly clear and a certain amount of deflection provided. If the scheme could be reviewed some six to nine months after completion, consideration could then be given to safety measures along Heathfield Road and any options related to the Primary School.

Aware that completion of Cherry Lodge could take some months, the Chairman suggested that TfL be lobbied in the meantime on improving the Keston Mark junction. It was also necessary to take account of views from Keston Villagers on safety related measures for Heathfield Road. The Portfolio Holder advised against a width restriction on approach to the village given access requirements for vehicles such as emergency vehicles, buses and refuse vehicles.

Following debate, Members agreed to support the recommendations in Report ES14092 and to additionally recommend that implementation of the scheme is delayed until the Cherry Lodge development is completed. Members also recommended that measures be considered to reduce excessive traffic speeds through Keston Village and that TfL continue to be lobbied on measures to improve the Keston Mark junction.

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

**(1) approve the proposed congestion relief scheme previously set out in Report ES13094 and shown on drawing ESD/11473-01;**

- (2) delegate the decision on final scheme design to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services, following consultation with Ward Councillors and the Portfolio Holder;**
- (3) delay implementation of the scheme until the Cherry Lodge development is completed;**
- (4) consider measures to help reduce excessive speeds through Keston Village and improve road safety; and**
- (5) ensure that TfL continue to be lobbied on measures to improve the Keston Mark junction.**

**F) PRIVATE STREET WORKS REFERENDA - UPPER DRIVE AND SWIEVELANDS ROAD (PART), BIGGIN HILL**

**Report ES14095**

In recent years, Ward Councillors had received complaints regarding the condition and use of Upper Drive and Swievelands Road, Biggin Hill, neither having been made up and adopted as a highway maintainable at the public expense. On several occasions the Council had been asked to carry out urgent repairs at its own expense, under S.230 (7) of the Highways Act 1980, but no budget was currently available to enable such repairs.

For the unmade part of the streets to become highway, maintainable at public expense, the Council would need to adopt them, subject to the highway having been improved to an acceptable standard. Much of the cost of making up a private street would need to be recharged to owners of premises fronting the street in line with the Private Street Works Code.

A referendum was conducted to determine the views of frontage owners on making up of the streets. Initial designs were undertaken and cost estimates obtained for frontage owners. Consideration was also given to the effects of Greenery Agreements, degree of benefit, and the possibility of recharging a proportion of the costs to the owners of premises situated in the numerous cul-de-sacs served by the streets.

As part of the referendum, owners of a property having a flank or rear frontage were informed that, subject to their particular circumstances, their charges could be reduced by between 20-67% of the standard amount. The Council was not permitted to charge a proportion of the making-up cost to owners of premises in adjoining cul-de-sacs. Owners could be requested to make voluntary contributions, and any such monies collected would reduce the street works charges.

Taking account of the issues above, owners of premises in Upper Drive were advised that the estimated cost of making up the street would be between £720-£740 per metre of frontage, and in Swievelands Road between £815-£835 per metre of frontage.

For Upper Drive, 46 referendum letters were delivered to frontagers with 31 replies received (67%). The results demonstrated insufficient support for the road to be made-up and adopted, with 69% of the total frontage, excluding 'Greenery Agreement' land, either not in favour or not expressing a view.

A total of 57 referendum letters were delivered to properties in Swievelands Road with 28 replies received (49%). The results did not indicate a majority of frontagers in favour of making-up and adopting Swievelands Road, with 67% of the total frontage, excluding 'Greenery Agreement' land, either not in favour or not expressing a view. However, given the road's location on the highway network and the views of Ward Members Report ES14095 proposed that a Private Street Works scheme be progressed for the road. The likely making-up cost was £600k, with £300k borne by L B Bromley.

Councillor Benington (Biggin Hill) addressed the Committee explaining that Swievelands Road and Upper Drive were located where Biggin Hill valley rises upwards. Part of Swievelands Roads was not made up and remained unadopted with the former tarmacked surface badly weathered causing difficulties for driving along the road. Councillor Benington supported this part of Swievelands Road being made up but accepted that Upper Drive would not be made up. Councillor Melanie Stevens (Biggin Hill) concurred with Councillor Benington that the part of Swievelands Road under consideration is in a particularly poor condition, causing serious difficulties for drivers, particularly during winter months.

In discussion Members supported the recommendation that no provision should be made for making up Upper Drive.

In considering Swievelands Road, there was concern the referendum results did not show a majority in favour of making up and adopting the road. Although a referendum was not necessary for the project, the Portfolio Holder felt it would be worthwhile to make further enquiries on how frontage owners yet to respond might feel on the matter. There was no budget to make up and adopt such roads solely at Council expense - to do so would be contrary to current policy. It was explained that there had been much effort to approach those not replying or expressing a view. Officers had sent repeat letters to those not replying, and approaches had been made in person to each relevant property. From such visits, ten frontage owners had expressed support for the making-up and two were against.

If it is against policy to proceed where the Council is expected to contribute financially (in this case £300k), and there is no significant demand for the work, it was suggested that no further consideration should be given to the project. Efforts had been made to contact frontage owners not replying or expressing a view. As such, and until such time as there is a clear majority of frontage owners expressing their support for such a project, Members agreed to decline their support for the making up and adoption of the remaining part of Swievelands Road.

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

**(1) no provision be made for the making up of Upper Drive in view of the results of the referendum for this street; and**

**(2) no scheme be taken forward under the Private Street Works Code for that part of Swivelands Road between its junction with Valley View and Bankside Close.**

**G) TODDLER PLAY AREA AT PRIORY GARDENS**

**Report ES14045**

Improvement works to the value of £30k were proposed for play space improvements at the toddler play area, Priory Gardens, High Street, Orpington.

Funds for the scheme equipment and installation were to be provided from the Section 106 Planning agreement related to the multi storey car park development at Earls Way, (Tesco Supermarket).

Consultation during the summer holidays with parents of children using the play area found that toddler items in the play area were considered outdated and of a poor standard.

Members supported the proposed improvement works.

**RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the carrying out of improvement works to the Priory Gardens toddler play area funded by S106 monies.**

**31 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORT WITH A  
RECOMMENDATION TO THE EXECUTIVE AND OTHER  
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO  
HOLDER**

**A) PLANNED HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME 2015/16**

**Report ES14093**

Members considered programmes of planned road and footway maintenance for completion by close 2015/16. Schemes were also presented for subsequent years as was information on the Council's annual bid to Transport for London (TfL) for bridge assessment and strengthening.

Planned maintenance minimises the level of reactive maintenance necessary, so increasing value for money and customer satisfaction. It also reduces unplanned network disruption and contributes to fewer damage claims.

The overall programme was prioritised by expected budget and based on highway condition and other factors such as use, location, adjacent services, frequency of reactive maintenance, level of public enquiries and consultation responses.

Additional Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding was also available during 2014/15 for resurfacing busy bus routes (£120k) and resurfacing other roads where accidents had been attributed to skidding (mass action £135k).

A one-off sum of £504,982 had also been received from the Department for Transport (DfT) to permanently repair potholes. It was necessary to spend the sum by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016 and approval was sought to its release from central contingency.

Approval was also sought to submit a £987k bid to the London Bridges Engineering Group (LoBEG) for structural projects, TfL advising later in the year on actual allocation.

Although Members supported the recommendations, the Chairman highlighted a Ward Councillor's disappointment that Pope Road, Bromley had not been included within the proposed programme. It had also been suggested that Cross Road, in the same Bromley Common and Keston Ward, might not be a high priority for maintenance. The Chairman also asked that sections of Sevenoaks Road be considered for maintenance and noted that Rye Crescent, Orpington was listed at Appendix C but as a bus route should be considered for "mass action" resurfacing. He therefore suggested that the maintenance programme needed to compare the priority road lists with bus routes to ensure the correct funding source.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Executive be recommended to agree the release of £505k Department for Transport (DfT) funding from Central Contingency for planned highway maintenance; and**

**(2) the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to -**

- (a) agree that the schemes listed at Appendix A to Report ES14093 form the basis of the Council's programme of planned highway maintenance on borough roads for 2015/16 and, subject to budgetary provision, the works be progressed;**
- (b) note the schemes of work for future years as listed at Appendices B and C to Report ES14093;**
- (c) agree that the additional DfT funding of £505k be allocated to planned highway maintenance, with authority delegated to the Director of Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder, to select schemes from Appendix B for completion during 2015/16;**

- (d) agree the proposed TfL funded programme of highway maintenance works for 2014/15 and 2015/16, as set out at Appendices D and E to Report ES14093; and**
- (e) approve the bid for bridge strengthening and assessment, 2015/16, at Appendix F to Report ES14093, and its submission to Transport for London.**

**32 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2014/15; HALF-YEAR PROGRESS REPORT**

**Report ES14089**

Members considered progress against commitments in the 2014/15 Environment Portfolio Plan.

Progress was being made against the Portfolio Plan objectives although a slight increase in litter was noted from Tranche 1 data for 2014/15. An increase in fly-tipping was also noted and advice sought on whether covert work with local police had produced positive developments/successes.

Councillor Brooks enquired whether further measures could be introduced to ensure the cleanliness of high streets. He suggested closed top bins for non householders and CCTV camera use to identify individuals depositing bags of waste on high street pavements. Councillor Brooks also referred to material often dropped during collections and not retrieved.

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that as much resource as the budget would allow is given to High Street cleaning, including Penge High Street. To supplement the Council's work, businesses in Penge might wish to consider creating a Business Improvement District for the area. The Portfolio Holder also hoped that it might be possible to obtain extra resource from any future funding possibility. Reference was made to the reply to Councillor Brooks' formal question related to refuse bags left on high street pavements and, where possible, officers from the Council's Waste team could assist in dealing with a particular local problem.

The Portfolio Holder further highlighted a programme to replace open top litter bins with closed or "hooded" bins to help prevent household waste being deposited. The use of CCTV technology was subject to restrictions outlined in legislation; however, if it was possible to report incidents of bagged waste on highway land, officers could respond to specific problems. The Council's street cleansing contractors should retrieve dropped material during waste and recycling collections; residents could also place any dropped waste in an appropriate bin and report the incident. This approach already worked well in areas with a strong residents association. The Chairman reminded that street cleansing performance would be reviewed at the Committee's next meeting when representatives of the Council's street cleansing contractors would be in attendance to answer questions.

On other Portfolio areas, it was necessary to try to maintain current service levels with less budget provision in future. Measures would be taken to address increased fly-tipping along rural roads, one approach involving the tracking of waste via transmitters implanted into material likely to be fly-tipped. The level of recycling was good but there was also concern for reduced paper tonnages. On transport, the borough's road safety record has been good for the previous ten years. Extending the Docklands Light Railway to Bromley North and Bromley South remained the Council's preferred route for a new transport link into the borough; any future Crystal Palace development would also need improved transport links. However, any extension of the Bakerloo line to Hayes was opposed.

As it was no longer necessary to display a vehicle excise licence (tax disc), a Member suggested that it was difficult for residents to identify a potentially abandoned vehicle. If there was any suspicion a vehicle might be abandoned, it was suggested that details should be reported to the Council and officers could investigate further. It was also possible for residents to check whether a vehicle is currently taxed via the GOV.UK website. The Council's own website ([http://www.bromley.gov.uk/info/200089/street\\_care\\_and\\_cleaning/190/dumped\\_cars](http://www.bromley.gov.uk/info/200089/street_care_and_cleaning/190/dumped_cars)) provided a link to the GOV.UK website (<https://www.gov.uk/check-vehicle-tax>).

**RESOLVED that progress against commitments in the 2014/15 Environment Portfolio Plan be noted.**

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

**Report ES14088**

The Chairman advised that some items scheduled for the Committee's next meeting were now proposed for the Committee's March 2015 meeting.

The date of the March 2015 meeting would also be moved from 11<sup>th</sup> March and Members would be consulted on an alternative date.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Committee's work programme be agreed subject to an alternative date being found for the Committee's March 2015 meeting, and some items being moved to that meeting from the meeting scheduled for 20<sup>th</sup> January 2015;**

**(2) progress related to previous Committee requests be noted; and**

**(3) a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio be noted.**

The Meeting ended at 10.11 pm

Chairman



### QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ORAL REPLY

#### **1. Questions from Mr Philip Horton, on behalf of the Chelsfield Park Residents Association** (asked on Mr Horton's behalf by Mr Chris Torbet-Smith)

Mr Horton submitted the questions "*regarding the proposed deletion of parking restrictions around Chelsfield Station*".

a. If the intent behind the proposal to de-restrict parking on the flank boundary of 55, Oxenden Wood Road is to benefit the residents of the Chelsfield Park Estate, why have those residents not been consulted about the proposal?

#### **Reply**

The intent of the proposal is to moderate parking pressure in neighbouring roads where crowded crossovers causing impaired sightlines are causing significant upset and danger to other homeowners, whilst at the same time retaining as much parking stock as possible for public use in less intrusive places.

The six houses most directly affected by the change were informed of the proposal by post.

The scheme has since been modified twice in response to those residents expressed concerns.

#### **Supplementary Question**

Suggesting that residents of the six houses were not informed of the proposal, Mr Torbet-Smith enquired of the reasons for this.

#### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder maintained that residents of the adjacent six houses were informed by letter.

-----

b. Would not such an intention be better achieved by different hour restrictions on opposite sides of the road (as in Windsor Drive)?

#### **Reply**

I do not believe so. Any restriction by definition inhibits the availability of potential parking stock and flank fences have been determined to provide the 'least worst' solution in this regard.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Torbet-Smith suggested that the Portfolio's response did not satisfactorily answer his question.

### **Reply**

In response, the Portfolio Holder indicated that he would be happy to provide an extended reply to Mr Torbert-Smith's question by email.

-----

c. If the proposal is driven by commuter parking demands, would it not be better to provide a worthwhile increase in provision to extend the existing car park on the Highway and/or make use of vacant space in close proximity to Chelsfield Railway Station?

### **Reply**

The idea to extend the existing car park on the Highway has been and continues to be investigated, notwithstanding that any proposal championing the relaxation of planning restrictions designed to protect the Green belt would most likely prove to be highly controversial in its own right.

With regard to the "vacant space", specific clarification as to the exact location you have in mind would be appreciated to enable a considered response to be provided to this point.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Torbet-Smith indicated that drawings were available and he would take forward provision of these following the meeting.

-----

## **2. Questions from Mr David Clapham**

a. Drawing ESD/11473-02 shows two distinct areas of consultation, specifically how do the results differ from those of Keston Village and the roads to the west of Westerham Road compared to those to the east of Westerham Road?

### **Reply**

A lot of thought was given to the consultation area in order to try and obtain a balance of views of residents and users of this street junction. A total of 33 roads were consulted, with 7 in the 'east' (mentioned above) where the majority of views supported the proposal.

As regards to 'west' area, 3 roads were of split views, 13 roads supported the proposal and 8 roads did not support the proposal.

Residents of Westerham Road itself supported the proposal.

In regard to absolute numbers of yes/no responses, these were as follows:

- Roads to the west of Westerham Road: Yes = 81 / No = 71
- Roads to the east of Westerham Road: Yes = 21 / No = 0
- Westerham Road itself: Yes = 29 / No = 4

### **Supplementary Question**

Of the responses from Keston Village residents, Mr Clapham asked if there was a higher proportion against the proposed scheme.

### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that this was the case.

-----

b. Keston Village Residents' Association (KVRA) joined with the Friends of Keston Common (FoKC) and two other local groups to object to the proposed roundabout scheme and made comprehensive alternative suggestions. As these have not been made available to the public how will consideration of these be progressed?

### **Reply**

Council officers have prepared an extensive response to your paper which will be forwarded to you over coming days.

The contents are not regarded as an 'alternative' to the specific proposal being considered later this evening, rather a possible 'add on' to any potential safety measures which might prove to be forthcoming locally.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Clapham enquired how investigations might be progressed.

### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that safety matters would be considered e.g. in regard to Keston C of E Primary School and any possible consideration of converting Fishponds Road solely for one-way traffic. Thoughts on such matters would be arrived at later.

-----

c. B rated Heathfield Road travels through a narrow busy Conservation Area with a vibrant primary school and close to 6 specially designated areas. Residents complain continually about vehicle speeds and HGV's. Do you agree that the proposed roundabout will exacerbate these issues and reduce the significance of special areas?

**Reply**

This is something of a matter of subjecture and opinion, but I don't believe that necessarily to be the case.

If the scheme before us this evening is recommended for approval, the adaptation to the entrance of Heathfield Road at Westerham Road will ensure that average traffic speeds are reduced at that point.

If the right turning traffic exiting Heathfield Road into Westerham Road experiences less waiting time in future, queues should be reduced, and far less rat running at speed down Fishponds Road to 'beat the queue' should result.

To support this view, I am advised that the 7 day average northbound flow (5116 vehicles/day) is similar to the 7 day southbound average (5252).

This data does not suggest that drivers are currently put off using the southbound route because of the congestion, hence the southbound flow is believed unlikely to increase should the congestion be reduced by the introduction of the proposed roundabout.

It is acknowledged that average traffic speeds (the most recent survey recorded the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed at 35.7mph close to Keston Avenue) are faster than anyone would prefer to see, but such measurements are not abnormal for this class of road.

The local Police have been alerted to residents' on-going concerns in this regard.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Clapham enquired how concerns related to the number of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) using Heathfield Road might be addressed. Mr Clapham referred to vehicles proceeding at high speed along the road.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that it was not possible legally to differentiate between vehicles permitted to be driven along Heathfield Road. He added that the speed of vehicles along Heathfield Road was a matter for the Police to enforce.

-----

### **3. Questions from Mr Michael Ormond**

a. Clearly this will make it beneficial to drive through the village as the pinch point will be removed. This will obviously result in more traffic, increased danger to school children and residents, already in fear of speeding HGV's and cars. Has the Council taken into account this specific point of risk displacement?

#### **Reply**

This is something of a matter of subjecture and opinion, but I don't believe that necessarily to be the case.

If the scheme before us this evening is recommended for approval, the adaptation to the entrance of Heathfield Road at Westerham Road will ensure that average traffic speeds are reduced at that point.

If the right turning traffic exiting Heathfield Road into Westerham Road experiences less waiting time in future, queues should be reduced, and far less rat running at speed down Fishponds Road to 'beat the queue' should result.

To support this view, I am advised that the 7 day average northbound flow (5116 vehicles/day) is similar to the 7 day southbound average (5252).

This data does not suggest that drivers are currently put off using the southbound route because of the congestion, hence the southbound flow is believed unlikely to increase should the congestion be reduced by the introduction of the proposed roundabout.

#### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Ormand sought confirmation that in developing the scheme, consideration had been given to any increased traffic levels and consequent risks for village residents and children.

#### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that there has been such consideration.

-----

b. The congestion problem is minor and only really an issue driving south in the evening rush hour. Given budget restraints, is this really a priority spot for LBB over other congestion spots?

#### **Reply**

In addition to having a troubled safety history due to inappropriate speed along the length of Westerham Road, this particular junction has also been identified as a congestion 'hot-spot'.

The funds for dealing with priorities of this nature are provided by TfL via their London-wide 'LIP' (Local Implementation Plan) process.

The cost of the proposed roundabout is relatively low for this type of scheme which if approved would provide good value for money in terms of reduced congestion and increased safety both at the junction itself and also through the bends to the south of this location.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Ormand suggested that the bends further south along Westerham Road were some distance away from the junction with Heathfield Road and if the bends were a safety problem, he suggested that the problem be dealt with in the location of the bends rather than at the junction with Heathfield Road.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder referred to the need to reduce vehicle pollution (from congestion) and increase road safety. Westerham Road is a fast road and measures have been put in place to help address excessive speeds in the location of the bends. The scheme at Heathfield Road junction was, in effect, an extension of measures already in place to help curb high speeds at the bends.

-----

c. LBB has just approved building at Keston School, which included the need for traffic calming measures. Why not combine this with what to do at the end of Heathfield Road and the high number of accidents at "chicken farm bends", and work with the school and residents to find a cost effective, holistic solution?

**Reply**

All/any issues concerning highway safety around Keston School will be considered separately and do not feature as part of the proposal being considered this evening.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Ormond suggested delaying a decision on the Westerham Road/Heathfield Road scheme and consulting with Keston Village residents.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that he was not pre-disposed to judge what the Committee's recommendations would be on the scheme.

-----

#### **4. Questions from Mr Chris Torbet-Smith**

(With reference to drawing 11051-112 detailing changes in parking arrangements in Oxenden Wood Rd)

a. Can we have the full results of all related safety surveys/investigations which have been conducted relating to this proposal? If these are insufficient/incomplete can we rely on those responsible to ensure the plan is not implemented?

#### **Reply**

As part of the safety considerations various site visits were conducted to investigate the location and road width.

Swept Path Analysis was also commissioned, also visibility splay. Relevant records are available for viewing on request.

As such, I am advised that there is no technical reason to delay the implementation of the proposal.

#### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Torbert-Smith referred to safety considerations and parked cars, suggesting that it is not possible to provide a full safety survey without including any effects of parked vehicles. How was it possible to rely on advice from engineers when some advice appeared to be missing?

#### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder referred to a number of visits by engineers to the location – two had taken place and there were two more proposed visits. It was accepted that a three car solution could impede exit. Parked cars in side streets provide a “build-out” helping to lower travel speeds, particularly at junctions. This provided a safety benefit.

-----

b. Why is there such determination to push this through under ‘flank’ policy in order to generate parking for non-residents to the detriment, and against the wishes of, those directly affected?

#### **Reply**

The intent of the proposal is to moderate parking pressure in neighbouring roads where crowded crossovers causing impaired sightlines are causing significant upset and danger to other homeowners, whilst at the same time retain as much parking stock as possible for public use in less intrusive places.

The six houses most directly affected by the change were informed of the proposal by post.

The scheme has since been modified twice in response to those residents expressed concerns.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Torbert Smith sought to understand why the Council appeared to be focussing on such a small space for non-resident parking.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the six households were informed of the proposal by post. Following this objections had been received.

