

EXECUTIVE

Minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2015 starting at 7.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Stephen Carr (Chairman)
Councillors Graham Arthur, Robert Evans, Peter Fortune,
Kate Lymer, Peter Morgan and Colin Smith

Also Present:

Councillor Nicholas Bennett J.P., Councillor Simon
Fawthrop, Councillor William Huntington-Thresher,
Councillor Ian F. Payne and Councillor Angela Wilkins

209 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

210 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Nicholas Bennett declared in relation to minute 216, Bromley Museum and The Priory, Orpington, that he was a member of the following - the Imperial War Museum, the London Transport Museum, the National Archives and the Bromley Local History Society.

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher declared in relation to minute 216, Bromley Museum and The Priory, Orpington, that he was an adviser to the Orpington Business Improvement District (BID) and in relation to minute 220 Local Intermediate Housing Income Threshold Review that he was a member of the Affinity Sutton Regional Scrutiny Board.

Councillor Peter Morgan declared in relation to minute 213, Provisional Final Accounts 2014/15, that his daughter was a director of Kier.

211 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20TH MAY 2015

Report CSD15073

The Executive received a summary of matters arising from previous meetings.

A sheet setting out some additional working group memberships (minute 197) and some minor changes to Appendix A was tabled.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 20th May 2015 be confirmed.

212 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

A number of questions had been received from members of the public for oral and written reply – these are set out in appendix 1 to these minutes.

213 PROVISIONAL FINAL ACCOUNTS 2014/15
Report FSD15034

The Committee considered the provisional outturn for 2014/15 at portfolio level and Council-wide, as well as the implications for the Council's financial position in 2015/16. There was an overall net nil movement in balances consisting of net variations on Cr£2.4m on services, Dr£4.9m on central items and carry forwards, prior year adjustments of Cr£3.8m, carry forwards from 2013/14 of Dr£1.6m and general grants of Cr£0.3m. The Director of Finance emphasised that the Council had to consider both stewardship and sustainability, with a longer term financial planning approach as austerity continued, and not deferring savings and investing to achieve returns that would provide ongoing support for key services was a more sustainable approach.

Councillor Angela Wilkins expressed surprise at the proposals to transfer over £10m into the Investment Fund, suggesting that the much larger than expected underspend should be allocated to building homes and protecting services. The Leader responded that much of the underspend was from un-needed contingency and the Council had to deal with future budget projections and the year on year reductions in grant. The Council had to generate additional income, take savings early and invest in the fabric of the borough to reduce costs. The Leader stated that it was important that tight gatekeeping and effective management of budgets should continue.

RESOLVED that

(1) The provisional revenue and capital outturns for the 2014/15 financial year and the earmarked balances on the General Fund as at 31st March 2015 be noted.

(2) It is noted that a more detailed analysis of the 2014/15 final outturn will be reported for each portfolio to the relevant PDS Committees.

(3) The variations in 2014/15 impacting on the Council's 2015/16 financial position be noted.

(4) The comments from the Education, Care and Health Services Department, the Director of Regeneration and Transformation and the Director of Environment and Community Services as detailed in appendix 1B to the report be noted.

(5) The carry forwards of £484k relating to repairs and maintenance, approved under delegated powers as detailed in Appendix 5 to the report be noted.

(6) The requests for carry forwards totalling £1,186 (net), as detailed in Appendix 5 to the report, be approved subject to the funding being allocated to the Central Contingency, to be drawn down on the approval of the relevant Portfolio Holder.

(7) A total of £2,248k funding be released from Central Contingency as detailed in paragraph 3.2.1 to the report.

(8) The return to Central Contingency of a total of £578k as set out in paragraph 3.2.2 be noted.

(9) The Prior Year Adjustments totalling £3,754k as detailed in section 3.4 of the report be noted.

(10) Council be recommended to transfer £10,165k to the Investment Fund as detailed in section 4.1 of the report.

(11) Council be recommended to create a Business Rates Risk Reserve of £1,200k as detailed in section 4.2 of the report.

(12) Council be recommended to transfer £1,250k to the Healthy Bromley Fund as detailed in section 4.3 of the report.

