

LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

MINUTES

of the proceedings of the Meeting of the
Council of the Borough
held at 7.00 pm on 25 March 2015

Present

**The Worshipful the Mayor
Councillor Julian Benington**

**The Deputy Mayor
Councillor Kate Lymer**

Councillors

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

The meeting was opened with prayers

In the Chair
The Mayor
Councillor Julian Benington

78 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Kathy Bance , Eric Bosshard, David Cartwright, Peter Morgan, Keith Onslow, Ian Payne, Catherine Rideout and Charles Rideout.

Best wishes were conveyed to Councillor Peter Morgan for a quick recovery following his recent operation.

79 Declarations of Interest

A number of declarations were made in advance of the meeting related to item 6 (Biggin Hill Airport Proposal to vary the Airport's Operating Hours), details of which were tabled as follows:

Councillor Mary Cooke: Council Deputy Representative on Biggin Hill Airport Consultative Committee;

Councillor Judi Ellis: Complementary ticket to the 2014 Air Fair (but paid for it herself);

Councillor Peter Fortune: Complementary ticket to the 2014 Air Fair;

Councillor Hannah Gray: Running a business to business exhibition at Biggin Hill Airport on 16th September 2015 along with two fellow directors of Bank (Bromley and Kent) on Business;

Councillor Kate Lymer: Four Complementary tickets to the 2014 Air Fair;

Councillor Alexa Michael: Council Representative on Biggin Hill Airport Consultative Committee;

Councillor Ian Payne: Council Deputy Representative on Biggin Hill Airport Consultative Committee and Complementary tickets to the 2014 Air Fair;

Councillor Melanie Stevens: Council Representative on Biggin Hill Airport Consultative Committee and Complementary ticket to the 2014 Air Fair;

Councillor Tim Stevens: Council Deputy Representative on Biggin Hill Airport Consultative Committee and Complementary ticket to the 2014 Air Fair;

Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe: Two Complementary tickets to the 2014 Air Fair;

Councillor Richard Scoates: Council Representative on Biggin Hill Airport Consultative Committee.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett also declared a personal interest at the meeting as a Member of the Board of Bromley College of Further and Higher Education which hoped at some stage to open a College at Biggin Hill.

80 Questions from Members of the Public where notice has been given.

A number of questions from Members of the Public had been received for oral and written reply. Details of the questions and replies – including replies to

supplementary questions - are at **Appendices A and B**. Details of the questions were also tabled, including written replies to questions where a non-oral reply was expected.

The questions for oral reply were taken in order and answered by the Leader of the Council. Given the importance of the matter before Members, it was agreed that time for the questions would be extended beyond the 15 minutes provided in the Council's Constitution for ordinary meetings of the Council.

The Mayor explained that a questioner would have opportunity to ask a supplementary question but that such a question should not take the form of general comment or a statement.

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

Four questions had been received from Members for oral reply. Details of the Questions and Replies are at **Appendix C**.

As the questions were unrelated to the main business of the meeting, the Mayor, in using his discretion to order agenda items, advised that the questions would be taken at the end of the meeting following debate on the evening's substantive item.

82 Written questions from Members of the Council

Four questions had been received from Members for written reply. Details of the Questions and Replies are at **Appendix D**.

Again, as the questions were unrelated to the main business of the meeting, the Mayor used his discretion to take the questions at the end of the meeting.

83 Biggin Hill Airport Proposal to vary the Operating Hours

Report DRR15/035

The Special Council meeting had been called to consider a proposal from Biggin Hill Airport Limited (BHAL) to vary the operating hours at the airport. Lawyers acting on behalf of BHAL wrote to the Council on 5th November 2014 proposing that the airport's operating hours be varied pursuant to the terms of the Lease.

The Mayor explained that for legal reasons the Council's Executive would be making the final decision on the matter. The Executive would meet immediately following the Special Council meeting. Report DRR15/035 sought a decision on whether the proposals should be supported or rejected. Executive Members at the Council meeting would be able to hear views expressed and any recommendations made; Council would therefore inform the Executive in its decision making.

The Mayor indicated that Members of the Executive had been advised that they may take part in the debate but it would be advisable for them to refrain from voting during the Council meeting.

The Mayor asked the Leader of the Council and Chairman of the Executive, Councillor Stephen Carr, if he wished to speak before opening up debate.

Councillor Carr explained that the Council meeting had been called to allow Executive Members to listen to the views of Council Members. The outcome from Council was not binding and Councillor Carr acknowledged that the topic was particularly emotive. From the outset he emphasised his total respect for the views of Members and for the views of those who had responded to the Council's public consultation. It was nevertheless important for the authority as a public body to respond to BHAL's application reasonably and in a timely manner and to fulfil its duty to all borough residents.

Councillor Carr took the opportunity to comment on matters included in a number of frequently asked questions received in previous weeks.

The public had been consulted recognising the Council's commitment to residents to do so. Councillor Carr also contrasted BHAL's current application with two previous BHAL applications in advance of the 2012 Olympics. The first, in November 2010, requesting fare paying passengers, was rejected. The second in 2011, to vary operating hours over the period of the Olympics, came with no commitment to an ongoing Noise Management Package or other mitigation. With the current application was the capability, at the airport's expense, to be able to monitor flight path noise and potential infringements of the lease. There was also now every possibility of the VOR beacon being relocated to provide further mitigation and benefit to local residents.

Councillor Carr also highlighted that Members of the majority group on the Council had been given a free vote on the issue.

Following comments from Councillor Carr the matter was opened up for debate. Councillor Nicholas Bennett moved the following Motion which was seconded by Councillor Peter Fortune:

"That subject to agreement from the airport to all concessions, conditions, and obligations which can reasonably be required in consideration for agreeing a variation to the operating criteria in the third schedule to the lease, and subject to the Executive being satisfied with the concessions, conditions, and obligations negotiated, the Executive should then agree in principle to the extension of hours and consult again with Council before the final decision is made".