Such roads are part of the public highway for the benefit of the borough as a whole. Some people would use Chelsfield station and park. Use of the Flank Fence Parking Policy can offer some parking relief (in view of pressure for parking spaces) and such flank fence spaces can be used in less busy locations. Such parking spaces would be facilitated for the greater good of borough residents.

-----

c. As we have never been consulted on this matter we wish the proposal to be deferred until all avenues/options have been explored, including awaiting the results of changes to Orpington station.

**Reply**

I feel I must refer you to my answers at 4'a' and 4 'b' above.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Torbert-Smiith maintained that a full consultation was needed with residents and residents consulted on the "full picture".

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that the normal consultation process had been slightly foreshortened by the Local Government election in May 2014. Prior to the election a consultation paper, with a wide circulation, had been sent to residents. Although Chelsfield Park was initially omitted, residents in the area were subsequently consulted on the flank fence policy as it would affect Chelsfield Park. Five parking spaces were initially proposed for Oxenden Wood Road, but the number of spaces proposed had been reduced subsequent to consultation.

The Portfolio Holder explained that he had written to the Chelsfield Park Residents Association to apologise that the consultation had not been undertaken as a pure consultation. The next stage of the process would include the proposals being advertised e.g. in local press, when further opportunity would be provided for residents to present comments.

-----



## **5. Question from Mr Chris Mulinder**

Given the costs involved, inconvenience of implementation and the impact to the local area, has there been a thorough evaluation of traffic calming measures, improvements to the A-Road route and Keston Mark Junction and restrictions to traffic through the village to reduce the congestion at this junction?

### **Reply**

Funding across London for road safety schemes is provided from TfL.

It is dispersed across the Boroughs on the basis of whether the funds will maximise the reduction of historic injury accidents, particularly serious and fatal accidents.

Thankfully in almost every regard, without ever becoming complacent, it has to be noted that Heathfield Road's current safety record is such that it does not qualify for such funding at this time.

In respect to the operation of the signals at the Keston Mark, Bromley is lobbying TfL heavily for improvements to be made to the timing of the lights to significantly improve traffic flow.

### **Supplementary Question**

In view of Heathfield Road being a B Road through Keston Village, and congestion only occurring during peak times, Mr Mullinder asked whether it would not be better to look at the Keston Mark junction to determine the extent to which traffic uses the A road.

### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that it was not his position to guide the Committee (in making its recommendations).

-----

At this point the Chairman had provided a period of 30 minutes for questions and replies. In view of the substantive business on the Committee's agenda, the Chairman sought views from Members on whether a further 30 minutes should be given to hearing remaining questions and replies. The matter was put to a vote and by a majority it was agreed that sufficient time had been allocated for questions (15 minutes more than required by the Council's Constitution). This was supported by the Chairman who confirmed that the remaining questions (detailed below) would receive a written response from the Environment Portfolio Holder.

**6. Questions from Mr Toby Blythe**

a. Any proposals to improve the junction of Westerham Rd and Heathfield Rd surely have to be considered taking into account the excessive amount of traffic that uses Keston Village as a cut through from both directions. What measures will be introduced to REDUCE cut through traffic using Keston village?

**Reply**

I can't promise that any measures 'will' be introduced given that they are very difficult indeed to engage or convince on such matters, but Bromley is lobbying TfL heavily for improvements to be made in the timing of the lights at Keston Mark to significantly improve traffic flow through that particular junction.

-----

b. Keston Village is the quickest route south or north, but it is still a B road and a small village. The levels of daily traffic are comparable if not higher than many surrounding A roads causing huge disruption. What considerations for this roundabout proposal will address this inextricably linked issue?

**Reply**

The 'consideration' is that there will be no direct effect on Keston Village should the roundabout proposal be progressed.

-----

c. Keston village evidently eases the traffic volumes on the surrounding A roads – do LBB acknowledge this and why therefore is the focus on the junction in question in isolation when it is obvious more significant measures are needed at various surrounding junctions in particular at the Keston Mark?

**Reply**

To a point yes, albeit as you have identified yourself in 'b' above, the route through Keston Village cuts off two sides of the A232 'triangle' defined by the Keston Mark junction and is therefore and will remain the logistically preferred route for many motorists irrespective of any delays which might be occurring/improved upon at that junction.

The Heathfield Road junction scheme is designed to reduce congestion at that specific location and also contribute to road safety more widely along Westerham Road by lowering average traffic speeds.

With respect to the junction at Keston Mark, I refer you to my answer at 'a' above.

-----

## **7. Questions from Michelle Blythe**

a. Why are you investing in a Roundabout at the end of Heathfield Road, when clearly there is an urgent requirement to re-design the junction at the Mark/Croydon Road?

### **Reply**

The Heathfield Road junction scheme is designed to reduce congestion at that specific location and also contribute to road safety more widely along Westerham Road by lowering average traffic speeds.

In respect to the junction at the Keston Mark, Bromley is lobbying TfL heavily for improvements to be made to the timing of the lights to significantly improve traffic flow.

-----

b. If plans go ahead, what will you offer Keston Village by way of a safe crossing facility as drivers will start to use Heathfield Road as a "short-cut" and traffic will increase? We have a school in Keston Village, and no crossing facility (as all other schools have in the Borough).

### **Reply**

Consideration can be given to this if a suitable location and the local footfall demand achieve the necessary criteria. It is however incorrect for you to suggest that "all other schools have" same.

Regarding "traffic will increase" that remains something of a matter of subjecture and opinion, but I don't believe that necessarily to be the case.

To support this view, I am advised that the 7 day average northbound flow (5116 vehicles/day) is similar to the 7 day southbound average (5252).

This data does not suggest that drivers are currently put off using the southbound route because of existing congestion patterns, hence the southbound flow is believed unlikely to increase should the congestion be reduced by the introduction of the proposed roundabout.

-----

c. What traffic calming measures will you introduce as a result of the likely increase in traffic?

### **Reply**

Funding across London for road safety schemes is provided from TfL.

It is dispersed across the Boroughs on the basis of whether the funds will maximise the reduction of historic injury accidents, particularly serious and fatal accidents.

Thankfully in almost every regard, without ever becoming complacent, it has to be noted that Heathfield Road's current safety record is such that it does not qualify for such funding at this time.

Regarding "likely increase in traffic" that remains something of a matter of subjecture and opinion, but I don't believe that necessarily to be the case.

To support this view, I am advised that the 7 day average northbound flow (5116 vehicles/day) is similar to the 7 day southbound average (5252).

This data does not suggest that drivers are currently put off using the southbound route because of existing congestion patterns, hence the southbound flow is believed unlikely to increase should the congestion be reduced by the introduction of the proposed roundabout.

-----

## **8. Questions from John Algar**

a. Keston village is classified as a rural village, with small shops, post office and Keston CE Primary School. Heathfield Rd is a B road which runs through the heart of the village. A roundabout will only increase traffic and speed. Why cannot measures be proposed to reduce traffic speed?

### **Reply**

This is something of a matter of subjecture and opinion, but I don't believe that necessarily to be the case with regard to either traffic or speed.

If the scheme before us this evening is recommended for approval, the adaptation to the entrance of Heathfield Road at Westerham Road will ensure that average traffic speeds are reduced at that point.

If the right turning traffic exiting Heathfield Road into Westerham Road experiences less waiting time in future, queues should be reduced, and far less rat running at speed down Fishponds Road to 'beat the queue' should result.

To further support this view, I am advised that the 7 day average northbound flow (5116 vehicles/day) is similar to the 7 day southbound average (5252).

This data does not suggest that drivers are currently put off using the southbound route because of the congestion, hence the southbound flow is believed unlikely to increase should congestion be reduced by the introduction of the proposed roundabout.

Specific to reducing traffic speeds, funding across London for road safety schemes is provided from TfL.

It is dispersed across the Boroughs on the basis of whether the funds will maximise the reduction of historic injury accidents, particularly serious and fatal accidents.

Thankfully in almost every regard, without ever becoming complacent, it has to be noted that Heathfield Road's current safety record is such that it does not qualify for such funding at this time.

It is acknowledged that average traffic speeds (the most recent survey recorded the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed at 35.7mph close to Keston Avenue) are faster than anyone would prefer to see, but such measurements are not abnormal for this class of road.

The local Police have been alerted to residents ongoing concerns in this regard.

-----

b. UDP Policy 5.51 states that road safety consideration needs to influence decisions regarding traffic management policy. How will a roundabout improve safety when funds could be better spent on traffic calming?

**Reply**

Roundabouts lower the average traffic speed of all approaching vehicles.

-----

c. UDP policy 3.2 of the London plan is to achieve a 40% reduction in carbon emission, particularly in a residential area. Westerham Road is classified as a main A road. With fewer residents, why should this road not have priority for traffic flow?

**Reply**

The introduction of a roundabout at the junction will reduce congestion and therefore reduce carbon emission.

'A' roads obviously do stand higher in the road hierarchy than 'B' roads, but both are very important routes and drivers are perfectly at liberty to use either.

-----

**9. Question from Councillor Kevin Brooks**

What policy options are being explored to solve bags of refuse being dumped outside of properties on High Streets due to lack of appropriate room in flats to store refuse. If none are being explored, why? As something that increases High Street refuse, how often is rubbish cleared from outside business premises?

## **Reply**

Where this problem has been identified, attempts are made to identify the properties that the waste has come from. In such cases, the resident will be sent a notice stating that simply dumping their refuse on the street is an offence, and that they will be fined if this happens again.

Our Waste Advisors will visit properties where there is a problem caused by the lack of outside space for storage of refuse. In many cases, arrangements have been made with the ground floor occupants to provide storage space, sometimes enabling several residents to share this facility. In other cases, arrangements have been made with commercial properties occupying the ground floor for shared space in their commercial collection containers.

Hence, rather than a specific policy being applied, we look to assist residents in finding a solution based on the practicalities at their specific address.

With regard to clearance from business premises, the Council's trade waste collection service operates on a daily basis. However, businesses are free to choose how often their waste is collected. In addition, not all businesses utilise the Council's service – they are free to utilise any of the licenced commercial trade waste collection services.

If waste from a business isn't properly contained, Waste Advisors are able to serve a notice requiring that it be properly contained and only placed on the highway for collection on the appropriate day.

-----

## **QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

### **10. Questions from Mr Trevor Goodman**

Mr Goodman asked the following questions "*with reference to the proposal to eliminate parking restrictions in Oxenden Wood Road*".

a. According to the Highways team there is a 2m clearance between a parked car and the curb in the area affected. The lorries using the estate are 2.55m wide and will have to mount the grass verge to pass. Why does the Council feel this is safe?

## **Reply**

Parked vehicles serve as unofficial 'build outs'. Build Outs assist in lowering average traffic speeds.

The road width here is 5.4m so when a wide car or van is parked there remains a clearance of over 3m, which is sufficient for a lorry to pass by without mounting the grass.

-----

b. Why was there no consultation for local residents about this scheme?

**Reply**

The six houses most directly affected by the change were informed of the proposal by post.

The scheme has since been modified twice in response to those residents expressed concerns.

-----

c. There have been scores of objection to the scheme and not one advocate. Why are you thinking of going ahead?

**Reply**

The Council's 'flank fence' parking policy is designed to moderate parking pressure in neighbouring roads where crowded crossovers causing impaired sightlines are causing significant upset and danger to other homeowners, whilst at the same time retain as much parking stock as possible for public use in less intrusive places.

-----

**Question from Mr Zieminski**

What is the classification of Heathfield Road and what physical traffic calming measures could the Council introduce to reduce the number of vehicles (including HGVs) that exceed the speed limit along it on a daily basis?

**Reply**

Heathfield Road is a mixed use classification, which included it being a local distributor road. It is a highway and therefore HGVs also make use of it, although less than 1% of traffic flow along Heathfield Road is by HGVs. Waste vehicles, buses and removal vehicles all use it along with delivery vehicles for local residents .

Regarding speeding traffic, it is acknowledged that average traffic speeds (the most recent survey recorded the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed at 35.7mph close to Keston Avenue) are faster than anyone would prefer to see, but such measurements are not abnormal for this class of road.

The local Police have been alerted to residents ongoing concerns in this regard.

-----

**Question from Mr Colin Willetts**

Since the early October repair schedule has gone and having received a further email from Mrs Skeggs 21/10/14 in that there are now weeds growing over the damaged brickwork (Brooksway canal bridge), can you supply a new date for rectification?

**Reply**

These works could begin as early as next week, dependent on the delivery of the specialised hand crafted bricks required to complete the task.

-----



Report No.  
FSD150002

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:**      **Environment Portfolio Holder**

**For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Environment PDS Committee on**

**Date:**                      **20<sup>th</sup> January 2015**

**Decision Type:**      Non-Urgent                      Executive                      Non-Key

**Title:**                      **BUDGET MONITORING 2014/15**

**Contact Officer:**      Claire Martin, Head of Finance  
Tel: 020 8313 4286    E-mail: Claire.martin@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:**              Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment and Community Services

**Ward:**                      Borough-wide

---

1.    Reason for report

This report provides an update of the latest budget monitoring position for 2014/15 for the Environment Portfolio, based on expenditure and activity levels up to 30th November 2014. This shows an underspend of £123k.

---

2.    **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**That the Environment Portfolio Holder:**

**2.1    Endorses the latest 2014/15 budget projection for the Environment Portfolio.**

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy Sound financial management.
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council; Quality Environment
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable
  2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost
  3. Budget head/performance centre: All Environment Portfolio Budgets
  4. Total current budget for this head: £41.6m
  5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budgets 2014/15
- 

## Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 190 fte
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement: The statutory duties relating to financial reporting are covered within the Local Government Act 1972; the Local Government Finance Act 1998; the Accounts and Audit Regulations 1996; the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Government Act 2002
  2. Call-in: Applicable
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The services covered in this report affect all Council Taxpayers, Business Ratepayers, those who owe general income to the Council, all staff, Members and Pensioners.
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

### **3. COMMENTARY**

- 3.1 The 2014/15 projected outturn is detailed in Appendix 1. This forecasts the projected spend for each division compared to the latest approved budget, and identifies in full the reasons for any variances.
- 3.2 Costs attributable to individual services have been classified as “controllable” and “non-controllable” in Appendix 1. Budget holders have full responsibility for those budgets classified as “controllable” as any variations relate to those factors over which the budget holder has, in general, direct control. “Non-controllable” budgets are those which are managed outside of individual budget holder’s service and, as such, cannot be directly influenced by the budget holder in the shorter term. These include, for example, building maintenance costs and property rents which are managed by the Property Division but are allocated within individual departmental/portfolio budgets to reflect the full cost of the service. As such, any variations arising are shown as “non-controllable” within services but “controllable” within the Resources Portfolio. Other examples include cross departmental recharges and capital financing costs. This approach, which is reflected in financial monitoring reports to budget holders, should ensure clearer accountability by identifying variations within the service that controls financial performance. Members should specifically refer to the “controllable” budget variations relating to portfolios in considering financial performance. These variations will include the costs related to the recession.

#### **Comments from the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services**

- 3.3 Overall, the controllable budget for the Environment Portfolio is projected to be underspent by £89k.
- 3.4 The projected overspend in Waste Services is primarily due to the decline in the tonnage of paper collected and the increase in the tonnage of residual waste collected. Both of these factors are reflected on the national stage and are largely outside our control. A growth bid is included in the latest four year forecast for the full year effect of these variances.
- 3.5 The overspend of £418k within Waste Services is more than offset by underspends of Cr £507k across other areas of the portfolio budget.

### **4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 The Resources Portfolio Plan includes the aim of effective monitoring and control of expenditure within budget and includes the target that each service department will spend within its own budget.
- 4.2 The four year financial forecast report highlights the financial pressures facing the Council. It remains imperative that strict budgetary control continues to be exercised in 2014/15 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years.
- 4.3 Chief Officers and Departmental Heads of Finance are continuing to place emphasis on the need for strict compliance with the Council’s budgetary control and monitoring arrangements.

### **5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The main variations compared to the last reported budget monitoring report are as follows: -

| <b>Variation</b>                                      | <b>£'000</b> |
|---|--------------|
| Increase in waste disposal tonnages                   | 102          |
| Reduced use of 4th vehicle for GGW collection service | -30          |
| Increase in parking income                            | -23          |
| Increase in underspend for support service staff      | -25          |
| Release of bad debt provision                         | -50          |
| Additional street works income                        | -38          |
| Other minor variations across the Portfolio           | -25          |
|   | <b>-89</b>   |

5.2 Although the overall budget shows an underspend of £123k for 2014/15, the controllable budget for the Environment Portfolio is projected to be underspent by £89k at the year-end based on the financial information available to 30<sup>th</sup> November 2014. Within this projection there are variations which are detailed in Appendix 1 and summarised below.

### **Parking (Cr £176k)**

- 5.3 A surplus of Cr £135k is projected for parking fee income and management action has been taken to freeze the equipment replacement budget of £50k to help offset budget pressures elsewhere within the portfolio .
- 5.4 A net deficit of Dr £9k is projected for parking and bus lane enforcement. This is mainly due to a combination of greater compliance and the impact of the works at Bromley North, which has resulted in some areas becoming temporarily unenforceable from April to September 2014.

### **Support Services (Cr £90k)**

- 5.5 There is an underspend of £90k due to the vacancy of the Assistant Director post and a business rate rebate for the depots.

### **Street Scene & Green Space (Dr £313k)**

- 5.6 Reduced tonnages of paper have meant that a deficit of £140k is projected.
- 5.7 Actual disposal tonnage (mainly from households) is expected to be at least £394k above budget at the year end. This is partly offset by underspends of £122k from the green garden waste collection service and £14k from other net variations across the waste service.
- 5.8 There has been a reduction in the number of commercial and school customers from the trade waste collected service, resulting in a loss of income of approximately Dr £90k. This has been offset by an increase in the number of traders visiting the Civic Amenity sites, generating additional income of £70k.
- 5.9 Other variations within Street Scene and Green Space include a deficit of Dr £20k from the Fixed Penalty Notice litter enforcement scheme offset by additional income from licences for skips and street traders (Cr £25k).
- 5.10 The parks and green space budget is projecting an underspend of £64k. This is made up of Cr £20k from staffing vacancies, Cr £9k from additional income and Cr £35k from management action to reduce the overall divisional budget.
- 5.11 Other minor variances within Highways and markets total Cr £36k.

## Transport and Highways (Cr £136k)

5.12 There is an overall net underspend of Cr £136k projected within the Transport and Highways budget, mainly due to vacancies within staffing and a surplus of income for street works.

5.13 The table below summarises the main variances: -

| <b>Summary of Major Variations</b>   | <b>£'000</b>        |
|--|---------------------|
| Net surplus of income from on- and off- street parking                           | Cr 135              |
| Impact of management action within parking                                       | Cr 50               |
| Net shortfall of income from parking and bus lane enforcement                    | 9                   |
| Underspend within support services   | Cr 90               |
| Increase in waste disposal tonnages  | 394                 |
| Underspend from green garden waste collection service                            | Cr 122              |
| Net shortfall of income from trade waste collected, delivered services and paper | 160                 |
| Underspend within parks and greenspace   | Cr 64               |
| Street works income and release of bad debt provision                            | Cr 88               |
| Other variations across the Portfolio  | Cr 103              |
|  | <b><u>Cr 89</u></b> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>                       | Legal, Personnel  |
| Background Documents:<br>(Access via Contact Officer) | 2014/15 budget monitoring files within E&CS Finance section |

This page is left intentionally blank

## Environment Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary as at 30.11.2014

| 2013/14<br>Actuals<br>£'000 | Division<br>Service Areas              | 2014/15<br>Original<br>Budget<br>£'000 | 2014/15<br>Latest<br>Approved<br>£'000 | 2014/15<br>Projection<br>£'000 | Variation<br>£'000 | Notes | Variation<br>Last<br>Reported<br>£'000 | Full Year<br>Effect<br>£'000 |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------|--|------------------------------|
|                             | <b>Customer &amp; Support Services</b> |  |  |                                |                    |       |  |                              |
| Cr 6,461                    | Parking                                | Cr 6,036                               | Cr 6,036                               | Cr 6,212                       | Cr 176             | 1 - 4 | Cr 169                                 | 0                            |
| 1,247                       | Support Services                       | 1,198                                  | 1,199                                  | 1,109                          | Cr 90              | 5     | Cr 65                                  | 0                            |
| <b>Cr 5,214</b>             |  | <b>Cr 4,838</b>                        | <b>Cr 4,837</b>                        | <b>Cr 5,103</b>                | <b>Cr 266</b>      |       | <b>Cr 234</b>                          | <b>0</b>                     |
|                             | <b>Public Protection</b>               |  |  |                                |                    |       |  |                              |
| 76                          | Emergency Planning                     | 75                                     | 75                                     | 75                             | 0                  |       | 0                                      | 0                            |
| <b>76</b>                   |  | <b>75</b>                              | <b>75</b>                              | <b>75</b>                      | <b>0</b>           |       | <b>0</b>                               | <b>0</b>                     |
|                             | <b>Street Scene &amp; Green Space</b>  |  |  |                                |                    |       |  |                              |
| 4,135                       | Area Management/Street Cleansing       | 4,079                                  | 4,079                                  | 4,099                          | 20                 | 6     | 20                                     | 0                            |
| 2,540                       | Highways                               | 2,535                                  | 2,535                                  | 2,484                          | Cr 51              | 7     | Cr 51                                  | 0                            |
| Cr 18                       | Markets                                | 1                                      | 1                                      | 9                              | Cr 10              | 8     | Cr 10                                  | 0                            |
| 5,775                       | Parks and Green Space                  | 5,898                                  | 5,955                                  | 5,891                          | Cr 64              | 9     | Cr 64                                  | 0                            |
| 481                         | Street Regulation                      | 461                                    | 461                                    | 461                            | 0                  |       | 0                                      | 0                            |
| 17,085                      | Waste Services                         | 17,570                                 | 17,572                                 | 17,990                         | 418                | 10    | 362                                    | 743                          |
| <b>29,998</b>               |  | <b>30,544</b>                          | <b>30,603</b>                          | <b>30,916</b>                  | <b>313</b>         |       | <b>257</b>                             | <b>743</b>                   |
|                             | <b>Transport &amp; Highways</b>        |  |  |                                |                    |       |  |                              |
| 6,436                       | Highways incl London Permit Scheme     | 6,611                                  | 6,864                                  | 6,728                          | Cr 136             | 11    | Cr 23                                  | 0                            |
| 129                         | Highways Planning                      | 136                                    | 136                                    | 136                            | 0                  |       | 0                                      | 0                            |
| 177                         | Traffic & Road Safety                  | 171                                    | 173                                    | 173                            | 0                  |       | 0                                      | 0                            |
| <b>6,742</b>                |  | <b>6,918</b>                           | <b>7,173</b>                           | <b>7,037</b>                   | <b>Cr 136</b>      |       | <b>Cr 23</b>                           | <b>0</b>                     |
|                             |  |  |  |                                |                    |       |  |                              |
| <b>31,602</b>               | <b>TOTAL CONTROLLABLE</b>              | <b>32,699</b>                          | <b>33,014</b>                          | <b>32,925</b>                  | <b>Cr 89</b>       |       | <b>0</b>                               | <b>743</b>                   |
| 7,391                       | <b>TOTAL NON-CONTROLLABLE</b>          | 6,386                                  | 6,481                                  | 6,447                          | Cr 34              | 12    | Cr 19                                  | 0                            |
| 2,035                       | <b>TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES</b>        | 2,095                                  | 2,109                                  | 2,109                          | 0                  |       |  | 0                            |
| <b>41,028</b>               | <b>PORTFOLIO TOTAL</b>                 | <b>41,180</b>                          | <b>41,604</b>                          | <b>41,481</b>                  | <b>Cr 123</b>      |       | <b>Cr 19</b>                           | <b>743</b>                   |

## Reconciliation of Latest Approved Budget

£'000

## Original budget 2014/15

41,180

Keston Ponds Dam carry-forward from 2013/14

65

Lead Local Flood Authorities

250

Increase in annual insurance premiums

98

Allocation of Merit Awards

11

## Latest Approved Budget for 2014/15

41,604

**REASONS FOR VARIATIONS****1. Income from Bus Lane Contraventions Dr £32k**

Due to a combination of greater compliance and the impact from the works at Bromley North which has resulted in some areas becoming unenforceable from April, a deficit of income of £32k is projected.