214 CAPITAL PROGRAMME OUT-TURN 2014/15
Report FSD15032

The Executive received a report setting out the final outturn on capital expenditure and receipts for 2014/15. Capital expenditure for the year was £50.5m, compared to the final approved budget of £52.5m agreed in February 2015. At that time, further slippage of £2m was assumed for capital financing purposes, so there was no overall variation in the use of capital receipts, external contributions and revenue contributions.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and the carry forward of the unspent capital budget (£18k) on the block provision for emergency works to surplus sites be approved.

215 INVESTMENT PROPERTY REVIEW
Report DRR15/056

The report provided an overview of the Council's investment portfolio and proposed a process for reviewing this portfolio. The following categories of property would be reviewed in priority order over the coming year – estate shops (freehold and leasehold), shopping centres, green belt, miscellaneous commercial properties, residential properties and sports and community uses.

The first report, on estate shops, was scheduled to be presented to Members in September. All properties would be challenged rigorously.

The Executive was also asked to reaffirm a set of management policies set out in the report as (a) to (k). The Executive and Resources PDS Committee had scrutinised the report on 3rd June 2015 and proposed that policy (k), which was not to dispose of small areas of land for garden extensions unless it was in the Council's interest, should be deleted. Members agreed that this should be deleted and considered that unused land should be disposed of wherever possible. The PDS Committee had also suggested that policy (g) should be reviewed to ensure compliance with competition legislation.

RESOLVED that

(1) The proposed programme for the review of the Investment Property Portfolio be approved as set out in section 4 of the report.

(2) The management policies outlined in section 5 of the report be endorsed, with the exception that policy (k) be deleted and policy (g) be reviewed.

216 BROMLEY MUSEUM AND THE PRIORY ORPINGTON
Report DRR15/046

In February 2015 officers had recommended, in the context of the need to make budget savings, that the Bromley Museum be relocated to the Central Library and the Priory building be disposed of on the open market. Since then, at the request of the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation, officers had investigated the future of the Museum and the Priory and held discussions with residents and interested parties. Although heritage and arts were highly valued by residents, it was accepted that the current museum standard was weak, and a new approach to provision of a local museum was needed with significantly reduced revenue costs.

Relocating the Museum to the Central Library still offered the best solution for an improved and sustainable Museum that would be in a position to attract more visitors, and officers were exploring different options for a pool of trained staff to be available to assist with particular school visits, or for trained volunteers to assist in running the exhibits.

The future of the Priory was a separate issue which was still being considered. The building had been declared an asset of community value and various Council and community group based options were being investigated.

The report had been scrutinised by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee on 3rd June. The Committee had supported the recommendations with some small changes to include reference to disposal of a leasehold interest, to delete reference to the cost of the proposed relocation being funded from capital receipts to avoid any impression that the move depended

on sale of the Priory and to make the capital and revenue funding decisions up to £395k and up to £15k.

In addition, PDS Members had supported a resolution calling for the Executive to decide to offer the Lubbock Collection back to the family. Councillor Nicholas Bennett, the Council's Heritage and Design Champion, argued that the artefacts in the Lubbock Collection had no link to the borough other than that Sir John Lubbock had lived in the borough. He felt that as display space at the Central Library would be limited it should be focussed instead on exhibits more directly related to the history of Bromley. The Leader stated that he would be happy to consider the future of the Lubbock collection further once the new exhibitions were in place and their success had been measured. The Executive members felt that there was scope for the new Museum to include both the Lubbock Collection and space for local history.

RESOLVED that

(1) The cessation of the museum service at the Priory, Orpington, and the provision of new museum exhibitions at the Central Library, Bromley, managed by Local Studies and Archives, be agreed.

(2) The Priory be declared surplus to operational requirements with effect from 1st October 2015 and, subject to further work by Strategic Property Services on other Council uses for the building, authority is given to offer the property for sale or disposal of a leasehold interest on the open market.

(3) The outcome of the staff consultation be noted and the proposal to cease the museum service be endorsed.

(4) The allocation of up to £395k for the relocation of exhibitions, the addition of the scheme to the capital programme, and the allocation of up to £15k per annum revenue to Local Studies and Archives to commission temporary exhibitions and care for the collection be approved.