The debate which followed covered a number of points from those in favour of the BHAL proposals and those against, including those briefly summarised below:

Summarised points in favour of the BHAL proposals

- Aviation technology had already changed since the lease was signed - adjustments could be expected from time to time during the 125 year lease.
- The commercial reality of aviation transport had also changed - for BHAL to continue as a viable commercial concern, change to the lease should be accepted to accommodate the changing face of modern avionics. Aviation is international and fast changing and it was important for Biggin Hill to compete with competitors including business focused London airports and airports from North West Europe. A change to the operating hours would enable BHAL to operate on a level playing field with competitors and ensure its ongoing viability. In light of significant competition, the airport could deteriorate if not supported in its expansion.
- It was necessary to take a holistic approach and consider the bigger picture.
- Revenue to L B Bromley could also be expected to increase through increased rent and increased business rates at a time when the Council's finances are under unprecedented pressure. The increased income might help to reduce the level of cuts to front line services and might help lower the gap between rich and poor in the borough.
- Currently BHAL could significantly increase movements under the lease without any sanctions.
- Noise limits in the lease are out of date with no means of effectively monitoring or enforcing the limits.
- The lease currently takes no account of latest technology in monitoring and tracking aircraft and their noise, with the Council missing out on opportunities to control noise and pollution.
- The motion would enable the Council to negotiate conditions and noise limits and hold BHAL to its promises on noise reduction, with sanctions being applicable should BHAL fail.
- Movements would be cut to 50,000 (as recommended by Cole Jarman, Acoustic Consultants) so removing any concern for massive expansion feared some years previously.
- The number of aircraft above the borough could be expected to reduce and plans to have the stacking beacon moved were well advanced.
- The opportunity was provided to achieve a better outcome for residents and the environment in a controlled and balanced way whilst also

allowing the airport the flexibility to remain a successful business location for the future.

- There would be opportunities for more jobs and for engineers to be trained and employed in Bromley - skills and training could be expected from a new aviation college.
- Small businesses could also be supported and the airport heritage was of benefit to all in the borough.
- Public consultation highlighted a majority in favour of expansion.
- The airport could create up to 2,300 new jobs in a modern high tech industry which is growing.
- The number of aircraft movements had been steadily reducing over the previous 15 or so years.
- Modern aircraft are quieter and better air traffic control enables aircraft to approach at a higher level and on a more precise flight path.
- With the preservation of Biggin Hill's name and its association with successful and high quality flying operations, income could be generated for the borough in more ways than through rent and other payments by the airport. Other considerations were important such as the airport's historical associations, the planned heritage centre, and the chapel forming a major tourist attraction. It made business sense to enable the airport to function in the best possible way for the 21st century.
- It was necessary for the Council to maintain control of the asset through the lease to encourage the aviation business market and prevent others considering the airport for operations such as scheduled holiday flights.
- All residents take some amount of noise from sources such as emergency vehicle sirens and railway traffic.
- No proposal for change is ever warmly supported by those who live nearby - there would be no progress if only those affected make the decision.
- If negotiations are successful the Council would have an opportunity which would be good for training, jobs, Biggin Hill, and Bromley as a whole.

Summarised points against the BHAL proposals

- Little change from the previous refused applications - times would be extended to unacceptable levels in the current application. The operational hours suggested are unsocial and would impact resident lifestyles. Proposals would blight residents under the flight path.
- The Council owns the airport to protect the interest of all residents – the lease had been established to support the airport and residents under the flight path.
- The noise contour line is too close to the airport to provide any idea of the impact it would have further out and would only have impact around Biggin Hill.
- Noise decibels from an aircraft causing actual disturbance is of more importance than an average decibel level.
- It is questionable how many additional jobs might be taken by Bromley residents and there is no mention of specific positions amongst the additional jobs – if business aircraft manufacturers are involved, the companies could be expected to bring their own workforce.
- Affected residents expressed strong objections during public consultation – the views of affected residents are paramount.
- Community Fund grants (from fines for non-compliance with noise abatement levels) for double glazing/ sound insulation to bedroom windows might take some time to deliver.
- There is no mention that the Aviation College will be built at Biggin Hill.
- Applications for alternative flight paths and relocation of the VOR beacon could be a lengthy process. If the applications are approved, there would be nothing to prevent BHAL continuing to use the existing flight paths.
- The number of jobs to be created was understood to be linked to the number of aircraft based at Biggin Hill – however, it was understood that the number of aircraft based at the airport had reduced.
- Improvements such as higher flight level, increased angle of descent, and possible flight path changes are matters for the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) to approve. A new flight path was needed but no formal application from BHAL to change the flight path had been received by the CAA. If an application was to be received it would take four years to process. It was not BHAL's decision and change might not take place following an application. Before negotiations can take place, it was suggested that BHAL come back to the Council with firm

proposals e.g. when a change to the flight path has been approved. The initial proposals are not “set in concrete”, and there are no signed contracts, agreements, or guarantees.

- Other than for noise abatement, there appeared to be no sanctions or financial penalties for failure to deliver.
- Potentially, anywhere in the borough could be affected by helicopter flights which do not have a specific flight path.
- Benefits outlined by BHAL had not been proven and the financial benefit was unsubstantiated. All the benefits are aspirational, not guaranteed, and separate from a change to operating hours and varying the current terms of the lease.
- There is transport and accessibility drawbacks for Biggin Hill which could lead to concerns for road congestion - expansion would be hampered by a lack of transport infrastructure.
- Average day noise levels could increase if operating hours are extended. Residents living close to the airport and/or under flight path are likely to experience increased noise. Many thousands of people would be affected and residents would suffer more noise earlier and later each day; early risers might retire early and could be disturbed just prior to 11pm. The same could apply to younger children. Those rising at 7am or 7.30am might be disturbed by aircraft just after 6.30am. Recommendations on hours from the Noise Consultant could also cause difficulties for those working different hours.
- The proposed new operating hours are a big increase on existing hours. Although there would be a cap of eight movements between 6.30am and 7am and a cap of eight movements between 10pm and 11pm, the cap would potentially allow for one take-off or landing every 3.75 minutes between 6.30am and 7am and one take-off or landing every 7.5 minutes between 10pm and 11pm. As such, the cap did not seem to offer much protection for residents living under the flight path.
- It would not be possible to reverse a decision (to extend operating hours) and would go against the principles of the Council originally purchasing the airport.
- None of the following have anything to do with the proposed variation to operational hours: new aviation businesses and workshops; a new hotel; an aviation engineering college; 2,300 new jobs; noise abatement; and a change of flight path. Why had BHAL not commenced or completed some of these measures before now? Why was a change of flight path not followed up previously?

- The decision was being rushed through without proper discussion. Why rush if there is no time limit? Best to at least clarify and resolve issues contained in initial proposals before reaching a decision. The initial proposal might be agreed without sufficient thought and could result in no benefit being obtained for the borough.
- There were no guarantees on matters to do with finance.
- Why was it not possible for aircraft manufacturing companies to be established at Biggin Hill airport under the current terms of the lease? Such companies would be manufacturing aircraft rather than flying and would not need an extension to flying hours.
- No effort was made to find out how many would be affected by the extra operating hours or how they would be affected – the consultation questionnaire did not ask this.
- For business aviation, BHAL already had better operating hours than London City, Farnborough and Northolt airports. If the competitors being considered were Luton, Southend and Stanstead airports, these airports have facilities open 24hrs per day.
- Key questions to consider were those around the hours people rise or retire - people living under the flight path were getting older. BHAL suggestions could go ahead without a change in hours as the economy comes out of recession.