**2. Off Street Car Parking Cr £70k**

Overall a surplus of £70k is projected for off street parking. There is a projected surplus of Cr £40k from Village Way multi-storey car park. Additional income of Cr £30 is projected from surface car parks: major variations are at Beckenham Leisure Centre Cr £14k relating to one-off permit income, Station Road Bromley Cr £7k, Fairfield Road and Beckenham Cr £9k.

**Summary of variations within Off Street Car Parking**

|   | <b>£'000</b> |
|---|--------------|
| Off Street Car Parking income - multi-storey car parks  | Cr 40        |
| Off Street Car Parking income - other surface car parks | Cr 30        |
| <b>Total variations within Off Street Parking</b>       | <b>Cr 70</b> |

**3. On Street Car Parking Cr £115k**

An overall surplus of £65k is projected for on street parking income. Major variations are within Bromley Town Centre with a net surplus of Cr £11k, a net surplus of Cr £12k from Petts Wood, Cr £20k from Orpington, and Cr £22k from Shortlands and other areas.

Management action is being taken to freeze the equipment budget of £50k to offset budget pressures across the other areas of the portfolio.

**Summary of variations within On Street Car Parking**

|  | <b>£'000</b>  |
|--|---------------|
| Income from Bromley Town Centre                      | Cr 11         |
| Income from Petts Wood, Orpington & other areas      | Cr 54         |
| Management action - equipment budget                 | Cr 50         |
| <b>Total variations within On Street Car Parking</b> | <b>Cr 115</b> |

**4. Car Parking Enforcement Cr £23k**

Based on activity levels up to November 2014, there is a projected net surplus of £69k from PCNs issued by Vinci in the current year due to an increase in contraventions. Additional income is also projected for PCN contraventions in 2013/14 totalling Cr £10k.

A net deficit of Dr £55k is projected for mobile and static cameras due to the works being undertaken in Bromley North which has led to areas becoming unenforceable from April to date. This is partly offset by extra income received for tickets issued in 2013/14 of Cr £15k.

There are additional debt collection and registration fees of Dr £32k, due to the clearance of a backlog at the end of 2013/14 after the introduction of the new Parking IT system. This deficit is partly offset by a projected underspend on third party payments Cr £16k.

**Summary of variations within Car Parking Enforcement**

|  | <b>£'000</b> |
|--|--------------|
| Net additional costs re Debt Collection and Registration | 16           |
| PCNs issued by wardens                                   | Cr 79        |
| PCNs issued by mobile & static cameras                   | 40           |
| <b>Total variations within Car Parking Enforcement</b>   | <b>Cr 23</b> |

**Summary of overall variations within Parking:**

|  | <b>£'000</b>  |
|--|---------------|
| Bus Routes Enforcement                         | 32            |
| Off Street Car Parking income                  | Cr 70         |
| On Street Car Parking income                   | Cr 65         |
| Management action - on street equipment budget | Cr 50         |
| Car Parking Enforcement                        | Cr 23         |
| <b>Total variation for Parking</b>             | <b>Cr 176</b> |



**5. Support Services Cr £90k**

There is a projected net underspend within staffing of £50k. This is due to a combination of not replacing the Assistant Director of Customer & Support Services, a secondment not being backfilled, and delays in recruiting temporary cover. Additionally there is an underspend of £40k within Depot premises budgets, due to a one-off business rates rebate from 2013-14.

**6. Area Management & Street Cleansing Dr £20k**

Within the FPN littering offence scheme there is a deficit of £20k, relating to the period April 2014 to 31st August 2014. This has arisen due to a combination of lower than anticipated income recovery rates, as well as fewer tickets issued than expected during this period, and therefore costs exceed income collected. Following renegotiation of contract arrangements, the scheme is expected to be cost neutral to the end of the financial year as any cost due to income deficits will be covered by the contractor.

**7. Highways SSGS Cr £51k**

There is a net projected underspend within staffing budgets including car allowances, of £17k due to the part-year effect of a vacant post.

A surplus of income is projected from skip licences of £20k. This is due to a combination of a general upturn within the economy, as well as improved management systems and processes within the SSGS division. A small surplus of income is also projected from street traders' licences of £5k, giving a net surplus of £25k for the service. This is being used to contribute towards deficits within the Street Scene and Green Space division.

Other miscellaneous income of Cr £9k has been transferred from the deposits register relating to highways works undertaken. The net projected variation for Highways SSGS is an underspend of £51k.

**Summary of variations within Highways SSGS**

|  | <b>£'000</b> |
|--|--------------|
| Underspend within staffing, car allowances & leased cars | Cr 17        |
| Surplus income - skip licences & street trader licences  | Cr 25        |
| Miscellaneous income                                     | Cr 9         |
| <b>Total variation for Highways SSGS</b>                 | <b>Cr 51</b> |

**8. Markets Cr £10k**

Projected income surplus of £10k, due to higher customer activity than previously anticipated.

**9. Parks & Green Space Cr £64k**

Within staffing budgets there is a projected net underspend of £20k. This is largely due to vacancies within the Grounds Maintenance team.

Other miscellaneous income of Cr £9k has been transferred from the deposits register relating to parks works undertaken.

Management action has been taken to withhold £35k of expenditure within the parks budget to reduce the overall deficit within the divisional budget. Therefore the net projected variation for Parks & Green Space is an underspend of £64k.

**10. Waste Services Dr £418k**

There is currently projected to be a net overspend within waste disposal tonnages, excluding garden waste, of £286k. £42k of this relates directly to the extra disposal tonnage generated by the increase in trade waste delivered activity, as reflected from the extra income. The balance of £244k is the net effect of the anticipated growth in residual household tonnage of 2,940 tonnes and the projected reduction in recycled paper tonnage (2,100 tonnes).

In addition to the increase in residual disposal tonnage from households, the green garden waste tonnage is 1,360 higher for the first 8 months of the year when compared to the same period last year. The pattern of increased tonnages is expected to continue, and a year end variation of 2,400 tonnes is projected, resulting in an overspend of £108k.

The green garden waste collection service is projected to be underspent by £122k by the year end. This is due to a number of factors; Staffing and running expenses are expected to be £40k lower than budgeted and the fourth vehicle has only been required intermittently providing a saving of £80k. There is a projected net overachievement of income of £2k, which incorporates the continued sale of green garden waste stickers.

Reduced tonnages of paper collected from households has resulted in a projected deficit of income from paper recycling of £140k. Paper tonnages have been reducing for the last two years, and it is likely that this trend will continue into future years.

There is currently a projected deficit within income from trade waste collections of £90k. This has arisen where around 4% of commercial customers have withdrawn from the services since April 2014.

Within trade waste delivered income, there is a projected surplus of £70k, resulting from higher activity than budgeted. This offsets the disposal costs of the additional tonnage generated.

There are other projected net variations across the service of Cr £14k.

| <b>Summary of variations within Waste Services</b>   |    | <b>£'000</b>      |
|--|----|-------------------|
| Waste disposal tonnages                              |    | 394               |
| Underspend from green garden waste collection scheme | Cr | 122               |
| Paper recycling income                               |    | 140               |
| Trade waste collection income                        |    | 90                |
| Trade waste delivered income                         | Cr | 70                |
| Other net variations                                 | Cr | 14                |
| <b>Total variation for Waste Services</b>            |    | <b><u>418</u></b> |

#### **11. Highways (incl London Permit Scheme) Cr 136k**

There is a projected underspend on salaries of £35k resulting from part-year vacant posts.

Within NRSWA income for 2014/15, there is a net deficit of £30k for defect notices which has been more than offset by the release of a bad debt provision of £50k which is no longer required relating to some older debt. There is also £18k additional income for street works. Management action is being taken across the service to freeze non-essential expenditure to the value of £15k.

Following heavy rainfall towards the end 2013-14, costs relating to emergency flood works and clean-up operations have been incurred of £100k. These will be met by a drawdown from the one-off provision for emergency flood damage.

Other miscellaneous income of Cr £48k has been transferred from the deposits register relating to highways works undertaken.

| <b>Summary of variations within Highways (incl London Permit Scheme)</b> |           | <b>£'000</b>      |
|--|-----------|-------------------|
| Underspend within staffing   | Cr        | 35                |
| Street works income  | Cr        | 38                |
| Management action on non-essential expenditure                           | Cr        | 15                |
| Overspend relating to emergency flood work                               |           | 100               |
| Drawdown from earmarked reserve set aside for emergency flooding         | Cr        | 100               |
| Miscellaneous income from deposit register                               | Cr        | 48                |
| <b>Total variation for Highways</b>                                      | <b>Cr</b> | <b><u>136</u></b> |

**12.Non-controllable budgets Cr £34k**

For information here, the variation relates to a net surplus within property rental income across the

**Waiver of Financial Regulations**

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules state that where the value of a contract exceeds £50k and is to be exempted from the normal requirement to obtain competitive quotations, the Chief Officer has to obtain the agreement of the Director of Resources and Finance Director and (where over £100,000) approval of the Portfolio Holder, and report use of this exemption to Audit Sub committee bi-annually. No waivers over £50k have been actioned since the last report to the Executive.

**Virements Approved to date under Director's Delegated Powers**

Details of virements actioned by Chief Officers under delegated authority under the Financial Regulations "Scheme of Virement" will be included in financial monitoring reports to the Portfolio Holder. Since the last report to Executive, no virements have been actioned.

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.  
FSD14084

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Environment Portfolio Holder

For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Environment PDS Committee on

**Date:** 20th January 2015

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

**Title:** CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2<sup>ND</sup> QUARTER 2014/15

**Contact Officer:** Martin Reeves, Principal Accountant (Technical & Control)  
Tel: 020 8313 4291 E-mail: martin.reeves@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Director of Finance

**Ward:** All

---

1. Reason for report

On 26th November 2014, the Executive received the 2nd quarterly capital monitoring report for 2014/15 and agreed a revised Capital Programme for the four year period 2014/15 to 2017/18. This report highlights in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.3 changes agreed by the Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Environment Portfolio. The revised programme for this portfolio is set out in Appendix A, and detailed comments on scheme progress as at the end of the first half of 2014/15 are shown in Appendix B.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

The Portfolio Holder is asked to note and confirm the changes agreed by the Executive in November.

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services. Capital schemes help to maintain and improve the quality of life in the borough. Affective asset management planning (AMP) is a crucial corporate activity if a local authority is to achieve its corporate and service aims and objectives and deliver its services. The Council continuously reviews its property assets and service users are regularly asked to justify their continued use of the property. For each of our portfolios and service priorities, we review our main aims and outcomes through the AMP process and identify those that require the use of capital assets. Our primary concern is to ensure that capital investment provides value for money and matches the Council's overall priorities as set out in the Community Plan and in "Building a Better Bromley".
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Total increase of £0.3m over the 4 years 2014/15 to 2017/18, due to increased TfL support for highways schemes.
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
  4. Total current budget for this head: £26.1m for the Environment Portfolio over four years 2014/15 to 2017/18
  5. Source of funding: Capital grants, capital receipts and earmarked revenue contributions
- 

## Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1 fte
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 36 hours per week
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance
  2. Call-in: Applicable
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

### 3. COMMENTARY

#### Capital Monitoring – variations agreed by the Executive on 26th November 2014

3.1 A revised Capital Programme was approved by the Executive in November, following a detailed monitoring exercise carried out after the 2nd quarter of 2014/15. The base position was the revised programme approved by the Executive on 16th July 2014, as amended by variations approved at subsequent Executive meetings. All changes on schemes in the Environment Programme are itemised in the table below and further details are included in paragraphs 3.2 to 3.3. The revised Programme for the Environment Portfolio is attached as Appendix A. Appendix B shows actual spend against budget at the end of the first half of 2014/15, together with detailed comments on individual schemes.

|   | 2014/15       | 2015/16      | 2016/17      | 2017/18      | TOTAL<br>2014/15 to<br>2017/18 |
|---|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
|   | £000          | £000         | £000         | £000         | £000                           |
| Programme approved by Executive 16/07/14                      | 10,205        | 4,900        | 6,433        | 4,100        | 25,638                         |
| Woodland Improvements Programme (Executive 02/04/14)          | 77            | 49           |              |              | 126                            |
| Approved Programme prior to Q2 Monitoring                     | 10,282        | 4,949        | 6,433        | 4,100        | 25,764                         |
| <b>Variations approved by Executive 26/11/14</b>              |               |              |              |              |                                |
| Additional TfL support for highway schemes (see para 3.2)     | 346           |              |              |              | 346                            |
| Schemes rephased from 2014/15 into later years (see para 3.3) | -110          | 110          |              |              | 0                              |
| Total Amendment to the Capital Programme                      | 236           | 110          | 0            | 0            | 346                            |
| <b>Total Revised Environment Programme</b>                    | <b>10,518</b> | <b>5,059</b> | <b>6,433</b> | <b>4,100</b> | <b>26,110</b>                  |

#### 3.2 Transport for London (TfL) – Revised Support for Highway Schemes (£346k increase)

Provision for transport schemes to be 100% funded by TfL was originally included in the Capital Programme 2014/15 to 2017/18 on the basis of the bid in our Borough Spending Plan (BSP). Notification of an overall increase of £346k in 2014/15 was reported to the Executive in November and the Capital Programme was increased accordingly. Grant allocations from TfL change frequently and any further variations will be reported in subsequent capital monitoring reports.

#### 3.3 Schemes rephased from 2014/15 into later years

As part of the 2nd quarter monitoring exercise, £110k has been re-phased from 2014/15 into 2015/16 to reflect revised estimates of when expenditure on Environment schemes is likely to be incurred. This has no overall impact on the total approved estimate for the capital programme. Further details and comments are provided in Appendix B.

#### Post-Completion Reports

3.4 Under approved Capital Programme procedures, capital schemes should be subject to a post-completion review within one year of completion. After major slippage of expenditure in recent years, Members confirmed the importance of these as part of the overall capital monitoring framework. These reviews should compare actual expenditure against budget and evaluate the achievement of the scheme's non-financial objectives. Three post-completion reports are due to be submitted in 2014/15 for the Environment Portfolio. A report on the Chislehurst Road Bridge replacement is included on this agenda and the following reports will be submitted to a future meeting;

- The Hill Car Park – strengthening works
- Bromley Town Centre – increased parking capacity

3.5 This quarterly report will monitor the future position and will highlight any further reports required.

#### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services.

#### 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 These were reported in full to the Executive on 26th November 2014. Changes agreed by the Executive for the Environment Portfolio Capital Programme are set out in the table in paragraph 3.1.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>                       | Legal and Personnel Implications  |
| Background Documents:<br>(Access via Contact Officer) | Departmental monitoring returns October 2014.<br>Approved Capital Programme (Executive 16/07/14).<br>Capital Q2 monitoring report (Executive 26/11/14). |



# Appendix A

| ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME 26th NOVEMBER 2014 |   |                         |                   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                               |  |
|---|---|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Code  | Capital Scheme/Project                                    | Total Approved Estimate | Actual to 31.3.14 | Estimate 2014/15 | Estimate 2015/16 | Estimate 2016/17 | Estimate 2017/18 | Responsible Officer           | Remarks  |
|   |   | £'000's                 | £'000's           | £'000's          | £'000's          | £'000's          | £'000's          |                               |  |
|   | <b>SCHEMES FULLY FUNDED BY TRANSPORT FOR LONDON</b>       | 12000                   |                   |                  | 4000             | 4000             | 4000             |                               |  |
| 922602  | TFL - Borough Support                                     | 164                     | 164               | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | Angus Culverwell              | 100% TFL funding - The Capital Programme will be adjusted to reflect revised TFL approvals received.                 |
| 922608  | Cycling on Greenways                                      | 418                     | 401               | 17               | 0                | 0                | 0                | Malcolm Harris                |  |
| 922660  | Borough Transport Priorities (not allocated)              | 347                     | 247               | 100              | 0                | 0                | 0                | Angus Culverwell              |  |
| 922670  | Chislehurst Road Bridge replacement                       | 3994                    | 3994              | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | Paul Redman                   |  |
| 922668  | Biking Boroughs   | 393                     | 236               | 157              | 0                | 0                | 0                | Steven Heeley                 |  |
|   | <u>TFL - New funding streams</u>                          |                         |                   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                               |  |
| 922661  | Maintenance   | 5436                    | 3629              | 1807             | 0                | 0                | 0                | Angus Culverwell              |  |
| 922672  | LIP Formula Funding                                       | 7986                    | 5567              | 2419             | 0                | 0                | 0                | Garry Warner/Angus Culverwell |  |
| 922673  | Borough Cycling Programme                                 | 2                       | 2                 |                  |                  |                  |                  |                               |  |
| 922671  | Schools programme   | 52                      | 52                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | Steven Heeley                 |  |
|   | <b>TOTAL SCHEMES FULLY FUNDED BY TRANSPORT FOR LONDON</b> | <b>30792</b>            | <b>14292</b>      | <b>4500</b>      | <b>4000</b>      | <b>4000</b>      | <b>4000</b>      |                               |  |
|   | <b>OTHER</b>  |                         |                   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                               |  |
| 917242  | Winter maintenance - gritter replacement                  | 1210                    | 802               | 48               | 90               | 180              | 90               | Paul Chilton                  | £1.2m TFL funding Executive 16/10/13. £2,345k TFL funding; £150k Members' Initiative reserve; £762k Capital Receipts |
| 917247  | Orpington Public Realm Improvements                       | 2200                    | 2145              | 55               | 0                | 0                | 0                | Garry Warner<br>Kevin Munnely |  |
| 941536  | Beckenham Town Centre improvements                        | 3257                    | 0                 | 164              | 850              | 2243             | 0                |                               |  |
| 941893  | Depots - stand by generators                              | 120                     | 0                 | 60               | 60               | 0                | 0                | Paul Chilton                  |  |
| 941863  | The Woodland Improvements Programme                       | 126                     | 0                 | 77               | 49               | 0                | 0                | Pherenice Worsey-Buck         |  |
| 917252  | Street Lighting Invest to Save Initiative                 | 8507                    | 2934              | 5573             | 0                | 0                | 0                | Garry Warner                  | Funded by Invest to Save Fund (Executive 28/11/12)   |
| 927000  | *Feasibility Studies                                      | 40                      | 0                 | 10               | 10               | 10               | 10               | Claire Martin                 |  |
|   | <b>TOTAL OTHER</b>  | <b>15460</b>            | <b>5881</b>       | <b>5987</b>      | <b>1059</b>      | <b>2433</b>      | <b>100</b>       |                               |  |
|   | <b>CAR PARKING</b>  |                         |                   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                               |  |
| 926068  | The Hill Multi-Storey Car Park - strengthening works      | 232                     | 222               | 10               | 0                | 0                | 0                | Paul Redman                   | Approved by Executive 29/09/10   |
| 926069  | Bromley Town Centre - increased parking capacity          | 360                     | 339               | 21               | 0                | 0                | 0                | Paul Redman                   | Approved by Executive 23/05/12   |
|   | <b>TOTAL CAR PARKING</b>                                  | <b>592</b>              | <b>561</b>        | <b>31</b>        | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>         | <b>0</b>         |                               |  |
|   | <b>TOTAL ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO</b>                        | <b>46844</b>            | <b>20734</b>      | <b>10518</b>     | <b>5059</b>      | <b>6433</b>      | <b>4100</b>      |                               |  |