(5) The proposal from the Executive and Resources PDS Committee to offer the Lubbock Collection back to the Lubbock family is not supported.

217 BROMLEY TOWN HALL AND SOUTH STREET CAR PARK
Report CSD15075

The proposed developer of the Bromley Town Hall and South Street Car Park site had asked the Council to (i) add a small area of additional land fronting Widmore Road to the area which the Council had agreed to lease (subject to planning), and (ii) appropriate the site of the South Street Car Park for planning purposes. The Executive was reassured that these were minor technical issues and there was no reason for the Council to object.

RESOLVED that

(1) The addition to the area already included within the Town Hall site in the agreement for lease of the area shown hatched on plan 1 attached to the report be approved.

(2) The South Street Car Park site shown hatched on plan 2 attached to the report be appropriated under section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 to planning purposes in order to enable the powers in section 237 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to be used to facilitate the redevelopment of the site.

218 BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE CONSERVATION AREA
Report DRR15/052

At its meeting on 24th March 2015 the Development Control Committee approved a proposal for a new Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area. Extensive consultation had been carried out and the report set out officer responses to various suggested additions and removals.

The proposals had also been supported by the Beckenham Town Centre Working Group.

Officers were requested to check whether the conservation area boundary extended into Kelsey and Eden Park ward.

RESOLVED that a new conservation area named “Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area” with boundaries as set out in the map in section 3 of the report be adopted.

219 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) ON PLANNING OBLIGATIONS ADDENDUM ON CHANGES TO POOLING S106 CONTRIBUTIONS AND S106 THRESHOLD CHANGES
Report DRR15/009

The report proposed an addendum to the Council’s existing Supplementary Planning Document Planning Obligations (2010) to reflect changes introduced by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended), which came into effect from 6th April 2015. As an interim measure, until a local CIL was in place, the Council would need to seek financial contributions from developers only for specific purposes and ensure that only a maximum of five contributions were spent for specific items of infrastructure.

It was noted in particular that the threshold at which the Council would require affordable housing contributions had been changed in a ministerial statement issued on 28th November 2014 from ten units to eleven.

The proposed changes had been endorsed by Development Control Committee on 24th March 2015.

RESOLVED that the addendum at Appendix 1 to the report updating references to pooling and threshold changes be agreed.

220 LB BROMLEY LOCAL INTERMEDIATE HOUSING INCOME THRESHOLD REVIEW
Report DRR15/047

The Councils Supplementary Planning Documents on Affordable Housing and Planning Obligations specified that local intermediate housing income threshold figures should be reviewed regularly. The current figure of £35,000, set in 2008, did not reflect local house prices and incomes. At its meeting on 24th March 2015 the Development Control Committee had agreed reviewed local upper limit intermediate housing income thresholds for one, two and three bedroom units.

RESOLVED that reviewed local upper limit intermediate housing income thresholds be agreed as follows –

- 1 bedroom units £38,800**
- 2 bedroom units £50,500**
- 3 bedroom units £62,500**

GLA upper limit applies to 4 bedroom + units.

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

RESOLVED that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the items of business referred to below as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

**The following summaries
refer to matters
involving exempt information**

222 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20TH MAY 2015

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 20th May 2015 were confirmed.

Executive
10 June 2015

223 RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

The Executive approved a proposal to enter into a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) to purchase properties to assist the Council in addressing homelessness pressures.

The Meeting ended at 9.03 pm

Chairman

EXECUTIVE

10th June 2015

(A) QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Michael Meekums, Bromley Museum Volunteer Co-ordinator

Bromley Museum staff have opened the Poverest Roman Bath House to the public every year since it was excavated in the 1970s, and it will be open to the public on 25th July this year. Will the Bath House be open to the public every year in the future?

Reply –

The Council is currently committed to enabling the opening of the bath house once a year by having a member of staff present at the opening which we have to do for insurance purposes.

2. From Gill Hughes

The Bromley Museum report refers in some places to “moving the museum”, but in others to “new museum exhibitions”. Which is being proposed – moving the museum from the Priors to the Central Library, or closing the museum and putting in its place museum exhibitions?