The Motion from Councillor Nicholas Bennett was put to the vote and was CARRIED.

Voting on the matter was recorded as follows:

For the Motion:

The Mayor and Councillors Allen, Ball, Nicholas Bennett, Ruth Bennett, Botting, Boughey, Brooks, Buttinger, Collins, Cooke, Dean, Dunn, Dykes, Ellis, Fookes, Fortune, Gray, Ellie Harmer, Will Harmer, William Huntington-Thresher, Jefferys, Livett, Nathan, Page, Phillips, Philpott, Pierce, Reddin, Rutherford, Diane Smith, Melanie Stevens, Turner, Tunnicliffe, Wilkins, and Williams (36).

Against the Motion:

The Deputy Mayor and Councillors Auld, Fawthrop, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Joel, Mellor, Michael, Owen, Scoates, and Tickner (10).

Council
25 March 2015

Abstaining from voting:

Councillors Arthur, Carr, Evans, Colin Smith, Tim Stevens, and Stephen Wells
(6).

Mayor

The Meeting ended at 9.18 pm

Appendix A

COUNCIL MEETING

25TH MARCH 2015

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Mrs Annick Tuesley

Why does the Council allow the Airport to state that it operates from 06.30 to 22.00, when those are the very hours that were overwhelmingly rejected (twice) prior to the Olympics, and what justification would there be for the Council to grant those hours now, and even more?

Reply

It should be noted that for aircraft normally based at the Airport the lease allows departures from between 06.30 am and 07.30 am on weekdays, and landings up until 22.00 pm on weekdays only.

For these reasons, accepting the restrictions that are in place, I believe it is possible to describe the Airport as being open from the hours of 06.30 am to 22.00 pm. and therefore operational.

Supplementary Question

Mrs Tuesley asked whether the Council accepted that the Noise Action Plan presented by the airport was only limited to assessing progress every five years towards noise reduction within the airport contours and if this was the case, Mrs Tuesley enquired how this would help residents.

Reply

The Leader indicated that should the decision be approved it was his intention that any monitoring would be live, day-by-day, and constantly reviewed from the period that an application was successful.

2. From David Hook

Will the proposed (by BHAL) limited number of Air Traffic Movements of 50,000 per year, be incorporated into the new Lease, and/or temporary adjustment to the existing Lease?

Reply

If amendments are approved, any change to air traffic movements would be incorporated into the revised third schedule of the lease.

3. From Peter Birdsall

(i) Regardless of the outcome of tonight's meeting, what steps are the Council planning to take which will increase the income from this relatively poorly performing investment property?

Reply

The lease determines the rent and fees the Council can expect to receive from the Airport. This is made up of an index-linked base rent plus an additional amount payable at the higher of the amount by which 3% of turnover or 12.5% net profits exceeds the base rent.

As stated in the report at paragraph 3.2, the base rent in 2014/15 was £89,444 and the additional turnover/profit income was £119,084. Also, as stated in paragraph 5.5, the Council's budget assumes an estimated income of £206,000 from the Airport.

Regardless of the decisions tonight, the Council will continue to support appropriate business activity at the Airport which will not only support and attract further employment but also serve to increase the income the Council receives.

(ii) Why did the Council refuse to give residents any detail about income to the Council when the Airport has been keen to mention large amounts in newspaper articles? How believable are those figures?

Reply

As stated in the report at paragraph 3.11 BHAL submitted to the Council on 10th November, a "private and confidential" financial proposal which BHAL recently agreed could be included in the report. This was agreed by BHAL on the basis that as much information as possible should always be in the public domain in the interests of openness and transparency. Until such a time that BHAL agreed the financial information could be included in the report, the Council was not able to act otherwise.

Regarding "believability", as stated in paragraph 5.1 of the report, these figures represent a financial forecast, not a contractual commitment. Further work would be required on the financial appraisal linked to any conditions and

obligations the Council would require which in turn determine the amount the Council could expect to receive.

(iii) How do you explain the most recent figure that the Council stands to make £11million a year? Is that before or after all the infrastructure and service costs?

Reply

As stated, the £11m is a BHAL income forecast. It represents a cumulative figure over the period 2015/16 to 2030/31 and does not represent the annual income. Any such forecasts must be treated with caution. As far as I know any forecast does not include any assessment of costs.

4. From Mike Overall

(i) Irrespective of the result of tonight's debate, will the Council now ask the Airport to prepare a fully detailed Report on use of Alternative Flight Paths over open countryside on the East, accompanied by a Noise Action Plan that considers overflying of residential areas rather than airport contours?

Reply

In such an event, we will not only ask but insist.

(ii) Since this seriously affects tens of thousands of Keston Village and Bromley residents, will the Council make publicly available detailed results of these studies and, if enforceable, impose sanctions for non-compliance by the Airport?

Reply

Absolutely.

5. From Michael Latham

(i) Why are Members asked to consider this application given that the officer's report for Members states at Finance 1; 'It has not been possible to gauge how realistic these projections are at this stage as no detailed submissions were provided to support these proposals' ?

Reply

It is the case that more detailed discussions between BHAL and LBB would be required before details could be agreed. However, Members need to decide if the proposals merit further discussion. That is the purpose of the report tonight.

(ii) Why does the officer's report at 6.4 (d) not mention the environmental damage inflicted on the non-air conditioned Princess Royal University Hospital by planes flying low overhead to land at Biggin Hill – as this can affect all Bromley residents – at particularly stressful times?

Reply

Effects on the hospital have been considered: it is a noise sensitive facility that the Government would expect to be assessed against the 57dB $L_{Aeq,16h}$ parameter in line with dwellings. The hospital is located outside the present and anticipated future noise contour at this value.

The Aviation Policy Framework states (in para.3.37) that airport operators should offer acoustic insulation to noise sensitive buildings, including hospitals, exposed to levels of noise above 63dB $L_{Aeq,16h}$. The hospital lies well outside this contour.

(iii) Will Councillor Carr confirm the Chief Executive wrote to him on 22.9.04 and 3.3.05 about the; 'detrimental effect on the PRUH and its patient environment' since when planes have become lower and larger - and that Councillor Arthur, non-Executive Hospital Trust Board Member, was party to those letters ?