## Appendix B

| ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - APPROVED CAPITAL PROGRAMME 26th NOVEMBER 2014 |  |                                 |   |                                  |  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Code  | Capital Scheme/Project                               | Actual to<br>31.3.14<br>£'000's | Approved<br>Estimate Jul<br>2014<br>£'000's | Actual to<br>18.09.14<br>£'000's | Revised<br>Estimate Nov<br>2014<br>£'000's | Responsible Officer Comments   |
| <b>SCHEMES FULLY FUNDED BY TRANSPORT FOR LONDON</b>                   |  |                                 |   |                                  |  |  |
| 922602  | TfL - Borough Support                                | 164                             | 19  | 0                                | 0  |  |
| 922608  | Cycling on Greenways                                 | 401                             | 93  | 0                                | 17   | TfL funding allocated to individual scheme   |
| 922660  | Borough Transport Priorities (not allocated)         | 247                             | 54  | 0                                | 100  | TfL funding allocated to individual scheme   |
| 922670  | Chislehurst Road Bridge replacement                  | 3994                            | 10  | 0                                | 0  | Scheme completed; post completion review to Environment PDS 20/01/15   |
| 922668  | Biking Boroughs                                      | 236                             | 193   | 18                               | 157  | TfL funding allocated to individual scheme   |
| <u>TfL - New funding streams</u>                                      |  |                                 |   |                                  |  |  |
| 922661  | Maintenance  | 3629                            | 1223  | 544                              | 1807                                       | TfL funding allocated to individual scheme   |
| 922672  | LIP Formula Funding                                  | 5567                            | 2548  | 587                              | 2419                                       | TfL funding allocated to individual scheme   |
| 922673  | Borough Cycling Programme                            | 2                               | 11  | 0                                | 0  |  |
| 922671  | Schools programme                                    | 52                              | 3   | 0                                | 0  |  |
| TOTAL SCHEMES FULLY FUNDED BY TRANSPORT FOR LONDON                    |  | 14292                           | 4154  | 1149                             | 4500                                       |  |
| <b>OTHER</b>  |  |                                 |   |                                  |  |  |
| 917242  | Winter maintenance - gritter replacement             | 802                             | 48  | 0                                | 48   | Currently discussing options for winter equipment with users and investigating market  |
| 917247  | Orpington Public Realm Improvements                  | 2145                            | 55  | 0                                | 55   | Balance of funding being utilised for minor redesigns to scheme.   |
| 941536  | Beckenham Town Centre improvements                   | 0                               | 214   | 37                               | 164  | Design and Development for TfL Major Improvement Initiative. Design and Development costs funded by TfL. Traffic modelling brief is out to tender and other survey work is ongoing. The Project follows on from Beckenham TC improvements delivered by the Council in 13/14. Rephased further £50k from 14/15 into 15/16   |
| 941893  | Depots - stand by generators                         | 0                               | 120   | 0                                | 60   | Engaging with manufacturers and suppliers regarding options and technical specifications. Detailed investigative and enabling works are required, this means possible power outages at various intervals, which has to be coordinated between the various service user groups and may not meet the planned time scale proposed. Rephased £60k (Installation funds) into 15/16. |
| 941863  | The Woodland Improvements Programme                  | 0                               | 0   | 0                                | 77   | £126k grant offered by Forestry Commission (Executive 02/04/14). £77k in 14/15 and £49k in 15/16   |
| 917252  | Street Lighting Invest to Save Initiative            | 2934                            | 5573  | 1426                             | 5573                                       | Funded by Invest to Save Fund (Executive 28/11/12) - Report presented to Executive 15/10/14 to amend the project in replacing fewer lamp columns and convert more lanterns. Additional connections are being passed to UKPN as a result of a previously unknown interconnected network.  |
| 927000  | Feasibility Studies                                  | 0                               | 10  | 0                                | 10   |  |
| TOTAL OTHER   |  | 5881                            | 6020  | 1463                             | 5987                                       |  |
| <b>CAR PARKING</b>  |  |                                 |   |                                  |  |  |
| 926068  | The Hill Multi-Storey Car Park - strengthening works | 222                             | 10  | 0                                | 10   | The scheme has been completed aside from a minor 'snagging' item. This is being resolved leading to release of the balance of retention funds and scheme conclusion.   |
| 926069  | Bromley Town Centre - increased parking capacity     | 339                             | 21  | -1                               | 21   | One remaining scheme - Elmfield Road: awaiting safety audit, but not expected to cost more than £21k.  |
| TOTAL CAR PARKING   |  | 561                             | 31  | -1                               | 31   |  |
| <b>TOTAL ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO</b>                                    |  | <b>20734</b>                    | <b>10205</b>                                | <b>2611</b>                      | <b>10518</b>                               |  |

Report No.  
ES15001

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Environment Portfolio Holder

For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Environment PDS Committee on:

**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> January 2015

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Executive Key

**Title:** PARKING CHARGES

**Contact Officer:** Gerry Broomfield, Car Park and Assets Manager  
Tel: 020 83134509 E-mail: Gerry.broomfield@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment and Community Services

**Ward:** All

---

1. Reason for report

A review has been undertaken of parking charges across the borough in line with the agreed Parking Strategy and benchmarked against inflation since prices were last increased in 2012. The report recommends changes to on- and off- street parking fees as set out in Appendix 1 and changes to the resident parking scheme.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Environment Portfolio Holder agrees:

- 2.1 The proposed parking charges as set out in Appendix 1 with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015;
- 2.2 Changes to the Resident permit parking scheme effective from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015 as follows -
  - a) revised charges for the six areas highlighted in Appendix 2
  - b) the introduction of virtual permits from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015
  - c) to cease the entitlement to free books of Visitor Vouchers for the over 60s;
- 2.3 That a review of the impact of revised parking and permit charges should be undertaken after 12 months; and
- 2.4 That the Executive Director of Environment & Community Services be authorised to agree with the Portfolio Holder minor changes to parking charges to address local priorities.

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy: Parking Strategy
  2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment Vibrant, Thriving Town Centres
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated Cost of £16k implementation costs
  2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost: Estimated additional income of Cr £550k
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Parking
  4. Total current budget for this head: Cr £6m
  5. Source of funding: Existing Revenue Budget
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 28.8 fte
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance:
  2. Call-in: Applicable:
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All motorists within the Borough.
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

### 3. COMMENTARY

3.1 In February 2012 the Environment Portfolio Holder agreed a new Parking Strategy which included a series of objectives for the Council's approach to parking:

#### Policy objectives

- To improve the safety of all road users.
- To provide sufficient affordable parking spaces in appropriate locations to promote and enhance the local economy.
- To assist in providing a choice of travel mode, and enable motorists to switch from unnecessary car journeys, to reduce traffic congestion.
- To ensure effective loading/unloading for local businesses.
- To provide the right balance between long, medium and short stay spaces in particular locations
- To provide a turnover of available parking space in areas of high demand.
- To assist the smooth flow of traffic and reduce traffic congestion.
- To enable residents to park near their homes.
- To assist users with special requirements, such as the disabled.
- To ensure that the Council's parking policies and working practices are clear and accessible to the public.

#### Operational objectives

- To set a level of charges which balances demand and supply for parking spaces across the borough.
- To provide an efficient service which offers Best Value.
- To control the budget within prescribed limits.
- To be seen as fair and responsive to customer needs

3.2 In March 2012 the charging structure was fundamentally reformed and parking charges increased. The principle behind the reform was that the system should be less complex, based on consistent hourly charges in areas of comparable parking demand, and with maximum stay tailored closely to the demand management pressures in particular locations. This would give a clear indication to motorists that town centre parking locations, particularly on-street, were designed for short stay retail visits. Tariffs in off-street facilities were set at a level to attract longer-term parking, and help to reduce traffic congestion and improve journey times in town centres.

3.3 In general, motorists tend to prefer on-street to off-street parking. This is largely due to perceptions of convenience and security. Because of the perceived convenience of on-street parking, it is generally more suitable for shorter stays and pricing should provide an incentive for more rapid turnover to maximise the availability of convenient on-street spaces.

3.4 The borough's on- and off-street parking facilities were divided into four broad Charging Groups:

Charging Group 1 – Car parks in Bromley town centre

Charging Group 2 – Car parks outside Bromley town centre

Charging Group 3 – On-street parking in Bromley town centre

Charging Group 4 – On-street parking outside Bromley town centre

- 3.5 Ensuring that parking charges keep pace with inflation is an important consideration for the Council. In the case of off-street car parks, charges are fully within the Council’s control. The Council’s discretion over charges for on-street parking is more restricted: these must be set for traffic management reasons, such as to ration available space and ensure that there is an adequate turnover of parking spaces. It remains important to consider on-street charges in the context of inflation. Parking charges have been frozen since 2012, so on-street spaces have become less expensive in real terms over time and charges have become a less effective tool in managing demand. This could impact on the turnover of spaces needed to ensure that shoppers can access local retail centres.

#### 4. PROPOSED PARKING CHARGES

- 4.1 Appendix 1 has the full details of the proposed changes to the parking charges and a summary of the changes is set out below. Season tickets would be adjusted proportionately.

##### Charging Group 1: Off Street Car Parks in Bromley town centre

- 4.2 Of the borough’s off-street car park spaces, 2,251 are located in Bromley town centre compared with a total of 2,292 in the rest of the borough.
- 4.3 It is proposed to increase the hourly rate from £1.00 to £1.20. A summary of the proposed changes to the maximum stay charges are shown in the table below: -

|                                   | Existing<br>Max rate<br>£ | Proposed<br>Max rate<br>£ |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Civic Centre MSCP                 | 11.00                     | 13.00                     |
| The Hill MSCP                     | 6.00                      | 7.00                      |
| Station Road                      | 4.00                      | 4.80                      |
| South Street & Palace Grove       | 4.00                      | 4.80                      |
| St Blaise                         | 11.00                     | 12.00                     |
| Mitre Close (4 hour maximum stay) | 4.00                      | 4.80                      |

- 4.4 The charges have been set at The Hill MSCP, to provide an incentive for commuters and town centre workers to use these facilities. Charges at the Civic Centre have also been set to continue focusing this facility on meeting the needs of shoppers, ensuring a reasonable turnover of convenient spaces. This would nudge motorists seeking an all-day parking space away from the Civic Centre, as this central car park is more suitable for shorter-stay visitors. Charges at the surface car parks would be capped for over 4 hours.
- 4.5 In the past, charge rates at the privately-owned INTU car park (formerly Glades) have closely mirrored those set by the Council for the Civic Centre. INTU currently charge £1 per hour. The town centre’s NCP facility at The Mall currently charge £1.30 per hour capped at £8.30 over 4 hours. Neither of these facilities has reported significant problems with pricing at this level. Charges set between £1 and £2 per hour appear to be the norm and continues to compare favourably with charges in Croydon and Bexleyheath town centres; further information on benchmarking is covered in section 5 below.

##### Charging Group 2: Off-Street Car Parks outside Bromley town centre

- 4.6 Existing hourly charge rates in these car parks vary from 30p to 50p per hour. It is proposed that the fees are increased to between 40p to 60p as detailed in Appendix 1.

- 4.7 A higher rate is charged at the car parks attached to The Spa and West Wickham leisure centres, to manage demand, distinguish these car parks from general town centre parking, and ensure spaces are available for visitors to these facilities. It is proposed to increase the hourly rate at these car parks from 90p to £1.10.

#### Charging Group 3: On-Street Parking in Bromley town centre

- 4.8 On-street charges must be set for traffic management reasons, for example to ration available space and ensure that there is a rapid turnover of parking spaces. It is also important to maintain a differential between on and off street charges to encourage more long term parking off street.
- 4.9 Bromley town centre has the highest potential demand for on-street parking in the borough, and higher charges are necessary to manage this compared to on-street locations elsewhere. 832 of the Council's 2,117 controlled on-street spaces are in this town centre. An issue in Zone A in particular has been identified at peak times where vehicles wait for on-street spaces to be freed up, adding to congestion problems. Existing periods of maximum stay would be retained (2 hours Zone A, 4 hours in Zone B).
- 4.10 The table below summarises the proposed changes: -

|                            | <b>Existing<br/>Hrly rate<br/>£</b> | <b>Proposed<br/>Hrly rate<br/>£</b> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Bromley Town Centre Zone A | 1.50                                | 1.70                                |
| Bromley Town Centre Zone B | 1.10                                | 1.30                                |
| Bromley Town Centre Zone C | 0.80                                | 1.00                                |

#### Charging Group 4: On-Street Parking outside Bromley town centre

- 4.11 As with other on-street charges, prices must be set for traffic management reasons, for example to ration available space and ensure that there is a rapid turnover of parking spaces.
- 4.12 Current charge rates vary from 50p to 70p per hour. Maximum stay periods of 2 to 10 hours assist in controlling differential levels of demand for particular parking locations, depending on their purpose; no changes to these maximum stay periods are proposed. It is proposed to increase these charge rates to between 60p to 80p as set out in Appendix 1.
- 4.13 A range of practical and statutory actions would need to be undertaken before the revised prices could come into effect, including a 21 day Notice of Variation, amendment of the various Traffic Management Orders, machine software and sign changes and on line changes to the RingGo mobile phone software. The implementation costs are expected to be £15k and can be met from the existing Parking budget for 2014/15. The Revised charges should be effective from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. Any delay in introducing the revised charges would impact on income for 2012/13.

## **5. BENCHMARKING**

- 5.1 A benchmarking exercise has been carried out to compare parking charges in different neighbouring boroughs, in particular Bexley, Croydon, Sevenoaks, Lewisham and Greenwich. However, each borough is different; some do not have metropolitan retail centres and Greenwich in particular faces some pressure from tourism. Croydon town centre is also of

metropolitan retail importance, but is larger than Bromley town centre. Other similar outer London boroughs, e.g. Kingston and Sutton, can offer useful comparisons but are too distant to be realistic alternative destinations for Bromley shoppers. Many local authorities have increased prices in the past 18 months and some are considering further increases. Bexley, for instance, is looking to increase charges in 2015.

5.2 The table below compares the proposed charges for Bromley Town Centre with private car parks and those of other neighbouring boroughs.

|   | <b>Hrly rate</b> |
|---|------------------|
|   | <b>£</b>         |
| <b>LBB Bromley Town Centre off street car parks</b>         | <b>1.20</b>      |
| Private car parks   |                  |
| Intu Bromley  | 1.00             |
| The Mall (NCP)  | 1.30             |
| Supermarket car Parks                                       |                  |
| Sainsbury's, Bromley North non-customers (max stay 2 hours) | 2.00             |
| Waitrose, Bromley South non-customers (max stay 3 hours)    | 10.00            |
| Neighbouring Boroughs                                       |                  |
| Croydon Central (£1.30 - £2.40 depending on location)       | 2.40             |
| Bexleyheath Town Centre                                     | 1.00             |
| Greenwich Town Centre (80p to £2.50 depending on location)  | 2.50             |
| Lewisham Town Centre  | 1.40             |
| Kingston Town Centre (£1 to £2 depending on location)       | 2.00             |

5.3 Outside of the town centres the off-street car parks generally charge between 80p and £1.40 per hour depending on location.

## 6. PARKING PERMITS

- 6.1 Bromley sets the price of its permits based on the cost of managing the scheme, including the cost of administration and the level of enforcement needed to ensure the scheme is effective. This is strongly related to the hours of operation of the permit bays.
- 6.2 In March 2012, the permit charges were standardised in all but 6 areas of the borough, at a cost of £40 for schemes enforced up to 4 hours, or £80 for schemes enforced for more than 4 hours (normally full day enforcement).
- 6.3 It is now recommended that the residential permit charges in the remaining areas are brought into line with the other residential and business parking permits with a price of £80 to reflect full-day enforcement. These areas are:
- Bromley town centre Zone AB
  - Bromley town centre Zone AC
  - Camden Grove, Chislehurst
  - Farnborough Village
  - Ledrington
  - Burnt Ash Lane (G)
- 6.4 Bromley currently allows residents over the age of 60 to apply for two free books of visitor vouchers per annum. For the financial year 2013/4, 1176 residents applied, each normally requesting the full entitlement of two books which have a value if sold of £82k. For residents purchasing Visitor Vouchers the cost is £35 per book of 15 vouchers.



- 6.5 This is not a legal requirement and since the policy was introduced we now provide carer's permits at a discounted rate so the need for vouchers is reduced. In addition, Parking Services staff already use their discretion to deal with short term issues, for example if an elderly relative is being cared for by family members during a period of illness, by issuing an appropriate number of free vouchers. This approach has worked well for a number of years.
- 6.6 Following discussion at the Parking Working Group on 18<sup>th</sup> December it is recommended to cease the entitlement to free books of Visitor Vouchers for the over 60s from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. It is expected that number of requests for the visitor vouchers will reduce significantly once the vouchers are no longer free of charge, and therefore at this stage it is not possible to assess the level of demand and the additional income that may result from this proposed change.
- 6.7 There is no proposed price increase for any other permits at this time, including visitor vouchers. The full list of permits available with the current and proposed charges is shown in Appendix 2.

#### Virtual Permits.

- 6.8 In April 2014 on-line permit applications were introduced. 80% of residents now use the online option to purchase/renew their permits or buy visitor vouchers. This has resulted in a same or next day service compared with a number of days or weeks in the past at busy periods. Proof of residency and car ownership is now requested every 3 years instead of annually, with associated sample checking.
- 6.9 To further improve the efficiency of the service, it is proposed to introduce Virtual Permits from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. There is now a social acceptance of 'virtual technology' including for example the Tax Disk which is no longer issued. LB Bexley (through the Shared Service) introduced virtual permits and season tickets a number of months ago without complaint or issue.
- 6.10 Technology is such that enforcement of the permit scheme can be achieved without the need to display a 'permit' in the windscreen. The use of the Vehicle Registration Mark (VRM) is key. In fact Vinci Park (the current enforcement contractor) already works this way on a number of other contracts. There may be some minor savings in terms of stationery and postage as reminders and confirmations would be sent via email. Visitor Vouchers will still have to be printed and sent via the post.

#### 12 Month Permit Parking Review

- 6.11 Bromley determines the price of its permits based on the cost of managing the scheme, including the cost of administration and level of enforcement needed to ensure the scheme is effective. Based on this principle there has not been an increase in permit charges since April 2012 and there is no proposed increase at the present time, (except as shown in 6.3). The recommendations within section 6 of this report may have a bearing in this, however the full financial effect is unknown at this stage. Therefore it is recommended a full review of permit parking including visitor vouchers takes place including a financial analysis within 12 months, the findings of which are reported back to this committee.

## 7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The proposals in this report are consistent with the objectives of the Council's Parking Strategy, agreed by the Environment Portfolio Holder following Environment PDS Committee on 18th January 2012.
- 7.2 In relation to the impact of changes in parking fees on town centres, the Association of Town Centre Managers' view is that "there is no clear correlation between parking charges and retail

performance.” The British Parking Association report that the “...Europe wide Cost 342 study also found little evidence of correlation but did indicate that public reaction to increased parking charges is usually short term. Parking demand falls for a period and then reverts to normal. There is also some evidence that a sharp reduction in parking charges does not result in a proportionate increase in car park use.”

- 7.3 The BPA concluded that “The quantity, quality and security of parking provision are much more significant than its price to those consumers who drive retail performance.” In its response to the Portas report (Parking News, February 2012), the BPA continued to emphasise that “...car park users are not solely influenced by price. Quality, convenience, safety and accessibility are all factors affecting parking choices.”
- 7.4 Research from the Netherlands (Surveyor, August 2009) concluded that “...it is the social and economic activities of the destination which attract...and it is the quality of these that determine the parking fees which can be charged” and “...shoppers are prepared to pay for parking when the price reflects the perceived quality of the destination.”

## 8. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The estimated net effect of the proposals in this report is summarised in the table below: -

|                                     | Off street<br>£'000 | On street<br>£'000 | Permits<br>£'000 | Total<br>£'000 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Current 2015/16 budget              | 3,459               | 2,675              | 387              | <b>6,521</b>   |
| Estimated net income from proposals | 3,756               | 2,925              | 390              | <b>7,071</b>   |
| <b>Net additional income</b>        | <b>297</b>          | <b>250</b>         | <b>3</b>         | <b>550</b>     |

- 8.2 From the parking information available, there has been a sustained small decrease in demand for parking in the Bromley town centre main car parks of about 1% per year over the past six years. The closure of a key department store in 2006 and the subsequent national recession appears to have contributed to this decline in demand. However, it should be noted that this assumption has not been built into the financial model. If the decline does continue in 2015/16 there would be an additional risk of a shortfall in income from that projected. The decline may be arrested if the long term renewal strategy for Bromley town centre envisaged in the Area Action Plan proves to be successful.
- 8.3 Members should note that on the 14<sup>th</sup> January 2015 the Executive agreed, as part of budget setting, to make an assumption that parking charges would raise an additional £390k in 2015/16. This should be seen in the context of the freeze in charges since the 2012 increases, and comparable price inflation in the economy generally since then. As can be seen from the table above, it is estimated that an additional £550k will be raised from the proposals in this report. Future inflation for parking fee income will be built into the forecast.
- 8.4 The estimated cost of introducing the revised charges will be £15k. This will be met from within the existing Parking budgets for 2014/15.
- 8.5 At this stage it is not possible to quantify the financial impact of the proposal to cease the entitlement to visitor vouchers for the over 60's, although it could be as high as £82k. The financial position will be monitored throughout the next year and reported back to Members as part of the Permit Parking Review.