Reply -

The museum exhibitions are proposed to move to Central Library, where they will be overseen by Local Studies staff, who will also commission temporary exhibitions and take over the care of the collection.

Supplementary Question -

As a supplementary question, Ms Hughes read out a definition of a museum. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the Council would look to have the new Museum accredited with the Museums Association.

3. From Gill Hughes

What expertise do the Local Studies and Archives staff have in commissioning temporary exhibitions and caring for the collection?

Reply –

Local Studies has experience in exhibitions, for example the Caring for Casualties exhibition this year, and they are experienced in caring for collections. The local studies archive is currently in their care.

Supplementary Question –

Ms Hughes asked whether Local Studies staff had experience with artefacts. The Portfolio Holder responded that the service already had a number of artefacts which it looked after very well.

4. From Gill Hughes

What will happen to all the history boxes currently used for outreach work?

Reply –

Local Studies may decide to keep the boxes so they are available to groups visiting the new exhibitions. If the boxes are considered to no longer be required they will be given to schools or other non-profit community groups to use.

Supplementary Question –

Ms Hughes asked the Portfolio Holder to ensure that this was done. The Portfolio Holder responded that he would.

5. From Margot Rohan

Have Councillors, particularly members of the Executive, read the Outline Proposal submitted to Colin Brand by the Save The Orpington Priory campaign group? Will the Council consider a Community Asset Transfer when a detailed business plan is submitted, based on the Outline Proposal and, if so, on what terms?

Reply -

Councillors have received a copy of the proposal. The Council will consider all options including a Community Asset Transfer when we have a detailed sustainable business plan.

Supplementary Question –

Ms Rohan asked how long the Council would allow for a detailed business plan to be drawn up. In response the Portfolio Holder stated that there was the statutory period of six months, but if towards the end of this more time was required then this could be discussed.

6. From Margot Rohan

Croydon Council encourages creative and cultural industries, a growing demand. A proposal for artists' studios in Eurocrown House and Marmi Works is likely to be approved at Planning Committee on 4 June. Why does not Bromley Council consider this an appropriate use and revenue generator for part of The Priory?

Reply -

This may be a good use for the Priory and generate the revenue required to manage and maintain the building, this type of use was identified in the Historic England commissioned report. However, the work that officers have done has shown that this

type of use in part of the building would not generate enough income to offset the costs if a museum is the majority user of the building.

7. From Mr Richard Gibbons

How you will achieve 10-fold increase in visitors to 200,000 (43% of 468,096 Central Library visitors in 2013/14) to proposed Bromley Revisited and Lubbock Gallery displays stated as “a fair assumption” to Executive on 11 February, compared to 19,000 to Bromley Museum (6% of 308,966 Orpington Library visitors)?

Reply -

The proposed exhibition spaces are located in spaces that are used by many library users, and are very visible, therefore the potential to attract visitors is high. The Bromley town centre location is easy for visitors across the borough to get to, and the exhibitions proposed are of a much higher quality and will be developed with community input and using advice received from the British Museum and others.

Supplementary Question –

Mr Gibbons asked how, given that the new Museum would be spread over two floors, the Council would monitor visitor numbers. The Portfolio Holder responded that details had not been sorted out as yet, but the technology was available to do this.

8. From Mr Richard Gibbons

Given that Bromley Museum is being systematically run down in preparation for proposed closure, would the Council actively assist the ‘Save The Orpington Priory’ Community Group in its efforts to support “key priority” bullet points 1, 2, 3 on page 2 of the published Renewal & Recreation Portfolio Business Plan?

Reply -

The museum is not being systematically run down, additional efforts have been made to ensure that the museum is open as normal during this period of uncertainty. The community group would need to specify what assistance it wants from the Council before a definitive answer could be given.

9. From Mr Richard Gibbons

To assist the Council in reducing costs whilst maintaining a key theme of Renewal & Recreation “aspirations around our town centres and the borough’s cultural and leisure offer” would the Council consider offering items in the museum collection of specific relevance to Orpington to a local Community Group to manage?

Reply -

Consideration can be given during this process to this request. However, the Council will be restricted by the terms of each acquisition and will be following Museum Association guidelines.