Reply

This may be the case and I refer to the answer given to the last question. I can also confirm that in conversation with Mr Watkinson, that the Trust did not have any issues with these plans.

Supplementary Question

Mr Latham enquired whether the Leader accepted that the hospital Chief Executive confirmed in the year 2000 that the hospital trust were unaware of plans by the airport to attract bigger planes and also that the Council's Chief Planner confirmed at a Council meeting in 2003 that he was responsible for negotiating the hospital planning permission and that the overflying by planes had not been mentioned to the hospital trust.

Reply

The Leader indicated that he was unable to provide the confirmation Mr Latham sought and Mr Latham stated that he had letters to confirm it.

6. From Tony Trinick (Question put by Mark Trinick)

(i) Why did the Council not reveal that the supposed increase in jobs is not only linked to an increase in operating hours but to a raft of other major concessions to the Airport, including sacrificing Green Belt for hangars and building better access to the airport?

Reply

BHAL has made it clear that the potential to create up to 2,300 jobs is predicated on the hours being varied as proposed. Green Belt and transport matters would need to be dealt with separately and on their own merits in the normal way.

(ii) Why did the Council not reveal (I quote from Appendix 1 of the NLP report) that there is an underlying request to de-link the "roles of the Airport from environmental factors including green belt, noise, access and amenity"?

Reply

The Council does not believe it is in anyone's interest, including the Airport's, to "de-link" the role of the Airport from environmental factors including Green Belt, noise and amenity. The Airport does not operate in a vacuum and the Council will continue to ensure that its impacts on the wider community are properly considered in any response to current and future development plans.

Supplementary Question

Mr Trinick enquired whether a potential 2,300 new jobs and ambitious gross added value of £230m per year had been assessed in relation to hours only or the entire spectrum of the Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners report, and could the Council confirm that it would maintain its UDP (Unitary Development Plan) policy of balancing the economic prospects of the airport with residents' local amenities.

Reply

The Leader confirmed that balancing the economic prospects of the airport with residents' local amenities would be maintained. It was hugely important to the Council. Concerning a gross added value of £230m per year, the Leader did not immediately recognise the figure, and not wishing to misinform Mr Trinick, explained that advice would be sought and Mr Trinick advised.

7. From Susan Radford, Petts Wood & District Residents' Association

Does the Council accept that the aircraft approach heights proposed in the trial announced in BHAL's press release will remain unchanged over Petts Wood and therefore the promised reduction in noise is likely to be minimal in our area?

Reply

I understand that the recent BHAL press release stated that aircraft flight altitudes are being raised over Chislehurst and Petts Wood. Aircraft will establish on the current approach slope to complete their landing, but will join that slope approximately one-and-a-half miles further from the Airport and 400 feet higher. The Council, BHAL and residents should perhaps wait to see what difference this initiative makes before judging how effective these measures may or may not be.

Supplementary Question

As a condition of any change to operating hours, Susan Radford asked whether the Council would agree that BHAL should introduce fly paths which would not overfly residential areas.

Reply

In his reply, the Leader felt that everyone would like to see this happen. Some of the recommendations from the Council's noise consultant (including proposals related to noise contours) indicated that these, and the placing of conditions, would help address and perhaps counteract the noise impact that aircraft currently make. Any change to runway approach would also be of benefit.

8. From Giuliana Voisey

(i) Does the Council accept that the busiest and noisiest flight path is the one running below 2500 feet from Sidcup/Chislehurst to runway 21, as clearly demonstrated by the red corridor of NO votes on Map 2, Appendix 8, which gives a very good indication of where the main problem is?

Reply

Yes I do.

(ii) Does the Council realise that the estimated increase in revenue of £626,000 in 15 years' time equates to just £90 per household under this flight path alone, in 15 years' time, and the proposed Community Fund equates to £20 (£110 in total) based on a very conservative estimate of 7000 affected households?

Reply

As stated in the report and indicated in an earlier response, the figures presented by BHAL are forecasts not commitments. However, the income included in their projection is not insignificant and increases by £772k by 2030. I am not currently convinced that the supplementary community payments are commensurate with the increase in noise generated at anti-social hours and as stated in the report more work would be required to consider an appropriate level of charging if Members were to decide to allow these proposals.

(iii) How do 2300 jobs in 15 years' time in a borough that only has 1.4% unemployment (which is as low as it can realistically get), mainly created by attracting non-Bromley employees, compare with the sacrifices you are asking more than 100,000 of your residents to make from now?

Reply

Biggin Hill has been identified by the Council as one of three strategically important locations for future employment growth. I am pleased to note that we have recently received GLA funds to assist the Council and local stakeholders including the Airport to prepare a detailed feasibility report and business plan for an Aviation Technology and Enterprise Centre. Notwithstanding the fact that Bromley's economy remains healthy, we cannot rest on our laurels, and to ensure our economy remains healthy we need to ensure that good quality, sustainable local jobs are available for local people in the coming years. That is not to say that we will accept job growth at any cost. It is the job of the Council to ensure that the right balance is struck.

Supplementary Question

If the Council realised there was a problem in the flight path corridor to Runway 21, Giuliana Voisey enquired why the approach to the runway was not mentioned in the Airport's Noise Action Plan and consequently not picked up by the Council's noise consultants. She felt that people under the flight path approaching the runway were ignored in the Noise Action Plan.

Reply

The Leader indicated that a reason why no reference had been made was that it was something currently beyond the control of the airport and others. The Leader understood however that negotiations were moving forward to try and alleviate the problem.

9. From Hugh Bunce

(i) Why has no mention been made of the PRU hospital, one of the largest in South England, 1.5 miles from the end of the runway, with aircraft only 700 feet directly above creating a serious safety risk, and what can be done to restrict jet movements over this sensitive site?

Reply

As I stated in my response to Mr. Latham earlier, the effects on the hospital have been considered. Regarding safety risk, I am not aware of any concerns being raised with the Council to date but will happily consider any detailed concerns you may have which I can discuss with the Airport and/or appropriate authorities.

(ii) The flight path crosses from Locksbottom, to Bexley, covering 200,000 residents, two major hospitals, and 8 schools, (one of the most densely populated areas of the UK). Is the safety, quality of life, and environment of these people more important than developing an airport with severe infrastructure limitations?

Reply

Safety is of course a critical priority for the Council as landlord and we would not do anything that puts at risk people's safety. Airports are, of course, regulated by the Civil Aviation Authority, and they do not permit any activities at the Airport that put at risk people's safety. I should add that it should come as no surprise to residents who live under the flight path that their properties

indeed lie under the flight path of what has been an active airport for many years.