## 9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 In relation to on-street parking, the service is required to operate in a tightly restricted legal environment. Although the Mayor's Transport Strategy has now superseded earlier Traffic

Management and Parking Guidance for London, the boroughs continue to rely on the TMPG document as an authoritative interpretation of the legal framework. It advises:

*“(2.23) The level of parking charges must be set for traffic management reasons, such as to ration available space and ensure that there is a rapid turnover of parking spaces, rather than to maximise revenue. This is because section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 does not include the maximisation of revenue from parking charges as one of the relevant considerations to be taken into account in securing the safe, expeditious and convenient movement of traffic”.*

- 9.2 This interpretation of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, in the context of on-street charges, is widely accepted. Case law supports the view that the Act’s purpose is not revenue-raising, for example the judgement in R v LB Camden (ex parte Cran). The British Parking Association’s Parking Practice Notes 1 - Charging for Parking (Revised August 2011) emphasises this point by quoting the Camden judgement, saying that the 1984 Act:

*“...is not a fiscal measure. It contains no provision which suggests that parliament intended to authorise a council to raise income by using its powers to designate parking places on the highway and to charge for their use”.*

- 9.3 To implement the changes to the charging structure it will be necessary to amend The London Borough of Bromley (Off-Street Parking Places) Consolidation Order 1995 and any relevant On-Street Parking Orders.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>                       | Personnel Implications  |
| Background Documents:<br>(Access via Contact Officer) | ES12029 Parking Charges Report – 28 <sup>th</sup> February 2012 |

This page is left intentionally blank

## Appendix 1

### Parking Charges 2014/2015

| Zone/Category Name                        | Max Stay  | Current Charges | Current Max Charge | Proposed Charge Per Hour | Proposed Max Charge |
|---|-----------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Bromley Town Centre On Street</b>      |           |                 |                    |                          |                     |
| Zone A                                    | 2 hours   | £1.50           | £3.00              | £1.70                    | £3.40               |
| Zone B                                    | 4 hours   | £1.10           | £4.40              | £1.30                    | £4.80               |
| Zone C                                    | Unlimited | £0.80           | £8.00              | £1.00                    | £10.00              |
| <b>Bromley Town Centre Off Street</b>     |           |                 |                    |                          |                     |
| Multi Story Car Park Civic Centre         | Unlimited | £1.00           | £11.00             | £1.20                    | £13.00              |
| Multi Story Car Park The Hill             | Unlimited | £1.00           | £6.00              | £1.20                    | £7.00               |
|   |           |                 |                    |                          |                     |
| Surface                                   | 4 hours   | £1.00           | £4.00              | £1.20                    | £4.80               |
| Coach Park                                | 2 hours   | £2.50           | £5.00              | £3.00                    | £6.00               |
| <b>All other areas - On Street</b>        |           |                 |                    |                          |                     |
| Key Town Centres                          | 2 hours   | £0.70           | £1.40              | £0.80                    | £1.60               |
| Medium Sized Town Centres                 | 4 hours   | £0.60           | £1.20              | £0.70                    | £1.40               |
| Local Town Centres                        | 2 hours   | £0.50           | £1.00              | £0.60                    | £1.20               |
| Commuter and Long Stay                    | Unlimited | £0.50           | £4.00              | £0.60                    | £4.80               |
| <b>CPZ and P&amp;D Specialist Schemes</b> |           |                 |                    |                          |                     |
| Clockhouse                                | Unlimited | £2.00           | One fee            | £2.20                    | One fee             |
| Copers Cope                               | Unlimited | £2.80           | One fee            | £3.00                    | One fee             |
| Non BTC - T&H Review (Shortlands)         | 10 hours  | £0.30           | £2.00              | £0.40                    | £2.60               |
| <b>All other areas - Off Street</b>       |           |                 |                    |                          |                     |
| Small Shopping Parades                    | Unlimited | £0.30           | £2.00              | £0.40                    | £2.60               |
| Larger Shopping Parades (secondary)       | Unlimited | £0.40           | £2.00              | £0.50                    | £2.50               |
| Larger Shopping Parades (primary)         | Unlimited | £0.50           | £4.00              | £0.60                    | £4.80               |
| Station & Commuter Car Parks              | Unlimited | £0.30           | £1.50              | £0.40                    | £2.00               |
| Leisure Centre                            | 4         | £0.90           | £3.60              | £1.10                    | £4.40               |

This page is left intentionally blank

## Appendix 2

| Controlled Parking Zone Name | Current | Proposed |
|------------------------------|---------|----------|
| <b>Business</b>              |         |          |
| Bromley North (B)            | £100    | £100     |
| Bromley South (C )           | £100    | £100     |
| Chatterton Village (W)       | £100    | £100     |
| Clock House (Z5)             | £100    | £100     |
| Locksbottom (LB)             | £225    | £225     |
| Maple Road (MAP)             | £100    | £100     |
| Clock House (Z2)             | £100    | £100     |

|                                  |            |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Residential</b>               |            |            |
| Beckenham (BEC)                  | £80        | £80        |
| Beckenham (F)                    | £80        | £80        |
| Bromley North (B)                | £40        | £40        |
| Bromley South (C )               | £40        | £40        |
| <b>Bromley Town Centre (A/B)</b> | <b>£65</b> | <b>£80</b> |
| <b>Bromley Town Centre (A/C)</b> | <b>£65</b> | <b>£80</b> |
| Burnt Ash Lane (North) (J)       | £40        | £40        |
| <b>Burnt Ash Lane (G)</b>        | <b>£65</b> | <b>£80</b> |
| <b>Camden Grove (N)</b>          | <b>£65</b> | <b>£80</b> |
| Chatterton Village               | £40        | £40        |
| Clock House (Z1)                 | £80        | £80        |
| Clock House (Z2)                 | £40        | £40        |
| Clock House (Z3)                 | £40        | £40        |
| Clock House (Z4)                 | £40        | £40        |
| Copers Cope (R.)                 | £80        | £80        |
| Elms Estate (ELM)                | £40        | £40        |
| <b>Farnborough (FV)</b>          | <b>£65</b> | <b>£80</b> |
| <b>Ledrington Road (D)</b>       | <b>£65</b> | <b>£80</b> |
| Linden Grove (LIN)               | £40        | £40        |
| Locksbottom (E)                  | £80        | £80        |
| Orpington (H)                    | £40        | £40        |
| Orpington (I)                    | £80        | £80        |
| Orpington (K)                    | £80        | £80        |
| Petts Wood (S)                   | £80        | £80        |
| Walnuts Estate (WAL)             | £80        | £80        |

This page is left intentionally blank



Report No.  
ES14094

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Executive

For Pre-Decision Scrutiny by the Environment PDS Committee on

**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> January 2014

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Executive Key

**Title:** CLOSURE OF BECKENHAM, BROMLEY AND WEST WICKHAM PUBLIC TOILETS

**Contact Officer:** Peter McCready, Head of Area Management  
Tel: 020 8313 4942 E-mail: peter.mccready@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

**Ward:** Bromley Town, Copers Cope and West Wickham Ward

---

1. Reason for report

This report outlines a proposal to save £67k from the closure of Beckenham, Bromley and West Wickham High Street public toilets, declares the Beckenham property surplus and confirms the arrangements of Community Toilet Schemes as an alternative approach to the provision of public toilets in these town centres.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Executive agrees to:

- 2.1 **The closure of Beckenham, Bromley and West Wickham High Street public toilets from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015;**
- 2.2 **Declare the Beckenham public toilet surplus and offer it to the market, on the basis that if offers are not forthcoming that it should be demolished; and**
- 2.3 **Authorise the expansion of the Community Toilet Scheme as the alternative provision set out in paragraph 3.7.**

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
  2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment Vibrant, Thriving Town Centres
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated net saving of £22k in 2015/16, rising to £67k in 2016/17. A capital receipt could be generated from the sale of the Beckenham public convenience.
  2. Ongoing costs: Recurring saving
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Public Conveniences
  4. Total current budget for this head: £131k
  5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budget for 2014/15
- 

## Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1 FTE
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance
  2. Call-in: Applicable
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Visitors and businesses in Beckenham, Bromley and West Wickham High Streets
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: To be advised at the meeting

### 3. COMMENTARY

3.1 In January 2009 the Committee, and subsequently the Portfolio Holder received a report on “Community Toilets – Feasibility”. As a result of this it was agreed to conduct a feasibility study around the provision of community toilets in Bromley. The feasibility study included an assessment of each of the Council’s facilities and from this list of potential areas the community toilet scheme (CTS) has been widened with the following principles:

- Community toilets should at least match, and if possible improve, on the kind of provision made by the Council both in terms of opening hours and facilities for the disabled, baby change etc.
- Where ever possible provision should not be exclusively provided through public houses, since many people for reasons of faith or personal choice, including children, will not want to use these facilities. At least one “non-pub” facility should be available in each area during normal daytime shopping hours.
- Facilities provided by businesses should be of a standard that attracts shoppers and visitors to the area and therefore contributes to the business viability to the area.
- Potential participants should have clear internal signage to the toilet facilities.

3.2 In addition to the toilets provided by the Council other organisations and private companies also provide facilities, with town centres having more than ever before with cafes and major shops being the main providers. The exercise of reviewing the facilities on offer by these organisations and the perceived demand for toilets has determined the feasibility of introducing the initiative in conjunction with closures.

3.3 At the full Council meeting on the 28th February 2011, a decision was taken to agree to the closure of public toilets as part of the savings proposals presented.

3.4 Where public toilets have been closed a saving on routine cleaning and associated running costs (e.g. rates, utilities and maintenance liability) has been identified for the Streetscene and Greenspace revenue budget to assist with meeting the Council’s financial savings.

3.5 An assessment of the Council’s remaining provision has included the toilets in the borough’s town centres of Beckenham, Bromley, Penge and West Wickham. The provision of a public toilet in Orpington has been provided by the Orpington First BID since March 2014 following a refurbishment by the BID. In October 2014 Members received a report (Report no. ES14085) to extend the CTS initiative in Penge High Street with a closure proposed in January 2015. In conducting the feasibility of extending the CTS for the town centres, it would be intended to follow the approach already established in Beckenham, Bromley and West Wickham.

3.6 The general condition of these toilets is acceptable but the quality of the interior decoration limits the standard of cleanliness compared with higher standards achieved by the alternative provision of shops and local businesses. This is partly due to the whole facility being more modern than the Council’s public toilets, the fact that their use can be closely monitored, and the fact that they are less likely to become a focus for vandalism.

#### Proposal

3.7 This report proposes to close the Beckenham, Bromley and West Wickham High Street public toilets and to extend the CTS initiative with fourteen new entrants and retain the five pre-existing arrangements. The high street business partners include three new entrants and three pre-existing premises in Beckenham; six new entrants and two pre-existing arrangements in Bromley, and five new entrants in West Wickham (no pre-existing arrangements). The majority

of the agreements have no revenue cost implications which are either based upon the 'Open London' scheme or utilise other premises with no fee-paying requirements. The total additional cost of the new entrants to the scheme equates to £2k pa. A list of the high street Community Toilet Scheme business partners are tabled in Appendix A of this report.

- 3.8 The existing contract for the cleansing of public conveniences was awarded to Kier and commenced on 29th March 2012 for a five year period, with an option for a two year extension. Negotiations are in progress with the contractor (Kier) regarding the reduction in the total tendered sum for the cleansing of the Beckenham, Bromley and West Wickham toilets. At any time during the term of the contract the Council may decide to implement a variation to the service requirements, which may arise through no fault of the contractor.
- 3.9 With this proposal, the total aggregated value of the variation of the service has exceeded 10% of the original total tendered sum and the contractor would therefore be eligible for claiming a compensation event for the loss and expense with the entire effect of a change of service. The compensation event is assessed as the effect of the event on the forecast cost for work not yet done – this would relate to the remaining period of the contract (e.g. from the date of the notification of closure to 28th March 2017).
- 3.10 The Council has requested a written quotation from the contractor for assessment of the compensation event. The quote will be assessed using the procedures in the contract and the sum would be agreed by both parties. Firm details from the contractor were not available for inclusion within this report however the Head of Area Management has advised that an indicative cost of a one-off compensation fee in the region of £20k for this contract variation and would be met from within the Streetscene and Greenspace budget for 2015/16.
- 3.11 If the Executive agrees to the proposed closure, arrangements will be made to declare the Beckenham property surplus to Council requirements and would recommend marketing it, on the basis that if offers are not forthcoming that it should be demolished. If it proved impossible to sell the facility, the cost of service disconnection, demolition and reinstatement of the site is estimated at a cost of £15k for the location. There is no available budget provision within the Property Division to undertake this work, therefore the costs of demolition would need to be met by the Streetscene and Greenspace budget. The West Wickham property is attached to the adjoining Public Library and as part of a much larger landholding it is recommend that the building is retained until further consideration of the library is given. The Bromley property is located within the town centre redevelopment plan designated as Opportunity Site G. As the proposals for this site were not available at the stage of report writing, the property would be retained until confirmation of the development was made.
- 3.12 The closure of the three public conveniences would result in a net annual saving of £22k for 2015/16, after allowing for the one-off costs for compensation and demolition. Annual savings of £67k would be achieved from 2016/17 onwards.

#### **4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 A significant number of local authorities have adopted the means of making existing toilets in private premises available to the general public under the Community Toilet Scheme initiative.
- 4.2 Research in Bromley has shown that people feel safer using a toilet in a shop or other retail premises rather than in an unattended public convenience. Some older people are apprehensive about being away from home because of the lack of toilet facilities, or their fear of using them. The availability of Bromley's Community Toilet Scheme contributes towards supporting independence and to the promotion of vibrant and thriving town centres as well as a quality environment.

- 4.3 The Council's Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Community Toilet Scheme was developed in September 2008 and last reviewed in August 2010. The EIA set out to analyse the policy of replacing selected public conveniences with community toilet facilities. The policy parameters confirmed that levels of toilet provision to be no less than those currently provided by the Council and sufficient to meet the current and anticipated demands of users, including any special needs of the area and its users. The EIA will be reviewed and updated with qualitative data obtained from local consultation through the placement of public notices. This information was not available for inclusion within this report however the feedback will be reported to Committee Members prior to the Environment PDS and Executive meetings.

## 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The table below summarises the savings that would result from the proposed closure of Beckenham, Bromley and West Wickham High Street toilets from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015:-

| Analysis of savings                                       | Part Year   | Full Year   |
|---|-------------|-------------|
|   | 2015/16     | 2016/17     |
|   | £'000       | £'000       |
| Cleansing contract  | 34.0        | 34.0        |
| Running expenses - energy, water etc                      | 14.0        | 17.0        |
| Maintenance   | 11.0        | 11.0        |
| Business Rates (provided sold/demolished)                 | 0.0         | 7.0         |
| <b>Savings</b>  | <b>59.0</b> | <b>69.0</b> |
| Less additional cost of community toilets at West Wickham | -2.0        | -2.0        |
| Less estimated one-off compensation payable to contractor | -20.0       | 0.0         |
| Less potential demolition costs of Beckenham              | -15.0       | 0.0         |
| <b>Net savings achieved</b>                               | <b>22.0</b> | <b>67.0</b> |

- 5.2 It should be noted that the savings from the business rates will only be realised when the buildings are either sold or demolished.
- 5.3 A capital receipt could be generated from the sale of the Beckenham public convenience.

## 6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Section 87 of the Public Health Act 1936 gives local authorities a power to provide public toilets, but imposes no duty to do so. The provision of public toilets varies according to the local authority however more recent legislation (Local Government Act 2000) places a duty on local authorities (through their community strategy) to:

*Enhance the quality of life of local communities and contribute to the achievement of sustainable development in the UK through actions to improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area and its inhabitants.*

Members should note that Bromley's Community Toilet Scheme intends to achieve this aim.

- 6.2 The Council enters into Legal Agreements with businesses participating in the Community Toilet Scheme and provide an annual payment of £1,000 subject to the facilities available, plus VAT, payable in quarterly instalments. In return the Council publicise the scheme and locations of the facilities through media sources and the installation of appropriate street signage.
- 6.3 The Annual Sum can be varied at the Council's discretion subject to number of toilet facilities available by the businesses. The Council may suspend payment in the event that the facilities are unavailable to the public.

- 6.4 The scheme covers a variety of outlets to ensure that toilet facilities are available for a wide range of users, over a substantial part of the day and night. Participating businesses retain the right to refuse admission of any person to their premises including toilet facilities.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>                       | Personnel Implications  |
| Background Documents:<br>(Access via Contact Officer) | <p>Public Toilet Provision – Report for Pre-Decision Scrutiny by Environment PDS on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2014 and Executive on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2014;</p> <p>Review of Public Toilets/Community Toilets Scheme – Report to Environment PDS on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2009;</p> <p>Community Toilets Feasibility – Report to Environment PDS and Environment Portfolio Holder on 8<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> January 2009;</p> <p>Community Toilets Feasibility Study – Report to Environment PDS 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2008;</p> <p>Review of Public Toilet Provision – Report to E&amp;LS PDS on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2008;</p> <p>Report of the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee – “The Provision of Public Toilets” dated 6<sup>th</sup> October 2008.</p> |

**List of Current and Additional High Street Community Toilet Scheme Business Partners****Beckenham**

- Beckenham Civic Halls (new entrant, no revenue cost)
- Costa Coffee (pre-existing arrangement, £1k pa)
- Odeon Cinema (pre-existing arrangement, no revenue cost)
- Sainsbury's (new entrant, 'Open London' scheme, no revenue cost)
- Spa Leisure Centre (new entrant, no revenue cost)
- Waitrose (pre-existing arrangement, 'Open London' scheme, no revenue cost)

**Bromley**

- BHS (new entrant, no revenue cost)
- Central Library (pre-existing arrangement, no revenue cost)
- Civic Centre (pre-existing arrangement, no revenue cost)
- Marks & Spencer (new entrant, 'Open London' scheme, no revenue cost)
- McDonalds (new entrant, 'Open London' scheme, no revenue cost)
- Pavilion Leisure Centre (new entrant, no revenue cost)
- Sainsbury's (new entrant, 'Open London' scheme, no revenue cost)
- Waitrose (new entrant, 'Open London' scheme, no revenue cost)

**West Wickham**

- Café Nero (new entrant, additional £1k pa)
- Marks & Spencer (new entrant, 'Open London' scheme, no revenue cost)
- Sainsbury's High Street (new entrant, 'Open London' scheme, no revenue cost)
- The Swan Public House (new entrant, additional £1k pa)
- West Wickham Leisure Centre (new entrant, no revenue cost)

This page is left intentionally blank



Report No.  
FSD15003

## London Borough of Bromley

### PART 1 - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Environment PDS Committee

**Date:** 20th January 2015

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

**Title:** DRAFT 2015/16 BUDGET

**Contact Officer:** Claire Martin, Head of Finance  
Tel: 020 8313-4286 E-mail: claire.martin@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment and Community Services

**Ward:** Boroughwide

---

#### 1. Reason for report

- 1.1 The prime purpose of this report is to consider the Portfolio Holder's Draft 2015/16 Budget which incorporates future cost pressures and initial draft budget saving options which were reported to Executive on 14 January 2015. Members are requested to consider the initial draft budget savings proposed and also identify any further action that might be taken to reduce cost pressures facing the Council over the next four years.
  - 1.2 Executive are requesting that each PDS Committee consider the proposed initial draft budget savings and cost pressures for their Portfolio and the views of each PDS Committee be reported back to the next meeting of the Executive, prior to the Executive making recommendations to Council on 2015/16 Council Tax levels.
  - 1.3 There are still outstanding issues and areas of uncertainty remaining. Any further updates will be included in the 2015/16 Council Tax report to the next meeting of the Executive.
- 

#### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The PDS Committee are requested to:

- (a) Consider the update on the financial forecast for 2016/17 to 2018/19;
- (b) Consider the initial draft saving options proposed by the Executive for 2015/16.
- (c) Consider the initial draft 2015/16 Budget as a basis for setting the 2015/16 Budget;
- (d) Provide comments on the initial draft 2015/16 Budget for the February meeting of the Executive.

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy.
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council. Quality Environment
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
  2. Ongoing costs: Recurring cost.
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Environment Portfolio Budgets
  4. Total current budget for this head: £39.6m
  5. Source of funding: Draft revenue budget for 2015/16
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): full details will be available with the Council's 2015/16 Financial Control Budget published in March 2015
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory requirement.

The statutory duties relating to financial reporting are covered within the Local Government Act 1972; the Local Government Finance Act 1998; the Accounts and Audit Regulations 1996; the Local Government Act 2000; and the Local Government Act 2002.

2. Call-in: Call-in is not applicable.
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The 2015/16 budget reflects the financial impact of the Council's strategies, service plans etc which impact on all of the Council's customers (including council tax payers) and users of the services.
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Council wide

### **3. COMMENTARY**

#### **Approach to Budgeting, Financial Context and Economic Situation which can impact on public finances**

- 3.1 The overall approach to budgeting as well as an update on the economic situation were reported to the January meeting of the Executive in the “Draft 2015/16 Budget and Update on Council’s Financial Strategy 2016/17 to 2018/19” report.
- 3.2 Economic growth has returned and the UK is now seeing a faster increase in economic activity than the rest of the Eurozone. National debt is expected to fall but tax revenues remain weak. The pace of spending reductions will be faster than previously expected to reflect the latest position indicated by the Autumn Statement with no real increase in public spending expected until at least 2020. With the ongoing protection of health, overseas aid and possibly education, the significant austerity programme for local government will continue beyond the current financial forecast period i.e. beyond 2018/19. The Budget Strategy has to be set within the context of a reducing resource base, with Government funding reductions continuing until beyond 2020 – the on-going need to reduce the size and shape of the organisation to secure priority outcomes within the resources available. There is also a need to build in flexibility in identifying options to bridge the budget gap as the gap could increase further. The overall updated strategy has to be set in the context of the national state of public finances, unprecedented in recent times, and the high expectation from Government that services should be reformed and redesigned. There is also an on-going need to consider “front loading” savings to ensure difficult decisions are taken early in the budgetary cycle, provide some investment in specific priorities and to support invest to save opportunities which provide a more sustainable financial position in the longer term, ensuring stewardship of the Council’s resources. Any budget decisions will need to consider the finalisation of the 2015/16 Budget but also consider the longer time frame where it is now clear that the continuation of the period of austerity up to 2020 and beyond is inevitable. Members will need to consider decisions now that can have a significant impact on the future years’ financial position which ultimately will help to protect key services.
- 3.3 The Council receives a low level of government funding and has maintained the lowest Council Tax level in outer London (Band D equivalent, using ONS categories) by having the lowest spend per head of population in London. One of the key issues in future year budgets will be the balance between spending, Council Tax levels, charges and service reductions in an organisation starting from a low spending base. It is important to recognise that a lower cost base reduces the scope to identify efficiency savings compared with a higher cost organisation. Any decisions will need to take into account the longer term impact on the Council’s financial position – financial sustainability will be key in order to protect key services to Bromley residents.