10. From Mrs Andrea Stevens, PWDRA Committee member

Have you run any projections on how many students the aviation college would attract and, considering that the Airport has stated that Bromley Council will be financing the college, how many places would be reserved for students whose families live in Bromley?

Reply -

As no proposal has been submitted, it is not possible to speculate on funding requirements or student profiles.

Supplementary Question –

What amount of funding would the Department for Education be allocating to the new college? The Portfolio Holder responded that this would be a matter for the Department for Education to consider.

11. From Mrs Andrea Stevens, PWDRA Committee member

What type of courses will be offered at the new college and what NVQ level would these be?

Reply -

No proposal has been submitted to the Council.

Supplementary question –

Would courses at the college be private and paid for by the students or are they going to be financed by state grants? If private, who would receive the income? Ms Stevens also asked if the Portfolio Holder had any idea of the time-frame. The Portfolio Holder responded no proposal has been submitted to the Council and that he had no idea what the time-frame would be.

12. From Penny Denby

As the NAP is based on noise measurements over a 16-hour period, why do you believe that the NAP is more beneficial to residents during the requested unsocial hours than the provisions in the Lease, which ask for 'individual flight' measures?

Reply -

The Council is very keen to see better, more reliable flight path and noise monitoring arrangements which are transparent to everyone, including residents, to ensure that local residents are less bothered by flight movements. The provisions in the Lease remain unaltered and will stay in force: the provisions in the NAP seek to impose more stringent noise limits than those contained in the Lease. The Airport's proposals would serve to strengthen not dilute current management arrangements to achieve this aim. In considering the Airport's proposals, the Council must seek to achieve a reasonable balance between the needs of residents and the Airport, and this will be the subject of a further report to Members in due course.

Supplementary Question –

Ms Denby suggested that the terms being proposed were less beneficial than in the lease and this was unacceptable. The Portfolio Holder disagreed.

13. From Penny Denby

The Airport have stated that their clients do not necessarily want to fly late at night or early in the morning but they want to know that they can, then why are flights in the first half hour between 6.30 and 7.00 increasing from 31 in 2014 to 730 by 2030?

Reply -

The Airport's proposal is based on the need for greater flexibility in hours to attract new investment and jobs (730 flights being an annual figure.) The proposed flights in the extended hours are intended to achieve this. The proposal amounts to an annual average of not more than 2 flights in each early morning 30 minute period.

Supplementary Question -

As a supplementary question Ms Denby stated that business clients would need some certainty about knowing that they could fly when they wanted.

14. From Dr Nicola Stevens

Given that BHAL have stated that the planes arriving and departing are now larger, compared to 10-15 years ago, what revised emergency procedures are in place to cope with any incident at Biggin Hill airport and the nearby locality?

Reply -

All aircraft are categorised as requiring specific levels of Rescue and Firefighting Capability (RFF) at any aerodromes they use. Categories range from Category 1 (a light aircraft) to Category 10. The maximum RFF required at Biggin Hill is RFF Category 4 but can, with 1 hours advance notice, provide RFF Category 6. The equipment, staffing and training required to meet this level of RFF cover is laid out in regulatory documentation and BHAL is audited regularly by the CAA to ensure that they meet the required standards. Their Task and Resource Analysis is reviewed annually and includes liaison with the emergency services. Responses to all potential scenarios, both on and off airfield, are considered and agreed where necessary with relevant emergency services. Periodic exercises are held to test that response. The last major "all services" exercise was held in late 2013 which involved some 200 personnel and which was widely reported in the local press. There have been numerous smaller exercises since. The major exercise is normally bi-annual.

BHAL's emergency response requirements follow the same protocols and regulation as is employed at all major UK and EU airports, subject to European Aviation Safety Agency regulations.

Any changes in aerodrome operation or aircraft type or size drive review of the RFF response and resource. For instance, any new operating hours will necessarily require a review and doubtless an increase in resources.

Supplementary Question -

Dr Stevens asked whether the Princess royal University Hospital (PRUH) had been involved in any discussions about the airport. The Portfolio Holder was not aware, but offered to find out.

15. From Dr Nicola Stevens

What will the £3.5 million allocated to the airport be used for?