(iii) There are over 100,000 voters in four constituencies who are subjected to the effects of the flight path to Biggin Hill Airport. If you make a decision against their wishes are you happy to lose these constituencies on May 7th?

Reply

It is the job of elected Councillors to weigh up the pros and cons of all proposals that come before us. It is the case that not all residents (or Members come to that) will always be happy with decisions that are taken, but that is democracy at work.

Supplementary Question

Should voters in the constituencies affected by the flight path to the airport be unhappy with the decision taken, Mr Bunce asked for the Leader's view should voters be advised to no longer trust Conservatives to protect their amenities, quality of life, and their environment.

Reply

The Leader explained that the Conservative Group at the Council had allowed a free vote on the matter. It was a difficult decision for many and the Leader was determined that Members of the Conservative Group would be able to express their views in dealing with a particularly sensitive and emotive issue. The Leader understood that a lot of people would not favour a particular outcome but this was democracy at work and Members were elected to make difficult decisions.

10. From Barrie Mayer (Question put by Mrs Annick Tuesley)

(i) Isn't a decision on this Application seriously premature as most all the mitigating factors offered by BHAL or suggested by Cole Jarman are untested, best-efforts or insignificant?

Reply

The consultant's noise control recommendations are consistent with best practice used at other airports in the UK where they have been tried and tested.

(ii) Does the Council accept that the Noise Action Plan presented by the Airport is only limited to “assessing progress every 5 years towards noise reduction within the Airport contours” (page 10) and, if so, how is this going to help residents?

Reply

If the Council were to consider approving the application it would look for more rigorous management of noise reduction including continuous real-time monitoring.

Supplementary Question

Why was it not proposed that helicopters be excluded during the most unsocial hours by either the Airport or Cole Jarman?

Reply

The Leader indicated that this was the case as there had been no application to allow helicopters to operate in those hours.

11. From Jason Polis

(i) What would be the contractual and other legal provisions to revert the lease back to its current terms should the promises made, including those about noise reduction, fail to materialise or meet expectations?

Reply

BHAL as the Council`s tenant is seeking to amend the third Schedule of the lease which sets out the operating criteria for the airport - as it is entitled to do under the terms of that document. No decision has been made so my answer must be taken in that context. However if any variation to the third schedule was agreed the Council would look to ensure appropriate safeguards were included and this is identified as one of the three choices on the report being considered this evening.

(ii) What budgetary, legal and contractual provisions would be made to defend Council and Councillors from legal actions in relation to the consequences of any decision made in relation to this matter?

Reply

No decision has been made at this stage so it would be purely speculative to consider what if any challenges could be brought. As with all matters then if any consequential work couldn't be contained within existing budgets for legal services support – which can't be judged at this stage - the provision of any necessary supplementary funding would need to be considered at an appropriate time. Individual Councillors have a range of statutory protections and indemnities in respect of the majority of decisions that they collectively make.

(iii) What are all the expected consequences for residents and Council of earlier and later flights on every day and night of the week?

Reply

The consequence for residents of the proposals before Members tonight include:

- The potential to create new jobs and investment for the Borough.
- A cap on permitted flights.
- New, more affective noise management and monitoring arrangements.
- Increased hours of operation and associated mitigation measures including an aircraft charging schedule to reflect the increased noise generated during unsocial hours and to take account of any public purse expenditure required as a result of the increased business at the Airport.
- There could be more flights than currently and this is a factor we have to take into account in making a decision.

I would draw your attention to Appendix 7 of the report for a fuller analysis of the proposals, and the controls and obligations that would need to be in place to ensure the consequences for residents of the proposal are reasonably mitigated.

Supplementary Question

Should any variation to the third schedule of the lease be agreed, Mr Polis sought clarification in regard to safeguards that would be included and whether one of the safeguards would include reversion of the schedule back to its current terms.

Reply

The Leader suggested that the supplementary question from Mr Polis could only be determined as a result of any negotiations that might or might not go

forward. The Leader understood the point from Mr Polis and highlighted that the Council was determined to do what it could to protect residents if there was any change to the current terms of the lease. The Leader acknowledged the importance of the supplementary question from Mr Polis.

12. From Will Curtis

In the light of the overwhelming support for the proposals made for the future use of Biggin Hill Airport, does the Leader agree that, provided that environmental concerns can be satisfactorily addressed, the proposals made by the Airport will secure the future of the airport in the quietest and lowest density sector of commercial aviation whilst at the same time providing both social and economic benefits and safeguarding the heritage of Biggin Hill airport?

Reply

The various consultation results have indicated that a majority of the Borough residents support BHAL's proposals. However, BHAL's own proposals acknowledge that noise and other environmental concerns need to be properly managed in order to ensure that residents' concerns are properly addressed. The question is have BHAL offered a sufficient level of mitigation to allow these proposals to be supported? The Council's consultants have identified areas where the Airport would need to improve their offer to the Council and our residents before any approval should be given. Weighing up the pros and cons of the proposals and the adequacy of the mitigation measures is the subject of the debate tonight.

13. From Robert Walters

Can the Leader say what alternatives there may be to business and general aviation if the airport continues to lose market share due to its unfavourable operating hours and what other sectors of commercial aviation exist that could fill any revenue shortfall resulting from further loss of market share?

Reply

No I cannot.

14. From Barry Sargeant

With 31,500 residents supporting Biggin Hill's proposals, does the Council feel that it has received a clear instruction from residents to support BHAL's proposals?

Reply

The consultation is not a ballot or a referendum. Its results do not provide an “instruction” to the Council to support BHAL’s proposals. The purpose of the consultation was to give residents the opportunity to express their views which the Council would take account of in reaching its decision on the proposals. I should point out that whilst there was general support for BHAL’s proposals across the Borough as a whole, there was much less support in areas under or close to the flight path - notably Petts Wood and Knoll and Farnborough and Crofton Wards being against the proposals. In reaching a decision on the proposals the Council must take account of the concerns expressed as well as any expressions of support. In reaching our decision the Council must ensure that we are acting “reasonably” and have considered the application on its own facts and merits.

15. From John Willis

Does the Leader believe that the planned Aviation Technical College will fit well with the recently announced and very commendable boost in the government apprenticeship scheme such that it will create jobs for Bromley residents and align with current Conservative economic policies?

Reply

I hope so.

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

25TH MARCH 2015

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. From Andrew Cairns

What alternative uses for the airport site has the Council considered, more appropriate to the residential nature of the surrounding areas, given that the management of BHAL feel unable to operate a viable business without increasing their weekly operating hours by an overall 14.5% (42% increase at the weekend)?