#### **Changes that could impact on longer term financial projections**

- 3.4 In considering the next four years there remain many variables which will impact on any final outcome. Some examples are highlighted below:
- (a) The ongoing scale of schools transferring to Academies will result in further significant reductions in the Government’s LACSEG funding (now known as Education Services Grant) although the pace of transfer has been less than previously estimated. The ongoing transfer is expected to lead to an ultimate loss of £6m per annum between 2013/14 and 2016/17;
  - (b) Previous market assumptions about interest rates increasing have not materialised which is impacting on Income from interest on balances. Low lending rates are expected to

continue over the next year due to, for example, the continuation of “funding for lending” , Bank of England is expected to keep the base rate low, and limiting the lending period to banks to reflect cautionary advice from credit rating agencies. The Treasury Management policy was reviewed and Members agreed alternative lending options including investment in a property fund, diversified growth fund and increasing of lending limits to part nationalised banks which has led to potential additional income of £1.15m per annum. There remains a need to ensure the strategy finds the right balance between Security, Liquidity and Yield – in that order. In a recent survey Bromley achieved the second highest returns against a benchmark group of 12 local authorities. An assumed return of 1% has been included in the financial forecast for bank lending. Some local authorities are achieving returns as low as 0.25% per annum. Alternative investments relating to acquisition of properties as part of a wider investment strategy is expected to deliver additional income of £1m in 2015/16 rising to £2m per annum from 2016/17 (in addition to income of £2m per annum achieved through other property acquisitions);

- (c) The outcome of the review of local government finance, implemented from 2013/14, has led to the localisation of business rates and a new council tax support scheme. These changes resulted in a significant risk transfer from central government to local government. The Council Tax Support scheme implemented from April 2013 had transitional arrangements with client liability of 8.5% which increases to 19% from 2014/15. The draft 2015/16 Budget reflects continuation of the 19% agreed by Full Council on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2014. The latest estimate from the Council’s business rate share is included in the draft 2015/16 Budget and will ultimately be partly dependent on the outcome of appeals on valuations, level of conversion of office accommodation to residential dwellings as well as general trends in business rate income. The Government previously managed the increasing costs of council tax benefit and the risks relating to variations in business rates. The changes on localisation of business rates could provide potential financial benefits in the medium to longer term when the key developments in Bromley are completed e.g. Bromley South development, Crystal Palace etc.;
- (d) Government grants are a key source of income and continue to reduce in future years to reflect planned reductions in public spending;
- (e) The coalition Government have introduced many changes in its first term including, for example, changes to health (including transfer of funding for public health from 2013/14 with the transfer of 0-5 year old services from 2015/16), welfare benefits, Care Act, first stage of integration of health and social care (using Better Care Fund) and localism (including new powers of competence for Councils to act in the interest of their communities);
- (f) There will be many other variables as the forecast is based on predicting the next four years; the longer the timescale the greater the uncertainty. It is clear that a significant “budget gap” will continue beyond the four year financial forecast period.

### **Latest Financial Forecast**

- 3.5 The report to the Executive in January 2015 identified a budget gap rising to over £53m per annum by 2018/19, which is broken down in the table below. The projections from 2016/17 have to be treated with some caution as the future funding will be dependent on the outcome of the next Comprehensive Spending Review expected in the autumn of 2015 following the General Election in May 2015. The different national political parties have different approaches in reducing the national debt and eliminating the annual national deficit although it is certain that there will be ongoing reductions in government funding.

| Variations compared with 2014/15 budget   | 2015/16<br>£m | 2016/17<br>£m | 2017/18<br>£m | 2018/19<br>£m |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Cost Pressures</b>   |               |               |               |               |
| Inflation   | 4.1           | 8.6           | 13.2          | 17.9          |
| Grant loss  | 11.0          | 22.1          | 37.1          | 44.1          |
| Real changes (Appendix 5, Executive Report)   | 6.4           | 11.9          | 14.6          | 17.8          |
|   | <b>21.5</b>   | <b>42.6</b>   | <b>64.9</b>   | <b>79.8</b>   |
| <b>Income/Savings</b>   |               |               |               |               |
| Saving proposals (Appendix 6, Executive Report)   | -8.8          | -11.7         | -11.7         | -11.7         |
| Funding from Better Care Fund towards protection of social care   | -3.3          | -3.3          | -3.3          | -3.3          |
| Impact of revised Treasury Management Strategy  | -1.1          | -1.1          | -1.1          | -1.1          |
| Increase in property numbers (council tax base)   | -0.9          | -0.9          | -0.9          | -0.9          |
|   | <b>-14.1</b>  | <b>-17.0</b>  | <b>-17.0</b>  | <b>-17.0</b>  |
| <b>Other Proposed Changes</b>   |               |               |               |               |
| New Homes Bonus   | -4.4          | -4.7          | -4.7          | -4.7          |
| New Homes Bonus - contribution to Investment Fund   | 4.4           | 4.7           | 4.7           | 4.7           |
| Collection Fund Surplus 2012/13 set aside as one off support towards meeting funding shortfall in 2015/16 | -3.0          | 0.0           | 0.0           | 0.0           |
| Collection Fund Surplus 2013/14   | -2.3          | 0.0           | 0.0           | 0.0           |
| Reduction in business rate share  | 0.5           | 0.5           | 0.5           | 0.5           |
|   | <b>-4.8</b>   | <b>0.5</b>    | <b>0.5</b>    | <b>0.5</b>    |
| <b>Impact of 2.0% Council Tax increase</b>  | <b>-2.5</b>   | <b>-5.0</b>   | <b>-7.6</b>   | <b>-10.0</b>  |
| <b>Remaining "Budget Gap"</b>   | <b>0.1</b>    | <b>21.1</b>   | <b>40.8</b>   | <b>53.3</b>   |

- 3.6 The Council has to continue to plan for a very different future, i.e. several years of strong financial constraint. It is important to recognise that, given the current ongoing period of austerity, the downside risks significantly exceed the opportunities for improvement and that the budget gap in future years could widen substantially.
- 3.7 In considering action required to address the medium term "budget gap", savings for 2015/16 and 2016/17 have been identified including the impact of the "baseline reviews".

### Growth Pressures & Real Changes

- 3.8 A breakdown of the growth pressures included in the four year forecast for the Environment Portfolio is shown in the table below: -

| Growth Pressures and Real Changes   | 2015/16<br>£'000 | 2016/17<br>£'000 | 2017/18<br>£'000 | 2018/19<br>£'000 |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Absorption of inflation increases for PCNs  | 103              | 208              | 317              | 427              |
| Changes in parking CCTV enforcement (central contingency)   | 1,000            | 1,000            | 1,000            | 1,000            |
| Increase in waste disposal contract price & disposal targets  | 54               | 54               | 54               | 54               |
| Increase in refuse/recycling disposal costs to reflect tonnage from additional units                    | 37               | 74               | 111              | 148              |
| Increase in refuse/recycling collection costs to reflect additional units                               | 37               | 114              | 171              | 228              |
| New growth for waste for loss of paper income & increase in general waste tonnage (central contingency) | 743              | 1,093            | 1,116            | 1,139            |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>1,974</b>     | <b>2,543</b>     | <b>2,769</b>     | <b>2,996</b>     |

## Saving Options

- 3.9 A summary of the new savings options relating to the Environment Portfolio is shown by service area in the table below, with more details shown in Appendix 1 of this report. Appendix 2 includes the draft estimate summary sheet, budget variations, notes on the budget variations and the subjective analysis.

|  | 2015/16      | 2016/17      |
|--|--------------|--------------|
|  | £'000        | £'000        |
| Essential car user allowances                              | 74           | 74           |
| Organisational efficiencies & management costs restructure | 116          | 116          |
| Street Scene and Green Space Divisional restructure        | 182          | 530          |
| Area Management & Street Cleansing                         | 162          | 229          |
| Parks and Green Space                                      | 80           | 80           |
| Waste Services   | 461          | 616          |
| Parking  | 390          | 230          |
| Network Management   | 60           | 60           |
| Traffic and Road Safety                                    | 20           | 20           |
|  | <b>1,545</b> | <b>1,955</b> |

## 4. COMMENTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

- 4.1 Expenditure pressures and service risks in relation to services in the Environment Portfolio, particularly from unpredictable demand such as waste, parking, highways and winter maintenance, are detailed in Appendix 3.

## 5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Council's key priorities are included within the Council's "Building a Better Bromley" statement and include:

- Safer Communities
- A quality environment
- Vibrant, thriving town centres
- Supporting independence, especially of older people
- Ensuring all children and young people have opportunities to achieve their potential
- An Excellent Council

- 5.2 "Building a Better Bromley" refers to aims/outcomes that include "remaining amongst the lowest Council tax levels in Outer London" and achieving a "sustainable council tax and sound financial strategy".

## 6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The financial implications are contained within the overall report.

## 7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The Local Authorities (Standing Orders)(England) Regulations 2001 deal, amongst other things, with the process of approving the budget. Under these provisions and the constitution, the adoption of the budget and the setting of the council tax are matters reserved for the Council upon recommendation from the Executive. Sections 73-79 of the Localism Act 2011 has

amended the calculations billing and precepting authorities need to make in determining the basic amount of Council tax. The changes include new sections 31 A and 31 B to the Local Government Finance Act 1992 which has modified the way in which a billing authority calculates its budget requirement and basic amount of Council Tax.

## 8. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The Corporate Trade Union and Departmental Representatives' Forum receives regular updates on the Council's finances and the associated policy implications and challenges. Staff and their trade union representatives will be consulted individually and collectively on any adverse staffing implications arising from the budget options. Managers have also been asked to encourage and facilitate staff involvement in budget and service planning

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>                       |  |
| Background Documents:<br>(Access via Contact Officer) | Finance Monitoring, Estimate Documents etc all held in Finance Section |

This page is left intentionally blank



| Line | Division  | Saving Option  | 15/16<br>£'000 | 16/17<br>£'000 | Full Year<br>Saving<br>£'000 |
|------|---|--|----------------|----------------|------------------------------|
|      | <b>ALL DIVISIONS</b>  |  |                |                |                              |
| 1    | Essential Car Users   |  | 74             | 74             | 74                           |
| 2    | Organisational efficiencies & Management costs restructure          |  | 116            | 116            | 116                          |
|      | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  |  | <b>190</b>     | <b>190</b>     | <b>190</b>                   |
|      | <b>Street Scene &amp; Green Spaces (£30.5m Controllable Budget)</b> |  |                |                |                              |
| 3    | Area Management & Street Cleansing                                  | Cleansing of Public Conveniences Contract - Closure of remaining facilities (Bromley Town Centre, Beckenham, Penge and West Wickham)                           | 22             | 89             | 89                           |
| 4    | Area Management & Street Cleansing                                  | Reduce central contingency sum for street cleansing contract from £200k to £60k  | 140            | 140            | 140                          |
| 5    | Street scene and green space  | Restructuring of SSGS division including; a fully commissioned park service and a review of the client contract monitoring function across the whole division. | 182            | 530            | 530                          |
| 6    | Parks and Green Space   | Parks Strategy - cease development function in parks   | 80             | 80             | 80                           |
| 7    | Waste Services  | Reduced opening hours of the green garden waste satellite sites as per Environment PDS report 4 Nov 2014.  | 146            | 271            | 271                          |
| 8    | Waste Services  | Reduce frequency of kerbside paper collections from weekly to fortnightly. Savings achieved by rationalising vehicle utilisation.                              | 250            | 250            | 250                          |
| 9    | Waste Services  | Introduce charges for collection of domestic clinical waste, or transfer costs back to health authority  | 30             | 30             | 30                           |
| 10   | Waste Services  | Increase price of food waste liners from £2 to £2.50   | 35             | 35             | 35                           |
| 11   | Waste Services  | Increase price of GGW Wheelie Bin service from £60 to £65 per annum from 1 April 2016.   | 0              | 30             | 30                           |
|      | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  |  | <b>885</b>     | <b>1,455</b>   | <b>1,455</b>                 |
|      | <b>Transport &amp; Highways (£6.9m Controllable Budget)</b>         |  |                |                |                              |
| 12   | Parking   | Increase parking charges   | 390            | 230            | 230                          |
| 13   | Network management  | Additional £60k staffing to be charged to TfL Principal Road Maintenance capital budget  | 60             | 60             | 60                           |
| 14   | Traffic & Road Safety   | New charges for disabled parking bays and white bar markings as per report to Environment PDS 23 September 2014.   | 20             | 20             | 20                           |
|      | <b>SUB-TOTAL</b>  |  | <b>470</b>     | <b>310</b>     | <b>310</b>                   |
|      | <b>TOTAL</b>  |  | <b>1,545</b>   | <b>1,955</b>   | <b>1,955</b>                 |

This page is left intentionally blank

**ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO**  
**DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2015/16 - SUMMARY**

| 2013/14<br>Actual | Service Area                              | 2014/15 Budget | Increased<br>costs | Other<br>Changes | 2015/16 Draft<br>Budget |
|-------------------|---|----------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| £                 |   | £              | £                  | £                | £                       |
|                   | <b>Support Services</b>                   |                |                    |                  |                         |
| 1,246,997         | Support Services                          | 1,197,530      | 7,870              | Cr 118,730       | 1,086,670               |
| 1,246,997         |   | 1,197,530      | 7,870              | Cr 118,730       | 1,086,670               |
|                   | <b>Public Protection</b>                  |                |                    |                  |                         |
| 75,716            | Emergency Planning                        | 74,920         | 470                | Cr 970           | 74,420                  |
| 75,716            |   | 74,920         | 470                | Cr 970           | 74,420                  |
|                   | <b>Street Scene &amp; Green Space</b>     |                |                    |                  |                         |
| 4,135,675         | Area Management & Street Cleansing        | 4,079,220      | 75,530             | Cr 91,900        | 4,062,850               |
| 2,539,989         | Highways - SS&GS                          | 2,535,230      | 48,780             | Cr 17,500        | 2,566,510               |
| Cr 18,079         | Markets                                   | 1,050          | Cr 640             | Cr 40            | 370                     |
| 5,773,049         | Parks and Green Space                     | 5,898,110      | 92,700             | Cr 243,470       | 5,747,340               |
| 481,695           | Street Regulation                         | 461,380        | 510                | Cr 8,000         | 453,890                 |
| 17,086,069        | Waste Services                            | 17,569,680     | 345,100            | Cr 344,140       | 17,570,640              |
| 29,998,398        |   | 30,544,670     | 561,980            | Cr 705,050       | 30,401,600              |
|                   | <b>Transport &amp; Highways</b>           |                |                    |                  |                         |
| 6,436,065         | Highways (Including London Permit Scheme) | 6,611,300      | 139,890            | Cr 86,270        | 6,664,920               |
| 129,146           | Highways Planning                         | 135,920        | Cr 60              | Cr 4,490         | 131,370                 |
| Cr 6,461,134      | Parking                                   | Cr 6,035,710   | Cr 140,920         | Cr 281,270       | Cr 6,457,900            |
| 176,904           | Traffic & Road Safety                     | 170,510        | Cr 1,950           | Cr 24,380        | 144,180                 |
| 280,981           |   | 882,020        | Cr 3,040           | Cr 396,410       | 482,570                 |
|                   |   |                |                    |                  |                         |
| 31,602,092        |   | 32,699,140     | 567,280            | Cr 1,221,160     | 32,045,260              |
|                   |   |                |                    |                  |                         |
| 7,390,791         | TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE                    | 6,385,740      | 18,290             | Cr 1,071,690     | 5,332,340               |
| 2,034,673         | TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES                  | 2,095,330      | 0                  | 101,300          | 2,196,630               |
| 41,027,557        | PORTFOLIO TOTAL                           | 41,180,210     | 585,570            | Cr 2,191,550     | 39,574,230              |
|                   |   |                |                    |                  |                         |

**ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO****SUMMARY OF BUDGET VARIATIONS 2015/16**

| Ref       |   | <b>VARIATION<br/>IN 2015/16<br/>£'000</b> | ORIGINAL<br>BUDGET<br>2014/15<br>£'000 |
|-----------|---|---|--|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2014/15 BUDGET</b>   | 41,180                                    |  |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>Increased Costs</b>  | 586                                       |  |
|           | <b>Full Year Effect of Allocation of Central Contingency</b>        |   |  |
| <b>3</b>  | Increase in annual insurance premiums                               | 98  |  |
| <b>4</b>  | Contingency allocation re Street Cleansing contract                 | <u>140</u>                                | 238                                    |
|           | <b>Movements Between Portfolios/Departments</b>                     |   |  |
| <b>5</b>  | Transfer resources for Crystal Palace Community Project             | <u>Cr 24</u> Cr 24                        |  |
|           | <b>Real Changes</b>   |   |  |
| <b>6</b>  | Absorption of inflation increases for PCNs                          | 103                                       | Cr 4,116                               |
| <b>7</b>  | Increase in waste contract prices and contract disposal targets     | 54  | 8,759                                  |
| <b>8</b>  | Increase in refuse/recycling collection to reflect additional units | 37  | 6,610                                  |
| <b>9</b>  | Increase in refuse/recycling disposal to reflect additional units   | <u>37</u>                                 | 231                                    |
|           | <i>New Savings Identified for 2015/16 (subject to approval)</i>     |   |  |
| <b>10</b> | Organisational efficiencies & Management costs restructure          | Cr 116                                    | 1,363                                  |
| <b>11</b> | Essential car user allowances                                       | Cr 74                                     | 174                                    |
| <b>12</b> | Increase parking charges  | Cr 390                                    | Cr 6,002                               |
| <b>13</b> | Closure of Public Conveniences                                      | Cr 22                                     | 51                                     |
| <b>14</b> | Reduced central contingency sum for Street Cleansing contract       | Cr 140                                    | 200                                    |
| <b>15</b> | Restructuring across Street Scene & Green Space division            | Cr 182                                    | 13,089                                 |
| <b>16</b> | Cessation of Parks Strategy development                             | Cr 80                                     | 80                                     |
| <b>17</b> | Reduced opening hours - Green Garden Waste satellite sites          | Cr 146                                    | 277                                    |
| <b>18</b> | Reduced frequency of Kerbside Paper Collections                     | Cr 250                                    | 2,210                                  |
| <b>19</b> | New charges for Domestic Clinical Waste                             | Cr 30                                     | Cr 38                                  |
| <b>20</b> | Increase price of Food Waste Liners                                 | Cr 35                                     | Cr 46                                  |
| <b>21</b> | Additional staffing charged to TFL                                  | Cr 60                                     | 644                                    |
| <b>22</b> | New charges for Disabled Parking Bays                               | <u>Cr 20</u> Cr 1,545                     | 42                                     |
| <b>23</b> | Variations in Capital Charges                                       | Cr 1,083                                  | 1,961                                  |
| <b>24</b> | Variations in Recharges   | 92  | 2,175                                  |
| <b>25</b> | Variations in Building Maintenance                                  | Cr 80                                     | 434                                    |
| <b>26</b> | Variations in Rent Income   | Cr 21                                     | Cr 83                                  |
| <b>27</b> | <b>2015/16 DRAFT BUDGET</b>   | <u><b>39,574</b></u>                      |  |

## ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO

### Notes on Budget Variations in 2015/16

#### Ref    Comments

#### Full Year Effect of Allocation of Central Contingency

- 3    Annual insurance premiums (Dr £98k)  
An overall allocation of £116k was made from the contingency in respect of the insurance premium increase arising from the tendering of the Council casualty insurance arrangements in 2014. This was reported to the Executive & Resources PDS Committee on 5th June 2014.
- 4    Street Cleansing Contract (Dr £140k)  
Allocation of central contingency re Street Cleansing Contract into portfolio budget (total contingency is £200k). This enables a corresponding saving to be made - see below.

#### Movements Between Portfolios/Departments

- 5    Crystal Palace Community Project Fund (Cr £24k)  
Transfer of resources to Renewal & Recreation portfolio to manage Community Project Fund, within overall framework of pursuing a GLA-funded Crystal Palace Park improvement scheme.

#### Real Changes

- 6    Absorption of Inflation increases for PCNs (Dr £103k)  
Estimates are prepared on the basis that inflation is added to both income and expenditure. As penalty charge notices (for parking and bus lane contraventions) are set by the Mayor of London and therefore statutory, savings have to be found to absorb the inflation rate.
- 7    Increase in waste contract prices and contract disposal targets (Dr £54k)  
This represents the change in disposal targets of waste and prices built into the original contract for 2014/15.
- 8    Increase in Refuse/Recycling Collection (Dr £37k)  
The current refuse and recycling collection contract is based on the number of premises rather than bins. The additional costs reflect the anticipated increase in new properties for 2015/16.
- 9    Increase in Refuse/Recycling Disposal (Dr £37k)  
The additional costs for the disposal contract reflect the anticipated increase in tonnage generated from new properties for 2015/16.