Reply -

The Portfolio Holder stated that he was not sure what the £3.5m figure referred to. It was suggested that this could be money set aside in the Growth Fund for development in the Biggin Hill Area – i.e. not for the airport.

Supplementary Question –

Dr Stevens asked what the impact of this investment would be. The Portfolio Holder clarified that rateable income would increase, but it was not possible to quantify this at present.

(B) QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. From Richard Barnes

Could the Director for Finance please list how much Bromley Council has paid in connection with the Airport since the signing of the lease, including but not limited to the provision of reports by consultants?

Reply –

Since the lease was signed on 6th May 1994, the Council has spent a total of £1,768k in connection with Biggin Hill Airport. This comprises £185k revenue expenditure, and £1,583k capital expenditure, a breakdown of which is provided in the table below.

	1994/95- 1998/99	1999/00- 2003/04	2004/05- 2008/09	2009/10- 2013/14	2014/15-	Total
Revenue Expenditure						
Pumping Station Repairs	10,462	0	0	0	0	10,462
Minor Grounds Improvements	0	0	0	7,980	0	7,980
Insurances	636	0	0	0	0	636
Legal Expenses	363	12,820	0	0	0	13,183
Noise Monitoring	34,590	24,220	17,632	15,088	1,635	93,165
Noise Survey	8,214	0	0	0	0	8,214
Consultancy Fees	16,486	169	0	0	9,000	25,655
Survey/Consultation Costs	0	0	0	0	25,500	25,500
Capital Expenditure						
Runway Resurfacing	1,500,850	0	0	0	0	1,500,850
Lighting Improvements	82,619	0	0	0	0	82,619
Total	1,654,221	37,209	17,632	23,068	36,135	1,768,264

2. From Richard Barnes

As the Airport is pledging to ban the noisiest aeroplanes during the requested unsocial hours, will the Council ask that helicopters are also banned during those hours (with the exception of medical emergencies)?

Reply -

The lease does not require that helicopter movements are treated differently to any other aircraft movements. In considering the Council's response to the proposed increase in operating hours, we will need to ensure that we are acting reasonably in the interests of both residents and the Airport. It is recognised that the subject of helicopters is sensitive and was specifically referred at the meeting of the Executive in March 2015. Noise mitigation to be applied to all types of aircraft movements are matters currently under consideration in further discussions with the Airport, the outcome of which will be reported to a further meeting of Members.

3. From Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group

Council's proposals to close Bromley Museum, and sell off the historic Priory building. The report (DRR15/046, p.117) states that Ward Councillors have been asked for their views.

- (a) Which Ward Councillors have been approached, and in which wards?
- (b) What are the responses received from all Councillors (apart from Cllr Michael Rutherford)?
- (c) What were the views of the Members of the Policy, Development and Scrutiny Committee?

Reply –

- (a) All ward Councillors for Orpington and Bromley Town were asked for their views for the report.
- (b) No other responses for publishing in the report were received, however Cllr Huntington-Thresher had previously provided his view which was included in the February report, and he said that his view had not changed since this time.
- (c) The minutes for the E&R PDS will be published and available to the public.

4. From Susan Sulis, Secretary, Community Care Protection Group

Consultation on Council's proposals with regard to the Museum and the Priory.

- (a) Was this a 'Public Consultation'? Was it:-
- (b) prominently advertised on the home page of the Council's website?
- (c) Advertised in all Council Libraries and at the Bromley Museum?
- (d) Advertised in the local press?
- (e) Were non-internet users excluded?
- (f) Did it comply with the Cabinet Office Code of Conduct on Public Consultations?

Reply –

- (a) Yes
- (b) Yes it was advertised prominently on the home page.
- (c) It was advertised in Central Library and at Bromley Museum. Additionally information about the consultation was circulated by email and by local people.
- (d) Details of the consultation and how to take part were written up in the News Shopper on 22nd April.
- (e) No, paper copies of the survey were provided on request, and officers attended 16 meetings during spring 2015 alone.
- (f) The Local Authority has relatively few statutory duties to consult. This is not one of those occasions. There has been consultation on Bromley Museum at the Priory since 2009. The Cabinet Office's consultation criterion is reflective of good practice, and the Council's consultation on Bromley Museum at the Priory has been in line with good practice.