Reply:

The Council has not considered an alternative use for the airport site as it is leased to BHAL Ltd for a term of 125 years from 7th May 1994.

2. From Matthew Coates

(i) As job and Gross Added Value estimates are linked by NLP to more than just the increase in operating hours, has the Council received a satisfactory Business Plan from the Airport related exclusively to the increase in operating hours?

Reply:

The Airport has stressed that the forecast job growth could not be achieved without an increase in hours. The Council is reasonably satisfied that this is the case as evidenced by consultants (URS and DTZ) and BHAL's feedback from potential investors.

(ii) Why does the Council keep referring to the overall support for the Airport's proposals during its October survey when the Populus survey actually showed that only 35% unreservedly supported the only question that matters: Operating Hours, thus perpetuating BHAL's misrepresentation of it?

Reply:

The Council has encouraged the residents to read the full submission published on the Council's website. The populus survey result showed that "65% support the new opening times (including 35% who strongly support them) compared with 18% who oppose".

(iii) Why does the Council believe that taxpayers have to continue to provide funds and concessions to a private business serving an elite clientele AND already profitable, when that money would be better spent supporting other types of industries and enterprises?

Reply:

I don't believe the Council is.

3. From Zoe Chambers

(i) What forecasts have been run to ensure that there are enough students from the borough of Bromley to justify Bromley taxpayers paying £3.5m towards it and why was it not made clear that we taxpayers, not the airport, are paying for it?

Reply:

The Council is not in receipt of a Business Plan for the proposed training facility at the Airport and therefore it is premature to comment on costs and who will pay for the facility.

(ii) Has the Council analysed alternative sources of income for that large area which do not involve aeroplanes overflying people's homes and why would this not be a reasonable opportunity to ask the Airport (which is profitable and does not need extra support) whether they might want to rescind the lease if they do not like it as it is?

Reply:

The lease includes provision for the Airport to seek revisions to the operating criteria. That is all they are doing.

(iii) How much profit has the Council made in real terms from BHAL over the past 20 years after deducting the £1.5m to resurface the runway, additional money to install the ILS, £400k granted in 2007 (taken from BHAL's accounts) and other general infrastructure/services expenditure? Why do you think they are not taking you for a ride again?

Reply:

Since the lease agreement was signed, the Council has received rent payments totalling £2,382,374 for the period 1994/95 to 2013/14. In 1994, the Council undertook to contribute up to £1.5m towards the resurfacing of the main runway and actual expenditure on this totalled £1,500,850.00 between 1994/95 and 1998/99. In addition, the Council spent a total of £82,619.48 on lighting improvements between 1993/94 and 1998/99. This provides a net difference of £798,904.52 over the period 1993 to 2014.

We have checked back through our records and, from the information provided, have been unable to find any record of a contribution towards the ILS or of a £400k grant.

Subject to Members' decision tonight, I would be seeking to ensure that any new agreement with BHAL addresses more satisfactorily than was the case with the original lease agreement, a significantly better financial deal for our residents.

4. From Nicholas Voisey

(i) Now that I have read the report circulated yesterday, how can a decision be taken with so many imponderables, suggested 'best efforts' amendments, unsubstantiated projections, undeliverable pledges etc?

Reply:

The Council has received a proposal from BHAL and is obliged to consider the proposal in a timely manner.

(ii) How can the council even consider such a divisive decision based on putting two thirds unaffected residents of the borough against the third which is affected?

Reply:

The Council has a duty to weigh up the pro's and con's of such proposals and make decisions based on what is in the best interests of the Borough as a whole.

(iii) How can a Council, any council, support a party that has based its canvassing on market manipulation rather than market research and run a campaign by calling the opposition liars instead of using arguments as well as writing personal intimidating letters? All of this can be proven.

Reply:

The Council cannot be held responsible for activities undertaken by third parties and will make its own decisions based on its own merits and facts on the application it has received.

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

25th MARCH 2015

QUESTIONS FOR ORAL REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Councillor Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Environment

Can the Portfolio Holder tell me how many residents have been written to demanding a fee of £80 per annum for the disabled space outside their home? How many of them are old age pensioners? Does he think that it is fair that some of the most vulnerable in society are being charged £80 per annum for a parking space which is available to any blue badge holder.

Reply

The Council has written to approximately 350 disabled residents.

Whilst I suspect that a significant proportion, and for the sake of debate would accept that a majority, are probably pensioners, the precise number is not immediately known as that information is not retained on file. I have however asked officers to try and recover that data for you from the relevant application forms.

I do have to respectfully suggest however that I believe you are incorrect to possibly conflate all pensioners and disabled people with an inability to pay for this service if indeed that is your suggestion.

As such, I do believe that the proposed charge is fair as provision and enforcement of Disabled Bays are not statutory services and are ones which we can no longer afford without a contribution being made for their upkeep by those who benefit from them.

Also, and perhaps more importantly, and this is where I might be able to persuade you a little, we are currently working on the details of a scheme which should in future hopefully mean that we will be able to dedicate each paid for space solely for the sponsoring householder's benefit.

That said, despite several other London Boroughs already operating similar schemes, we are listening to the expressed concerns surrounding aspects of this policy in non-Controlled Parking Zone areas, and may further nuance the criteria slightly following further consultation with that particular client group.

Supplementary Question

The paper from Committee last autumn stated that consultation will be carried out in advance of this scheme becoming operational with all disability groups and other key stakeholders. Can you please tell the Council what groups were consulted and summarise their responses?

Reply

No, I can't, but I will have the Head of Traffic and Road Safety write to you with that information to be placed on record.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Nicholas Bennett

Councillor Smith will know that I wrote to him about a case in my ward two days ago. He has just mentioned "*not in Controlled Parking Zones*". Can he confirm whether the Equalities Act 2010 would prevent the Council charging disabled residents in a road where there are no parking controls, when everyone else can park for nothing? Has he looked at that aspect?

Reply

That is the cause of much debate. Some lawyers think possibly; others think definitely not. Other authorities are doing it which doesn't necessarily make it right if it is wrong but that it is part of the teasing out in the non-controlled parking zones. It could be that policy will evolve - that people with bays keep them but are not policed, which would mean that people who park in them without a ticket would not be ticketed; it may be that residents outside of controlled parking zones, when they get to realise that it will be policed and a bay is dedicated to them, will be more than happy to pay the fee. These are the sorts of conversations that will be going on in the coming weeks.

2. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Leader of the Council

In view of time constraints and the need for the Executive meeting to start at a reasonable time, Cllr Bennett agreed to accept the Leader's reply for the question below in written form.