- 10 Management costs restructure (Cr £116k)  
Review of council-wide organisational efficiencies & management costs restructure.
- 11 Essential car user allowances (Cr 74k)  
Review of council-wide essential car user allowance scheme generating savings to the Environment Portfolio of £74k
- 12 Increased parking charges (Cr £390k)  
This relates to increased charges for both on and off-street car parking. Detailed proposals will be submitted in January.
- 13 Closure of Public Conveniences (Cr £22k)  
Part year effect of closing the remaining four public conveniences.
- 14 Reduced central contingency sum for Street Cleansing contract (Cr £140k)  
Agreed reduction in the central contingency sum set aside for the Street Cleansing contract.
- 15 Restructuring across Street Scene & Green Space division (Cr £182k)  
Restructuring of SSGS division including; a fully commissioned park service and a review of the client contract monitoring function across the whole division.
- 16 Cessation of Parks Strategy development (Cr £80k)  
Deletion of the budget for the development function within the Parks Strategy budget.
- 17 Reduced opening hours - Green Garden Waste satellite sites (Cr £146k)  
Reduced opening hours of the green garden waste satellite sites as agreed by the Environment Portfolio Holder on 24 November 2014.
- 18 Reduced frequency of Kerbside Paper Collections (Cr £250k)  
Rationalising vehicle utilisation in order to reduce the frequency of kerbside paper collections from weekly to fortnightly.
- 19 New charges for Domestic Clinical Waste (Cr £30k)  
Introduce charges for collection of domestic clinical waste, or transfer costs back to health authority
- 20 Increase price of Food Waste Liners (Cr £35k)  
This proposal involves increasing the price of food waste liners from £2 to £2.50
- 21 Additional staffing charged to TfL (Cr £60k)  
Additional £60k staffing to be charged to TfL Principal Road Maintenance capital budget, thus generating a saving to the revenue budget.

- 22 New charges for Disabled Parking Bays (Cr £20k)  
New charges for disabled parking bays and white bar markings as agreed by the Environment Portfolio Holder on 24 November 2014.
- 23 Variations in Capital Charges (Cr £1,083k)  
The variation on capital charges, etc is due to a combination of the following:
- (i) Depreciation – the impact of revaluations or asset disposals in 2012/13 (after the 2013/14 budget was agreed) and in the first half of 2014/15
  - (ii) Revenue Expenditure Funded by Capital Under Statute (REFCUS) – mainly due to a significant general increase in the value of schemes in our 2015/16 Capital Programme that do not add value to the Council’s fixed asset base.
  - (iii) Government Grants - mainly due to a significant increase in credits for capital grants receivable in respect of 2015/16 Capital Programme schemes, which are used to finance expenditure that is treated as REFCUS.
- These charges are required to be made to service revenue accounts, but an adjustment is made below the line to avoid a charge on Council Tax.
- 24 Variations in Recharges (Dr £92k)  
Variations in cross-departmental recharges are offset by corresponding variations elsewhere and therefore have no impact on the overall position.
- 25 Variations in Building Maintenance (Cr £80k)  
This relates to the realignment of repairs and maintenance budgets to reflect business priorities. There are corresponding adjustments in other portfolios and these net out to zero in total.
- 26 Variations in Rent Income (Cr £21k)  
This relates to the reallocation of rental income budgets across departments/portfolios. There are corresponding adjustments in other portfolios and these net out to zero in total.

**Environment Portfolio**  
**DRAFT REVENUE BUDGET 2015/16 - SUBJECTIVE SUMMARY**

| Service area                              | Employees        | Premises         | Transport      | Supplies and Services | Third Party Payments | Income               | Controllable Recharges | Total Controllable | Capital Charges/Financing | Repairs, Maintenance & Insurance | Property Rental Income | Not Directly Controllable | Recharges In     | Total Cost of Service | Recharges Out       | Total Net Budget  |
|---|------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
|   | £                | £                | £              | £                     | £                    | £                    |                        | £                  | £                         |                                  |                        |                           | £                | £                     | £                   | £                 |
| <b>Support Services</b>                   |                  |                  |                |                       |                      |                      |                        |                    |                           |                                  |                        |                           |                  |                       |                     |                   |
| Support Services                          | 782,070          | 226,940          | 20,020         | 63,560                | 0                    | Cr 5,920             | 0                      | 1,086,670          | 144,000                   | 140,520                          | Cr 92,000              | 192,520                   | 399,040          | 1,678,230             | Cr 1,728,010        | Cr 49,780         |
|   | <b>782,070</b>   | <b>226,940</b>   | <b>20,020</b>  | <b>63,560</b>         | <b>0</b>             | <b>Cr 5,920</b>      | <b>0</b>               | <b>1,086,670</b>   | <b>144,000</b>            | <b>140,520</b>                   | <b>Cr 92,000</b>       | <b>192,520</b>            | <b>399,040</b>   | <b>1,678,230</b>      | <b>Cr 1,728,010</b> | <b>Cr 49,780</b>  |
| <b>Public Protection</b>                  |                  |                  |                |                       |                      |                      |                        |                    |                           |                                  |                        |                           |                  |                       |                     |                   |
| Emergency Planning                        | 47,710           | 0                | 4,410          | 22,300                | 0                    | 0                    | 0                      | 74,420             | 0                         | 0                                | 0                      | 0                         | 41,030           | 115,450               | 0                   | 115,450           |
| <b>Street Scene &amp; Green Space</b>     |                  |                  |                |                       |                      |                      |                        |                    |                           |                                  |                        |                           |                  |                       |                     |                   |
| Area Management & Street Cleansing        | 258,580          | 50,880           | 13,180         | 39,840                | 3,708,490            | Cr 8,120             | 0                      | 4,062,850          | 43,000                    | 27,520                           | 0                      | 70,520                    | 819,370          | 4,952,740             | Cr 374,140          | 4,578,600         |
| Highways - SS&GS                          | 401,130          | 0                | 18,620         | 2,635,970             | 0                    | Cr 181,710           | Cr 307,500             | 2,566,510          | 0                         | 0                                | 0                      | 0                         | 1,296,880        | 3,863,390             | Cr 2,880            | 3,860,510         |
| Markets                                   | 35,320           | 4,230            | 0              | 179,520               | 0                    | Cr 218,700           | 0                      | 370                | 0                         | 240                              | 0                      | 240                       | 63,030           | 63,640                | 0                   | 63,640            |
| Parks and Green Space                     | 1,529,580        | 3,796,210        | 95,560         | 537,930               | 364,860              | Cr 374,400           | Cr 202,400             | 5,747,340          | 508,000                   | 561,680                          | Cr 320,390             | 749,290                   | 3,678,640        | 10,175,270            | Cr 3,990,820        | 6,184,450         |
| Street Regulation                         | 445,160          | 0                | 12,830         | 6,900                 | 0                    | 0                    | Cr 11,000              | 453,890            | 0                         | 0                                | 0                      | 0                         | 71,640           | 525,530               | Cr 525,530          | 0                 |
| Waste Services                            | 565,380          | 17,450           | 16,780         | 265,560               | 21,566,770           | Cr 4,738,900         | Cr 122,400             | 17,570,640         | 15,000                    | 0                                | 0                      | 15,000                    | 626,500          | 18,212,140            | Cr 209,570          | 18,002,570        |
|   | <b>3,235,150</b> | <b>3,868,770</b> | <b>156,970</b> | <b>3,665,720</b>      | <b>25,640,120</b>    | <b>Cr 5,521,830</b>  | <b>Cr 643,300</b>      | <b>30,401,600</b>  | <b>566,000</b>            | <b>589,440</b>                   | <b>Cr 320,390</b>      | <b>835,050</b>            | <b>6,556,060</b> | <b>37,792,710</b>     | <b>Cr 5,102,940</b> | <b>32,689,770</b> |
| <b>Transport &amp; Highways</b>           |                  |                  |                |                       |                      |                      |                        |                    |                           |                                  |                        |                           |                  |                       |                     |                   |
| Highways (Including London Permit Scheme) | 963,520          | 1,834,730        | 76,230         | 5,428,100             | 357,660              | Cr 1,950,120         | Cr 45,200              | 6,664,920          | 3,624,000                 | 572,380                          | Cr 18,990              | 4,177,390                 | 1,509,300        | 12,351,610            | Cr 773,860          | 11,577,750        |
| Highways Planning                         | 139,020          | 0                | 1,260          | 4,410                 | 0                    | Cr 13,320            | 0                      | 131,370            | 3,000                     | 0                                | 0                      | 3,000                     | 111,630          | 246,000               | Cr 155,280          | 90,720            |
| Parking                                   | 788,760          | 834,520          | 24,030         | 645,790               | 2,417,850            | Cr 11,211,170        | 42,320                 | 6,457,900          | 138,000                   | 32,740                           | Cr 46,360              | 124,380                   | 380,990          | 5,952,530             | Cr 508,080          | 5,444,450         |
| Traffic & Road Safety                     | 1,371,910        | 0                | 21,430         | 32,850                | 181,690              | Cr 366,290           | Cr 1,097,410           | 144,180            | 0                         | 0                                | 0                      | 0                         | 575,480          | 719,660               | Cr 124,890          | 594,770           |
|   | <b>3,263,210</b> | <b>2,669,250</b> | <b>122,950</b> | <b>6,111,150</b>      | <b>2,957,200</b>     | <b>Cr 13,540,900</b> | <b>Cr 1,100,290</b>    | <b>482,570</b>     | <b>3,765,000</b>          | <b>605,120</b>                   | <b>Cr 65,350</b>       | <b>4,304,770</b>          | <b>2,577,400</b> | <b>7,364,740</b>      | <b>Cr 545,950</b>   | <b>6,818,790</b>  |
|   | <b>7,328,140</b> | <b>6,764,960</b> | <b>304,350</b> | <b>9,862,730</b>      | <b>28,597,320</b>    | <b>Cr 19,068,650</b> | <b>Cr 1,743,590</b>    | <b>32,045,260</b>  | <b>4,475,000</b>          | <b>1,335,080</b>                 | <b>Cr 477,740</b>      | <b>5,332,340</b>          | <b>9,573,530</b> | <b>46,951,130</b>     | <b>Cr 7,376,900</b> | <b>39,574,230</b> |



## RISK AREAS WITHIN ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO FOR 2015/16 ONWARDS

### Waste Services

#### Landfill Tax

Landfill Tax currently stands at £80 per tonne. The Government has confirmed that this Tax will then increase by RPI inflation in 2015/16 and thereafter.

The Government has not published any plans for introducing an Incineration Tax, but remains unwilling to rule it out. Until recently Waste tonnages were continuing to fall; and nationally, since 2003, municipal waste to landfill has fallen by 60%, and is now running at 8.5 million tonnes pa. This has the effect of government landfill tax income, which suggests that alternative income may yet be sought.

#### Increasing property numbers

Growth in the number of properties incurs additional expenditure, as extra collections are required and additional waste is generated. Currently each new property attracts a cost of £68 per year for collection (refuse, recycling and food waste), and an average of £78 per year for waste disposal. Each new property thus cumulatively increases costs by about £146 per year. On average, the number of properties in the borough has increased by about 500 each year, and this continues to add pressure to Waste budgets; not only for the collection and disposal of the waste, but also for the provision of recycling containers. At an average cost of £22 (including delivery) to equip a property with recycling containers, this represents an average additional cost of £11,000 each year to the Waste budget.

#### Municipal Waste Tonnages

After a long period of falling tonnages, the quantity of municipal waste collected in Bromley is rising again:

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| 2007/08 | 163,981 |
| 2008/09 | 157,225 |
| 2009/10 | 149,720 |
| 2010/11 | 144,890 |
| 2011/12 | 139,836 |
| 2012/13 | 138,400 |
| 2013/14 | 145,150 |

In the first 7 months of 2014/15 tonnages have increased by 3.2%, which suggests waste could increase by 4,000 tonnes over the full year compared to 2013/14. This is partly due to the easing of the recession. Whilst the impact of Recycling for All and local and national waste minimisation campaigns will contribute to restraining increases in waste, there is a substantial risk that tonnages will continue to rise as the economy revives.

The average cost of waste disposal for 2014/15 will be £82 per tonne. Each 1% increase in waste tonnage would increase disposal costs by £120k per annum.

### **Recycling Income**

The fall in overall waste tonnages also impacts on the quantity of recycling materials available for collection.

Paper is sold to Aylesford newsprint at a rate of £67 per tonne. 15,690 tonnes of paper were recycled in 2011/12, and 15,877 tonnes in 2012/13. The projection for the current year is 13,000 tonnes. Each 1% fall in paper tonnage will reduce income by £10k. It appears that recycled paper tonnages are falling across the UK, due to lower sales of printed media. In effect, the influx of tablets, laptops and smartphones is reducing the role of printed newspapers and magazines.

Similarly, income from textiles is falling, as the public take advantage of 'cash for clothes' shops and similar charity outlets.

### **Alternative disposal options**

The pricing schedule in the Waste Management Contract specifies a set minimum tonnage each year to be sent for incineration. Patently, Landfill Tax costs mean it would be beneficial to send more of Bromley's waste to incineration. However, with all disposal authorities facing similar pressures current incineration capacity is at a premium. Officers are currently exploring additional incineration capacity, both through Veolia and independently. We are also exploring the opportunity to send some of our waste to MBT or Autoclaving as an alternative disposal point for our landfill waste. Discussions regarding this are taking place with Veolia (Southwark) and Viridor (Croydon), as well as with Lewisham Council and Kent County Council.

### **Street Environment Contracts**

The Street Environment Contracts were re-let in 2012 and saw expenditure on Street Cleansing services reduce by about £1m per annum. This was a significant reduction (26%) in contract costs, achieved through variations in operational methodology and reductions in the frequency of carriageway and footway cleaning in a number of roads across the borough.

Officers revised the frequency of cleaning based on their experience and operational knowledge of local circumstances across the borough. However it was recognised that, given the significant budget reduction and reductions in the frequency of cleaning some roads, it might be necessary to review cleaning schedules in the light of any concerns about standards of cleanliness. This could result in a need to change operational methodology and/or the frequency of scheduled cleaning in some areas.

To manage this risk a budget of £200k is held in the street cleaning revenue budget to address any need to provide additional targeted cleans or to revise operational methodology. This budget provides flexibility to add non-scheduled

programmes of works (e.g. weekend sweeping, additional litter picking and bin emptying), whilst retaining budget capacity to manage risk. A further £200k is held in Central Contingency should there be a need to increase the frequency of cleaning. At this time there has been no call upon the Central Contingency sum of £200k, suggesting that this risk has diminished since last year.

### **Street works**

LB Bromley has a responsibility under the New Roads & Street Works Act to monitor the works of Statutory Undertakers (SUs) which affect highway infrastructure. When defects are identified in road or footway reinstatements, a defect notice is issued and a charge made on the SU concerned to cover additional inspections. Charges are also raised when works over-run their approved programme (S74) and when other issues are found on site (FPN's)

Income levels have varied during recent years in line with the performance of utility companies. The quality of works undertaken by Thames Water Utilities (TWU) had deteriorated, which led to additional income for the Council between 2007/8 and 2010/11. However TWU have been working hard in recent years to improve their performance, and have introduced new contracts to minimise defective works in the future.

Proposed changes in regulations, which limit the number of inspections that can be carried out when defects are identified, could result in reductions in defect income of up to fifty percent should they be introduced in future years.

Income from defect notices peaked at £903k in 2010/11, reducing to £793k in 2011/12 and £452k in 2012/13. Although income increased to £872k in 2013/14 it is estimated to drop to £642k in 2014/15 as SU performance improves. At the same time income from S74 has reduced from £222k to £8K, and FPN's from £77k to £40k due to improved performance and changes in regulations.

LB Bromley also administers the London permit Scheme for all road and streetworks, with permit fees received being ring-fenced to cover administration of the scheme. As the number of permits issued depends on actual work on the network, income will vary year on year. Income peaked in 2011/12 at £1.021m, reducing to £0.814m in subsequent years, and is estimated to drop to £0.760m in 2014/15.

### **Winter service**

2010/11 and 2011/12 saw a significant increase in expenditure on the winter service, following several years with little or no snow. Budgets have historically been based on patterns of spend for precautionary salting, primarily for frost or ice, with relatively little actual snow clearance. As a result of the protracted snow, ice and sub-zero temperatures during the winter of 2010/11 winter maintenance budgets were overspent by £706k, with extra costs incurred for tree maintenance of £35k as well as for waste collection costs of £77k.

It is unclear at this stage whether this is a permanent shift in weather patterns or a one-off. The Government has commissioned research into this issue. In the meantime there continues to be a significant risk of incurring additional expenditure on winter service.

### **Highways & Street Lighting Contracts**

Street lighting improvement and maintenance contracts have price fluctuation clauses based on actual cost indexing, whereas budget increases are based on the Consumer Price Index. Although the budgets are cash limited, over time the variation between the two will lead to a reduction in spending power in real terms.

The street lighting invest to save programme is nearing completion, and future savings from reduced energy and maintenance will be used to repay the 'loan'. With the intense investment period, future expenditure on maintenance will not follow historic spend profiles, i.e. electrical safety inspections are required every six years, which has required one sixth of the stock being tested each year. However, there will be no testing of the LED units during the next five years, although they will all require testing in year six. A similar situation will apply to cleaning and maintenance.

### **Parking**

Charges and tariffs for on- and off-street parking places are set by LB Bromley. A fundamental review of the Council's charging policy took place during 2011/12, leading to Member agreement to increase prices and simplify the tariff structure. A review of these charges is being put before Members in Jan/Feb 2015 to cover the period 2015/19. Members are aware of the potential impact of a further increase in charges, whilst recognising the pressure on the service to meet its income targets in the light of reduced demand and inflationary pressures.

It should be noted that the parking service operates in a restricted legal environment which "does not include the maximisation of revenue from parking charges as one of the relevant considerations to be taken into account in securing the...movement of traffic" (Traffic Management and Parking Guidance for London).

For a number of years there has been a general decline in 'paid for' car parking in the borough. The introduction of new on-street parking schemes and restricted zones has prevented the reduction from being even greater. Although new schemes will continue to be implemented to meet localised traffic and parking needs, there is no reason to suspect that the downward trend will be reversed, particularly in regard to off-street parking. Again this puts greater pressure on the service to meet its financial obligations. In the current economic climate it is difficult to make reliable estimates of parking demand in the short to medium term, or forecast the longer term effects on parking behaviour.

In December 2013, the Government issued a consultation document proposing a number of changes to the statutory framework for parking enforcement. In

particular the Government proposes to ban the use of CCTV for parking enforcement, and to impose a statutory waiting period of at least 5 minutes before enforcement officers can issue penalty tickets. The Government is also considering introducing discounts for motorists whose appeals are rejected, but who subsequently pay promptly. Should these changes be imposed on the Council, it is estimated that Bromley's income from parking fines could reduce by about £1 million p.a.

The Shared Service is continuing to perform well and is leading on a Tender exercise for the provision of all parking functions with a go live date of October 2016. There is a risk that a new contract price may be greater than that already being paid, even with a discount for a joint procurement/client. However it is hoped that a joint procurement will show a financial benefit for Bromley. A report will be put before Members in April 2015, further to the original Gateway report approved in April 2014.

### **Pressures from Public Demand**

Apart from the identifiable financial pressures arising from such items as budget reductions, contract costs and price increases, there are other pressures due to growing public expectations, social change and legislation. Increased public expectations of local services may be difficult to respond to during a period of tight restraints on resources.

Past surveys of public opinion have shown that four issues were consistently recognised as making Bromley a good place to live. These were low levels of crime, good health services, clean streets and public transport. The Environment and Community Services department leads for the Council on clean streets and on crime issues, particularly enviro-crime and anti-social behaviour; and the department has an input to TfL and others on public transport. There is continued public demand for high service standards in all these areas.

In terms of what needs most improvement in the local area, activities for teenagers, traffic congestion, road and pavement repairs, the level of crime and clean streets were regularly mentioned by residents. All of these service areas are either the lead responsibility of the Environment and Community Services department (clean streets, road & pavement repairs) or ones to which the department makes a significant contribution.

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.  
ES15005

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Environment PDS Committee

**Date:** 20th January 2015

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent                      Non-Executive                      Non-Key

**Title:** **CHISLEHURST ROAD BRIDGE – POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW**

**Contact Officer:** Paul Redman, Highways Asset Manager  
Tel: 020 8313 4930 E-mail: paul.redman@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment & Community Services

**Ward:** Orpington, Petts Wood and Knoll, St Pauls Cray, St Mary Cray, Chislehurst

---

1. Reason for report

This is a post implementation review of the reconstruction of Chislehurst Road Bridge.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

**The Environment PDS Committee to consider and comment on the content of this report.**

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
  2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
  2. Ongoing costs: N/A
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Capital Programme
  4. Total current budget for this head: £3.994m
  5. Source of funding: TfL funding
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 3
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 2 Fte
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Borough wide
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/a



### **3. COMMENTARY**

#### **Background**

- 3.1 Chislehurst Road Bridge is located on the A208 in Petts Wood. The structure carries vehicles and pedestrians over the railway, the route providing a main north – south link through the borough.
- 3.2 The original bridge was found to be weak and following structural assessment was weight limited to vehicles up to 7.5 Tonnes. A diversion route was established taking buses (routes 61 and 273) and HGV's along Poverest Road, Cray Avenue and Lessons Hill.
- 3.3 Approval was given to replace the structure with a comparable steel structure including provision of a fibre reinforced polymer enclosure to assist with future inspections and bridge maintenance (ref Committee Report ES10128). The costs associated with the proposals for bridge replacement are grant funded through Transport for London. Approval was given to use the Council's term Consulting Engineer (AECOM) for design, project management and site supervision of the scheme and to procure construction of the final design through competitive tender which involved a prequalification stage and invitations to tender.
- 3.4 Following the tender process, approval was given to award the contract for bridge demolition and reconstruction to Hochtief (UK) Construction Ltd (ref Committee Report ES11068) within a 12 month programme, at a tender value of £2.378m. Approval was given to use further funding to cover Network Rail Costs, enclosure costs and fees for project management and site supervision at a total estimated project cost of £4.114m.