What information he has as to the improvement of the local economy since May 2010?

Reply

Unemployment – claimant numbers and rates

The number of claimants of the main unemployment benefit (Job Seekers Allowance) has reduced from 5,900 in Jan 2010 to 2,600 in Feb 2015. As a proportion of the

working age population the percentage has reduced from 3% to 1.3% in the same period.

Number of enterprises

Total number of enterprises in the borough has increased from 10,700 to 12,300, an increase of 15%. The majority of this growth was in private sector enterprises of under 10 employees, with some shrinkage of the number of enterprises of 250 and above.

Number of employee jobs – part time / full time

The number of employee jobs in the borough has remained relatively stable between 2010 and 2013 (latest data available) increasing slightly from 100,300 in 2010 to 101,100 employee jobs. The number of full time jobs has remained virtually static during the period – with the main growth in jobs coming from part time jobs, increasing from 37,600 to 38,600 between 2010 and 2013.

Median earnings – weekly (full / part time) resident based and workplace based

The median weekly earnings of Bromley residents who are full time workers has increased from £652 in 2010 to £700 in 2014 (7.4% increase). For residents who are part time workers the increase during the period has been over 12%, from £167 to £187.

Median weekly earnings for jobs which are based in the borough (not necessarily held by Bromley residents) have shown a modest increase (3%) from £530 to £550 between 2010 and 2014. However, median earnings for part time workers in the borough are now nearly 13% more, increasing from £142 to £166 per week.

It should be noted that the earnings figures have not been adjusted for inflation.

Business survival rates

In 2010 the 1-year survival rate for businesses was 88.1%. In 2012 (latest available data) it was 93.1%

Business start ups

Based on a count of new business accounts started at major high street banks, the number of start-ups in the borough was just over 3,000 during 2010. For the whole of 2014 there were 2,700 businesses starting up (a 10% decline). This may reflect improved economic conditions as the number of employment opportunities has increased since 2010.

Town Centre vacancies and footfall

These have remained relatively low (in comparison with GB average) for most town centres, with the exception of Orpington.

Beckenham 11.0% (Dec 14) – c.f. 9.1% (June 14)
Bromley 11.8% (Nov 14) – c.f. 12.8% (May 14)
Orpington BID area 15.2% (Jan 15) – c.f. 15.2% (Sept 14)
Penge 8.1% (April 14) – c.f. 7.4% (May 13)

NB GB average 13.2%

Bromley North Village specifically has shown a marked improvement: Vacancy rates before the works in Feb 13 were 8.1%, during the works in Feb 14 were 9.1% and when the works completed the vacancy rates reduced to 6.6%.

Footfall in Bromley North Village has increased 62% on a weekday and 49% on a Saturday (compared to 2011).

Overall Bromley Town Centre footfall figures have also improved: The February 2015 Springboard data shows a 7.3% increase on February 2014, and a year to date increase year on year by 4.8%.

In the other 2 main town centres where footfall is monitored through manual counts the picture is more mixed:

Beckenham
Feb 2014 = 22,100
Feb 2015 = 30,300
37% increase

Orpington
Feb 2014 = 26,600
Feb 2015 = 22,600
15% decrease

3. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

What was the Council tax money terms and percentage increase in the three years 1999-2002 and in the 13 years since 2002?

Reply

The Portfolio Holder referred to the table below:

L B Bromley's Council Tax Band 'D' 1999/00 - 2015/16

Year	Bromley		Preceptors		Headline	
	Band 'D'	Increase	Band 'D'	Increase/ Decrease	Band 'D'	Increase/ Decrease
	£	%	£	%	£	%
1998/99	513.26	2.9%	96.31	17.8%	609.57	5.01%
1999/00	564.95	10.07%	105.01	9.03%	669.96	9.91%
2000/01	612.68	8.45%	122.98	17.11%	735.66	9.81%
2001/02	675.50	10.25%	150.88	22.69%	826.38	12.33%
2002/03	706.23	4.55%	173.88	15.24%	880.11	6.50%
2003/04	748.59	6.00%	224.40	29.05%	972.99	10.55%
2004/05	799.16	6.76%	241.33	7.54%	1,040.49	6.94%
2005/06	838.34	4.90%	254.62	5.51%	1,092.96	5.04%
2006/07	871.67	3.98%	288.61	13.35%	1,160.28	6.16%
2007/08	913.73	4.83%	303.88	5.29%	1,217.61	4.94%
2008/09	953.33	4.33%	309.82	1.95%	1,263.15	3.74%
2009/10	979.16	2.71%	309.82	0.00%	1,288.98	2.04%
2010/11	991.31	1.24%	309.82	0.00%	1,301.13	0.94%
2011/12	991.31	0.00%	309.82	0.00%	1,301.13	0.00%
2012/13	991.31	0.00%	306.72	-1.00%	1,298.03	-0.24%
2013/14	1,010.07	1.89%	303.00	-1.21%	1,313.07	1.16%
2014/15	1,010.07	0.00%	299.00	-1.32%	1,309.07	-0.30%
2015/16	1,030.14	1.99%	295.00	-1.34%	1,325.14	1.23%

The average increase from 1999/00 to 2001/02 in Bromley's element of the Band 'D' Council Tax was 9.6% totalling an average of £54.08 per annum.

The average increase in Preceptors was 16.3% totalling an average of £18.19 per annum.

The total average increase was 10.7% totalling an average of £72.27 per annum.

For the period 2002/03 - 2015/16, the total average increase was 3.5% totalling an average of £35.63 per annum.

Therefore, in summary, the increases since that time were just under a third of the level that they were during that time.

Supplementary Question

In light of the General Election on 7th May, what advice would Councillor Arthur give to the residents of Bromley about the attitude of the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats towards taxation?

Reply

I do believe that the figures largely speak for themselves and it will be for the electorate to judge us on our record to say whether they were comfortable with

having increases of 10.7% or whether they would rather have increases of less than a third of that figure.

They would also look at what happened to the reserves during that time when the reserves were sadly depleted during those three years since when we have repaired that damage and returned the reserves to the way they were in the early nineties. We have also brought a degree of ambition into how we are treating those reserves in order that they can give us £4m per annum to shore up front line services.

But it is interesting to reflect – and I was a here at that time – I think there 18 Lib Dems and 14 Labour Members and I think we can say that the electorate has passed judgement as the 18 have disappeared altogether and the 14 have been cut in half. It was an interesting thing at the time to watch in slow motion a car crash effectively where these two disparate groups tried to cobble themselves together and to see the Labour Group desperately trying to get into power by cobbling themselves on to a group with which they had nothing in common at all. It is interesting and I do reflect perhaps that Mr Miliband is doing much the same thing with Alex Salmond perhaps where he is saying that he wishes to cobble himself together with someone else to get in by the back door. So perhaps people ought to learn the lessons from Bromley.

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

In view of time constraints and the need for the Executive meeting to start at a reasonable time, Cllr Bennett agreed to accept the Portfolio Holder's reply for the question below in written form.

If he will make a statement on how the expected increase in pupil numbers in the coming years will be met by the provision of new places at both primary and secondary level?

Reply

Bromley has witnessed a significant increase in demand for primary places over the last five years with the number of children in reception increasing by approximately 600. According to pupil roll projections produced by the Greater London Authority demand will increase further from 3,982 in September 2014 to 4,148 in 2028.

We have ambitious plans to meet this demand. Already Churchfields, Clare House, Harris Primary Academy Crystal Palace, Parish Church of England Primary School, St Paul's Cray and Worsley Bridge schools have permanently expanded and bulge classes have been added at a number of schools.

Consultation on permanent expansion is currently taking place at Midfield Primary School with Edgebury Primary School to follow shortly. It is planned that more primary schools will consult on expansion over the next year permanently increasing the supply of primary school places in the borough.

Major building work is underway to physically expand schools. Clare House Primary School is being completely rebuilt as a 2 Form Entry School. Major extensions are currently being constructed at Churchfields, Parish, St Paul's Cray and Worsley Bridge schools to provide additional forms of entry, with smaller schemes at Bromley Road, Hawes Down Juniors and Keston schools being delivered over the coming months.

In addition to those schemes already being delivered, the Council has a developed primary school capital programme for the next three years. Schemes at Edgebury, Princes Plain, Scott's Park, Stewart Fleming and St George's schools are currently subject to detailed preparation work. Feasibility work is underway at James Dixon, Marian Vian, Farnborough, Chislehurst St Nicholas, Leasons, Poverest, Blenheim, Green Street Green and Oaklands schools.

However, the local authority cannot satisfy all demand for primary places within existing local schools and Free Schools have, and will continue to play, an important role in the Council's programme. Harris Beckenham, Harris Shortlands and La Fontaine academies opened in September 2014 and new Free Schools approved in Crystal Palace and Langley Park are due to open over the next couple of years.

Demand for secondary school places has started to increase after a period of decline in rolls. This increase is driven by two factors, the increase in demand for primary places passing through to secondary age and migration into Bromley.

According to pupil roll projections produced by the Greater London Authority demand for Year 7 places will increase further from 3,508 in September 2014 to 4,421 in 2031.

More places will be provided in secondary schools this September due to increasing local demand with Bishop Justus, Langley Park School for Boys and the Ravensbourne Academy all taking a bulge class.

We continue to work with our existing secondary schools to identify options for expansion where sustainable, but expansion alone will be unable to meet the additional 30 forms of entry required by 2030. New schools delivered via the Free School route will be required to satisfy that demand.

Colleagues will also be aware that along with the Beckenham Academy and Bromley College sponsored University Technical College (UTC) announced last year, another secondary Free School, Bullers Wood School for Boys is due to open in September 2016.

The local authority is also continuing conversation with the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Southwark with regards the possible creation of new catholic secondary school in the borough.

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCIL MEETING

25TH MARCH 2015

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Environment

Can the portfolio holder provide the number of disabled residents who have been written to demanding a fee of £80 per annum for the disabled space outside their home broken down by ward.

Reply

Current holders of a disabled parking bay have been sent a letter informing them of the decision which has been made to charge an annual fee. The Council has written to approximately 350 disabled residents. No demand for a fee of £80.00 has as yet been made. The bays are across all Wards borough wide and are not categorised by Ward but by each road.

I have asked officers to break this figure down by wards and update all Members at the earliest possible opportunity.

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

Further to my question at the last meeting If he will update the list by Plans sub-committee the number of applications since May 2014 which have been recommended for:

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

Reply

There were 22 Plans Sub Committees (PSC) from 1st May 2014 up to 5th March 2015.

There were 352 applications on PSC agendas

5 were withdrawn

Total therefore 347

249 were recommended for approval

100 were recommended for refusal

67 were subject to overturned recommendations where the Committee took a contrary view to the officer recommendation
 48 of those overturned had appeals lodged
 22 of those appeals were allowed
 10 were dismissed
 1 was part allowed and part dismissed
 1 was withdrawn
 12 are still in progress

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

What information he has as to the current operating conditions for flights into and out of the following airports:

Southend
 Luton
 Northolt
 London City?

Reply

Airport	Hours	Operations	Noise Limits	
			Daytime (07h00 – 23h00)	Night time (23h00 – 07h00)
Southend	24 hours	53,000 m.p.a. 120 movement/month at night		
Luton	24 hours	18M p.p.a. NQ (23h30 – 06h00) 9,650 m.p.a. SH (06h00 -07h00) 7,000 m/p/a	57dB Envelope 19.4km ² (2015) – 15.2km ² (2028)	48dB Envelope: 37.2km ² (2015) – 31.6km ² (2028) QC (23h30 – 06h00): 3,500 (2015) – 2,800 (2028)

Northolt	08h00-22h00 Mon-Fri 08h00-14h00 Sat 12h00-18h00 Sun/BH			
London City	06h30-22h00 Mon-Fri 06h30-12h30 Sat 12h30-22h00 Sun Specific limits on BHs	120,000 m.p.a. 592 Mon-Fri 100 Sat 200 Sun Specific limits on BHs	Factored movements not more than 120,000*	
Biggin Hill (current proposals)	06h30-23h00 Mon-Fri 07h30-23h00 Sat 08h00-22h00 Sun/BH	50,000	57dB (16h) Envelope 2.7km ² (2030)	SH (06h30 – 07h00) 57dB (30m) Envelope 2.6km ² (2030)

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

Further to Cllr Ruth Bennett's question at the last meeting if he will list by library the cost of issuing a book at each one?

Reply

2013/14 figures below - we don't have full year figures for 14/15. Please note this is based on the Controllable Budget.

Cost of Issuing a book per Library	
Branch	Cost per issue
Beckenham	£2.37
Biggin Hill	£2.54
Burnt Ash	£5.52
Central	£5.01
Chislehurst	£1.98
Hayes	£3.26
Mottingham	£3.76
Orpington	£2.28
Penge	£3.31
Petts Wood	£1.78
Shortlands	£2.77
Southborough	£1.83
St Pauls Cray	£3.50
West Wickham	£1.55