#### **Information**

##### **Achievement of Expected Benefits**

- 3.5 The project was delivered successfully, providing the Council with a new bridge facility, as specified, reinstating use of the section of the A208 at Chislehurst Road/Orpington Road, restoring this important north/south road link in the borough for all users of the highway including HGV's and buses, without the need for any diversions.
- 3.6 The project was delivered according to the contractual programme and within budget, with the road opened to traffic on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2012, following a start on site on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2011. The project outturn of £3.994m was within the original budget allocation of £4.114m.
- 3.7 This project included an FRP enclosure which effectively shields the bridge from the elements to help maximise its service life and enabling inspection and maintenance of the bridge without the need to arrange costly rail possessions through Network Rail. This will help reduce the Council's revenue outlay for many years to come.

##### **Unexpected Benefits**

- 3.8 Bridge demolition and reconstruction required the road to be fully closed to all motorised vehicles for the duration of the project (temporary pedestrian access across the bridge was maintained for the duration of the project) with all vehicles directed to use the original HGV diversion route indicated in 3.2 above. An unexpected benefit was residents' preference for the 273 bus to include Leeson's Hill and Cray Avenue in order the Nugent Estate shops were made more accessible. Once the bridge project had been completed TfL agreed that the 273 could continue to adopt the 'diversion' route.

- 3.9 A further unexpected benefit of the bridge reconstruction project is in respect of the improved traffic flow along Leasons Hill and Cray Avenue. Additional no waiting double and single yellow lines had been implemented at the time of the temporary diversion to help buses navigate Lessons Hill, and these continue to improve traffic flow. The bus lane in Cray Avenue was removed, also as part of the traffic management measures. This has not been reinstated and the associated benefits of improved traffic flow remain.
- 3.10 Turning initial wariness by neighbours to pride in being part of a project offering a significant legacy to the community. This was achieved through developing an effective dialogue with residents and responding quickly to problems and concerns. This was helped in no small part by having a scrutiny committee chair who was also a local ward member on the project board, ensuring confidence in the way the project was being run. As a demonstration of the level of effectiveness of our customer relations, this project found success in the Constructing Excellence Awards, winning the category for Outstanding Customer Satisfaction (London & South East Awards 2013).

## **Unexpected Problems**

### **Ecological**

- 3.11 An unexpected problem arose with the discovery of bats roosting on the soffit of the old bridge structure. Although an ecological survey was undertaken in 2009, this indicated the bridge had a low potential for supporting roosting bats. However, once mobilisation began it became evident bats were roosting in small diameter holes in the soffit of the bridge, thought to have been formed at the time of earlier concrete repair work in the 1970's. Although preliminary work on the project continued, the main programme could not be started until a licence had been granted by Natural England. This was forthcoming and with no delay to the contract.

### **Statutory utility fibre optic cable**

- 3.12 To enable demolition of the old deck and re-construction of the new deck it was necessary for significant utilities diversionary work to facilitate construction activities. During the course of diverting British Telecom services a further, previously unknown, telecommunications cable was identified. This was in spite of significant work at pre-implementation stage when trial pits and Statutory Undertaker searches were undertaken. The cabling identified was owned by Interoute and the cable was an important link with continental Europe used for transferring banking data throughout the day and night time. The issue was overcome by negotiation and approval was given to 'slew' the cable during a night time operation and allowing construction of the deck slab.

### **User Stakeholder Experience**

- 3.13 The new bridge provides a fit for purpose structure, not only making this section of the A208 both available and safe for the highway user but it has also ensured the safe operation of the important rail link below the bridge, which is used by many of the Council's residents for work and social purposes.

### **Lessons Learned**

- 3.14 The problem with the fibre optic cable described above identified that a change in procedure was required in respect of any requests for Utility Searches received by the Council's NRSWA team. Although information regarding all the main utilities are routinely checked should a search request be received, a procedural change to include all inactive utilities in the search results has

been implemented. Interoute cables had been laid (as a one off) in the borough in the early 1990's and without any subsequent activity they did not feature in the common searches previously undertaken.

- 3.15 This construction contract was let according to conditions of contract known as the New Engineering Contract (NEC). This form of contract is the preferred industry form and is supported by the professional organisations such as the Institution of Civil Engineers. Use of NEC is growing but the conditions have introduced tight time frames for both the contractor and service manager to provide data, respond to enquiries etc. With this more complex project a decision was made to purchase a licence to use software (the CCM system marketed by Management Process Systems Ltd) that modelled the conditions, providing prompts and shared 'space' for important contract documents. This software helped facilitate the complex contract administration of this project leading to swift resolution of Early Warnings and helping to draw the financial elements of the contract to conclusion without undue delay.
- 3.16 For future projects of a similar scale it is recommended that the PDS Committee Chairman and/or local ward member be invited to join the project board.

#### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Environment Portfolio Plan 2014-17 includes the key aim "Invest in the quality of our roads, pavements and street lighting". The Plan states that:

'Keeping our roads safe and in good repair is an important challenge. Following good practice, preventative maintenance remains a key element of our approach to highways management. This prevents further deterioration and ensures the impact of maintenance works on traffic movements is minimised.'

#### 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 This report provides information on the post completion review of the Chislehurst Road Bridge capital scheme.
- 5.2 As highlighted in 3.6 above, the final scheme cost was £120k below the original capital estimate as summarised in the table below: -

##### Financial summary of Chislehurst Road Bridge capital scheme

|   | <b>£'000</b>    |  |
|---|-----------------|--|
| Original Capital estimate                                   | 4,114           |  |
| Less reduction agreed by the Executive in July and Nov 2014 | -120            |  |
| Latest approved capital estimate                            | <u>3,994</u>    |  |
| Final scheme costs  | <u>3,994</u>    |  |
| Additional net underspend                                   | <u><u>0</u></u> |  |

- 5.3 This scheme was fully funded by TfL resources and Members should note that the scheme costs have been fully claimed and reimbursed.

## 6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Under the Highways Act 1980 the Council, as Highway Authority, has duties to ensure the safe passage of highway users and to maintain the highway.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>                       | Personnel implications  |
| Background Documents:<br>(Access via Contact Officer) | ES10128 – Chislehurst Road Bridge Procurement of a Replacement Bridge<br>ES11068 – Chislehurst Road Bridge Replacement – Contract Award |

Report No.  
ES15003

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Environment PDS Committee

**Date:** 20th January 2015

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent                      Non-Executive                      Non-Key

**Title:** **FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME, MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS, AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

**Contact Officer:** Alastair Baillie, Environment Development Manager  
Tel: 020 8313 4915 E-mail: alastair.baillie@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Nigel Davies, Executive Director of Environment and Community Services

**Ward:** Borough Wide

---

1. Reason for report

This report sets out information relating to the Committee's future business and contracts:

- Environment PDS's draft forward work programme
- Progress on requests from previous meetings and
- Environment Portfolio contracts summary.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 **That the Committee reviews the:**

- (a) **draft forward work programme (Appendix 1);**
- (b) **progress report related to previous Committee requests (Appendix 2); and**
- (c) **Environment Portfolio contract summary (Appendix 3)**

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
  2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Environment Portfolio 2014/15 approved budget
  4. Total current budget for this head: £33m, and £5.9m of LIP funding from TfL
  5. Source of funding: 2014/15 revenue budget and 2014/15 LIP funding agreed by TfL
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 190 fte
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Whole borough
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:

### 3. COMMENTARY

#### Forward Programme

- 3.1. **Appendix 1** sets out the Environment Portfolio's Forward Work Programme for 2014/15 (at the time of writing). The Programme identifies: the provisional report title; the lead division; and Committee's role. The Committee is invited to comment on the proposed schedule and suggest any changes it considers appropriate.
- 3.2 Other reports may come into the programme. Schemes may be brought forward or there may be references from other Committees, the Portfolio Holder or the Executive.

#### Previous Requests by the Committee

- 3.3 **Appendix 2** provides a progress report on requests previously made by the Committee. This list is checked after each Committee meeting so that outstanding issues can be addressed at an early stage.

#### Contracts Register Summary

- 3.4 **Appendix 3** sets out a summary of Environment Portfolio contracts (derived from the LB Bromley Contracts Register) where the total contract value is greater than £50k.
- 3.5 To help Members contracts are categorised by service and the current expiry dates are set out in bold. Further information is provided in the notes column.

### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 Each PDS Committee is responsible for setting its own work programme.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>                       | Financial, Legal and Personnel  |
| Background Documents:<br>(Access via Contact Officer) | <a href="#">Environment PDS agendas and minutes from 2006/07 to 2014/15</a> |

## APPENDIX 1

### ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE: FORWARD PROGRAMME FOR MEETINGS 2014/15

| Environment PDS: March 2015  | Division | Action  |
|--|----------|---|
| Forward Work Programme, Matters Arising from Previous Meetings and Contracts Register                        | E&CS     | PDS Committee   |
| Budget Monitoring 2014/15  | Finance  | For pre-decision scrutiny   |
| Environment Portfolio Plan 2015/2018   | E&CS     | For pre-decision scrutiny   |
| Commissioning – Proposed Changes to Provision and Contract Management of Streetscene and Greenspace Services | SS&GS    | Env PDS – 11 <sup>th</sup> March<br>Exec – 25 <sup>th</sup> March |
| Bromley Town Centre – increased parking capacity   | T&H      | For pre-decision scrutiny   |
| Streetworks Inspection Contract Extension  | T&H      | For pre-decision scrutiny   |
| Parking report (CPZ visitor parking vouchers)  | T&H      | For pre-decision scrutiny   |
| Surface dressing vs traditional planned maintenance  | T&H      | For pre-decision scrutiny   |
| Croydon Road, Restoration Ground Bandstand   | SS&GS    | Env PDS – 11 <sup>th</sup> March<br>Exec – 25 <sup>th</sup> March |
| Street Cleansing Performance Review  | SS&GS    | For pre-decision scrutiny   |
| The Hill car park – strengthening works  | T&H      | For pre-decision scrutiny   |



## APPENDIX 2

### ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE: PROGRESS REPORT ON PREVIOUS REQUESTS

| <b>Committee Date</b> | <b>Committee Request</b>  | <b>Progress</b>   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| 01.07.14              | Include more budget information when communicating the commitments set out in the Environment Portfolio Plan.     | To be addressed in the 2015/18 Environment Portfolio Plan   |
| 23.09.14              | Consideration be given to raising green garden waste charges to £65 and then subsequently in line with inflation. | Price increase to £65 from 2016/17.   |
| 04.11.14              | An alternative date be found for the Committee's meeting in March 2015.   | No alternative date had been secured at the time of writing but alternative date options would be provided to Members as soon as possible |

## APPENDIX 3

### ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE

#### CONTRACTS REGISTER SUMMARY (current expiry dates in **bold**)

| <b>Contract</b><br>(Officer / Register No.)                       | <b>Start Date</b><br>(Core Contract) | <b>End Date</b><br>(Core Contract) | <b>Extension / Waiver</b>           | <b>Contractor(s)</b>                                      | <b>Original Contract</b><br>£ Value + Extension | <b>2014/15 Projected Spend</b><br>(£) | <b>Environment PDS Notes</b>  |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Streetscene &amp; Greenspace</b>                               |                                      |                                    |                                     |   |   |                                       |   |
| <i>Depot / Transport Operations (Paul Chilton)</i>                |                                      |                                    |                                     |   |   |                                       |   |
| Council Fleet Hire<br>(Paul Chilton / 11551)                      | 06.11.06                             | 05.11.12                           | Waiver to extend to <b>05.11.15</b> | London Hire Ltd.  | 651,064 + 166,380                               | 81,380                                | Extension to Nov. 2015 to facilitate passenger fleet options analysis                             |
| Ambulance Hire<br>(Paul Chilton / 016278)                         | 06.11.07                             | 05.11.13                           | Extended to <b>05.11.15</b>         | London Hire Ltd.  | 2.254m + 292,866 + 282,870                      | 278,730                               | 2 <sup>nd</sup> one year extension agreed to Nov. 2015 to align with Fleet Hire                   |
| Maintenance & Repair of Motor Vehicles<br>(Paul Chilton / 024737) | 01.04.10                             | <b>31.03.19</b>                    | n/a                                 | Kent C.C.   | 938,000   | 118,000                               | Spend reduced due to decline in number of vehicles in use   |
| Supply of Contract Hire Cars<br>(Paul Chilton / 034382)           | 31.05.11                             | <b>30.08.15</b>                    | n/a                                 | Crown Commercial Suppliers (CCS): Vehicle Lease Framework | 2,724,250                                       | 503,930                               | Joining new CCS framework 2015. 2014/15 spend reduction due to lower number of leased cars in use |
| Depot Security<br>(Paul Chilton / 030099)                         | 01.04.10                             | 31.03.15                           | Extended to <b>31.03.17</b>         | Sight & Sound Security                                    | 625,000 + 290,000                               | 140,000                               | Contract term (5+2) to March 2015. Two year extension agreed                                      |
| <i>Parks &amp; Greenspace (Pat Phillips)</i>                      |                                      |                                    |                                     |   |   |                                       |   |
| Woodland Works  | 08.09.14                             | <b>31.12.17</b>                    | n/a                                 | T&T Earthmatters  | 225,720   | 56,430                                | Soft Landscaping Works Contract   |
| Rural Hedge Cutting   | 08.09.14                             | <b>31.12.17</b>                    | n/a                                 | Landmark Services   | 84,924  | 21,230                                | Eight lots let to five separate contractors   |
| Rural Grass Cutting   | 08.09.14                             | <b>31.12.17</b>                    | n/a                                 | T&T Earthmatters  | 201,020   | 50,260                                | Reported to Environment PDS 29.01.14  |
| Public Rights of Way  | 08.09.14                             | <b>31.12.17</b>                    | n/a                                 | T&T Earthmatters  | 140,356   | 35,090                                |   |
| Non Routine Works   | 08.09.14                             | <b>09.09.16</b>                    | n/a                                 | English Landscapes  | 241,118   | 120,560                               |   |
| Japanese Knotweed   | 08.09.14                             | <b>31.12.17</b>                    | n/a                                 | Southern Land Services                                    | 58,572  | 14,640                                |   |
| Hanging Baskets   | 08.09.14                             | <b>31.12.17</b>                    | n/a                                 | CJS Plants  | 215,476   | 53,870                                |   |
| Plants and Shrubs Supply<br><br>(Rob Schembri)                    | 08.09.14                             | <b>09.09.16</b>                    | n/a                                 | English Landscapes  | 23,866  | 11,930                                |   |
|   |                                      |                                    |                                     |   | <u>1,191,052</u>                                | <u>364,010</u>                        |   |

| <b>Contract</b><br>(Officer / Register No.)   | <b>Start Date</b><br>(Core Contract) | <b>End Date</b><br>(Core Contract) | <b>Extension / Waiver</b>                               | <b>Contractor(s)</b>   | <b>Original Contract</b><br>£ Value + Extension             | <b>2014/15 Projected Spend</b><br>(£)                 | <b>Environment PDS Notes</b>  |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| Grounds Maintenance<br>(Rob. Schembri / 11545)  | 01.01.08                             | <b>31.12.17</b>                    | n/a   | The Landscape Group Ltd.   | 26.1m   | 2,931,340   | Contract to run full-term. Options post 2017 under review £35k withheld to balance the overall portfolio budget (as at 30.09.2014).                 |
| Playground Maintenance<br>(Andy Biggs / 016235)   | 01.01.08                             | 31.12.13                           | Extended to 31.12.14<br><br>Extended to <b>31.12.17</b> | Safeplay   | 369,300 + 74,640 + 228,675                                  | 76,500  | Contract term (6+2+2 to December 2017). 1 <sup>st</sup> extension for one year only. 2 <sup>nd</sup> extension to full term (with Dec. 2015 review) |
| Arboriculture<br>(Julian Fowgies / 016267)  | 18.07.08                             | <b>17.07.17</b>                    | n/a   | Gristwood and Toms Ltd.  | 5.12m   | 498,420   | Reduced annual spend due to reduction in service provision  |
| <b>Area Management (Pete McCready)</b>  |                                      |                                    |   |  |   |   |   |
| Street Environment Contract<br><br>(Pete McCready / 037024<br>037023<br>037025<br>037022) | 29.03.12                             | <b>28.03.17</b>                    | n/a   | Kier (public toilets)<br><br>Community Clean (graffiti removal)<br><br>Veolia (gully cleansing)<br><br>Kier (street cleansing) | 281,983<br><br>1,221,800<br><br>1,463,538<br><br>15,798,212 | 46,900<br><br>244,360<br><br>292,710<br><br>3,152,140 | Five year contract with an option for a two year extension  |
| <b>Enforcement &amp; Street Regulation (Toby Smith)</b>                                   |                                      |                                    |   |  |   |   |   |
| Parks Security<br>(Toby Smith / 025902)   | 01.04.10                             | <b>31.03.20</b>                    | n/a   | Ward Security  | 4.13m   | 481,940   | CPI applicable  |
| <b>Waste Services (John Woodruff)</b>   |                                      |                                    |   |  |   |   |   |
| Waste Collection<br>(John Woodruff / 11525)   | 01.11.01                             | <b>31.03.19</b>                    | First extension to 2016. Second extension to 2019       | Veolia Environmental Services UK Ltd.  | 37.3m. + 64.6m + 26.1m                                      | 8,997,340   | First extension (2007) to align with Disposal contract (ELS07130). Second extension (2011) to realise service efficiencies                          |
| Waste Disposal<br>(John Woodruff / 11526)   | 24.02.02                             | <b>31.03.19</b>                    | Extended to March 2019                                  | Veolia Environmental Services UK Ltd.  | 160.5m + 27.5m  | 12,154,480  | Contract extended (in 2011) to realise service efficiencies Projected costs greater than budget   |
| Coney Hill Landfill Site Monitoring<br>(John Woodruff / 030220)                           | 28.07.10                             | <b>27.07.17</b>                    | n/a   | Enitial  | 969,500   | 136,200   |   |

| <b>Contract</b><br>(Officer / Register No.)                       | <b>Start Date</b><br>(Core Contract) | <b>End Date</b><br>(Core Contract) | <b>Extension / Waiver</b>                              | <b>Contractor(s)</b>                                  | <b>Original Contract</b><br>£ Value + Extension              | <b>2014/15 Projected Spend</b><br>(£) | <b>Environment PDS Notes</b>  |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Transport &amp; Highways</b>                                   |                                      |                                    |  |   |  |                                       |   |
| <i>Highways (Garry Warner)</i>                                    |                                      |                                    |  |   |  |                                       |   |
| Transportation Consultancy (Paul Redman / 029130)                 | 30.05.11                             | 30.11.13                           | Extended to <b>May 2015</b>                            | AECOM (via TfL Project Management Framework)          | 750,000 + 300,000  | 140,000                               | Waiver developed to extend contract to May 2015 to align with new TfL Framework Contracts   |
| Street Lighting Maintenance & Improvements (Paul Redman / 049757) | 01.04.13                             | <b>31.03.23</b>                    | Option for 1 year extension                            | May Gurney (Cartledge)                                | 8.45m + 8m over two years (invest to save)                   | 1,808,020                             | Annual contract value of £845k, plus £8m over two years via Invest-to-Save programme  |
| Street Works (NRSWA) (Garry Warner / 049756)                      | 01.04.13                             | <b>31.03.16</b>                    | n/a  | B&J Enterprises of Kent                               | 871,920  | 295,430                               | Contract term (3+2+2). Option to extend for 2 or 4 years, not yet taken   |
| Highway Maintenance – Minor & Reactive (Garry Warner / 025400)    | 01.07.10                             | <b>30.06.17</b>                    | n/a  | O'Rourke Construction & Surfacing Ltd.                | 17m  | 3,022,860                             | Budget increases with BCIS indices. Contract value changes as subject to external funding (e.g. TfL and DfT).                           |
| Highway Maintenance – Major (Garry Warner / 025399)               | 01.10.10                             | <b>30.06.17</b>                    | n/a  | FM Conway Ltd.  | 26m  | 3,989,020                             | Budget increases with BCIS construction indices. Contract value changes as subject to external funding (e.g. TfL and DfT).              |
| <i>Parking (Ben Stephens)</i>                                     |                                      |                                    |  |   |  |                                       |   |
| Parking (Ben Stephens / 11528)                                    | 01.10.06                             | 30.09.11                           | Extended to <b>30.09.16</b>                            | Vinci Park Services UK Ltd.                           | 23.2m (inc. 11.5k extension)                                 | 2,596,700                             | 5 + 5 year extension. School Crossing Patrols now funded by 33 schools & TfL (~£170,000)  |
| Parking ICT (Ben Stephens)  | 01.04.13                             | <b>30.09.16</b>                    | n/a  | ICES Ltd.   | 238,000  | 76,480                                | Shared ICT service with LB Bexley (costs are LB Bromley only)   |
| Parking Bailiff Services (Ben Stephens)                           | 1.04.14                              | <b>30.09.16</b>                    | n/a  | JBW Judicial Services, Phoenix Commercial Collections | 625k est. (income)   | 250k est. (income)                    | All Parking contracts co-terminus 30.09.16  |
| Parking Mobile Phone Bookings (Ben Stephens)                      | 17.03.10                             | 16.03.13                           | Extended to 16.03.15 To be extended to <b>30.09.16</b> | RinGo (Cobalt)  | 67,000 + 120,000 + 113,000 (total income LBB and contractor) | 16,000 (net income LBB only)          | 3 year contract extended for two years and currently being extended for a further 18 months. All Parking contracts co-terminus 30.09.16 |
| <b>Executive Director E&amp;CS</b>                                |                                      |                                    |  |   |  |                                       |   |
| On-street Poster Sites (Andrew Rogers)                            | 10.07.01                             | <b>09.07.16</b>                    | n/a  | Clear Channel   | 405,000  | £88,916 (income)                      | Income has increased over contract term as more units added   |
| Bus Shelter Poster Sites (Andrew Rogers)                          | 10.07.01                             | <b>09.07.16</b>                    | n/a  | Transport for London                                  | 900,000  | £88,131 (income)                      |   |