

LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

MINUTES

of the proceedings of the Meeting of the
Council of the Borough
held at 7.00 pm on 1 March 2017

Present:

The Worshipful the Mayor
Councillor Ian F. Payne

The Deputy Mayor
Councillor Hannah Gray

Councillors

Vanessa Allen	Peter Fortune	Chris Pierce
Graham Arthur	Will Harmer	Neil Reddin FCCA
Douglas Auld	Samaris Huntington-	Catherine Rideout
Kathy Bance MBE	Thresher	Charles Rideout QPM CVO
Julian Benington	William Huntington-	Michael Rutherford
Nicholas Bennett J.P.	Thresher	Richard Scoates
Ruth Bennett	David Jefferys	Colin Smith
Eric Bosshard	Charles Joel	Diane Smith
Katy Boughey	David Livett	Melanie Stevens
Kevin Brooks	Kate Lymer	Tim Stevens
Lydia Buttinger	Russell Mellor	Teresa Te
Stephen Carr	Alexa Michael	Michael Tickner
David Cartwright QFSM	Peter Morgan	Pauline Tunnicliffe
Alan Collins	Keith Onslow	Michael Turner
Peter Dean	Tony Owen	Stephen Wells
Ian Dunn	Angela Page	Angela Wilkins
Simon Fawthrop	Sarah Phillips	Richard Williams
Peter Fookes	Tom Philpott	

The meeting was opened with prayers

In the Chair
The Mayor
Councillor Ian F. Payne

67 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Kim Botting, Mary Cooke, Nicky Dykes, Judi Ellis, Robert Evans, Ellie Harmer and Terence Nathan. Councillor David Jefferys also apologised that he would have to miss part of the meeting.

The Mayor apologised that the meeting date had needed to be changed at short notice – this was due to late receipt of final funding figures from the DCLG.

68 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Nicholas Bennett declared in relation to minute 82 that he was on the Board of London South East Colleges.

Councillor Peter Morgan declared in relation to minute 75 that his daughter was a Director of Kier Group, who held a contract with the Council.

69 To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 12th December 2016

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 12th December 2016 be confirmed.

70 Petitions
Report CSD17105

A petition had been received from Mr Richard Wilsher calling for a pedestrian crossing on Copers Cope Road, Beckenham. Mr Wilsher addressed the Council on behalf of the petitioners.

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

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

Eighteen questions had been received from members of the public. The questions and replies are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

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

Fourteen questions for oral reply had been received from Members of the Council. The questions and replies are set out in Appendix B to these minutes.

73 Written questions from Members of the Council where notice has been given

Sixteen questions for written reply had been received from Members of the Council. The questions and replies are set out in Appendix C to these minutes.

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

The following statements were made –

The Portfolio Holder for Education and Children's Services, Councillor Peter Fortune, made a statement on the initial feedback from the inspections of the Council's Adult Education provision, Youth Offending Services and Children's Services. Since the Ofsted Inspection of the Adult Education College in 2015, the service had been redesigned and informal feedback was that it was now headed in a positive direction. The Youth Offending Service was also making good progress and, subject to official confirmation, was expected to move from one star to three stars. Feedback was also positive from Ofsted on Children's Services, with changes spurred by improvements to leadership and governance. The Portfolio Holder thanked the Director and the staff responsible for the improvements in these services.

The Portfolio Holder for Resources, Councillor Graham Arthur, made a statement on the proposals for the annual staff pay award (Minute 78.) For the fifth year in succession, the proposed award was higher than the national award, with an additional £300 for the lowest paid staff and an increase in standby payments, reflecting the Council's drive to reward achievement and tackle poor performance where it occurred. Investment in the workforce was crucial to maintaining the quality of services whilst maintaining balanced budgets. This was being supported not only by pay rises but also by merit payments totalling around £800,000 to 774 members of staff, a new performance review process named "Discuss", roll-out of new laptops for front line social workers, expenditure of £900,000 over two years on creation of a range of apprenticeships and discussion of a range of issues with departmental representatives.

75 Budget and Council Tax Setting 2017/18
Report CSD17036

The Director of Finance circulated the following supplementary information and amended recommendations -

"There were no changes to the final Mayoral precept accepted by the London Assembly on 20th February 2017.

Since the last meeting of the Executive there have been further changes on levies and the final position is shown in recommendation 2.1 (d) below.

On 20th February details of the final Local Government Finance Settlement were published. There are no changes to the level of Settlement Funding compared to the provisional settlement. Final allocations of New Homes Bonus were also confirmed and Bromley's allocation is £85k higher than previously estimated due to returned top-slice funding.

On 21st February 2017 the Department for Communities and Local Government issued the conditions relating to the Adult Social Care precept:

2% increase requires information to ensure that adult social care budgets are not being decreased by a greater proportion than those of other non-ringfenced services and that the precept is being used for adult social care costs;

3% increase requires additional evidence that the extra funding will be used to improve the way that adult social care services are delivered;

as announced in the provisional settlement the precept increase must be no greater than 6% in total over the next three years.

Updated information has been received from Bromley CCG regarding the 2017/18 Better Care Fund. This provides an indicative allocation of £20,287k compared to £20,427k previously reported. £38k of this reduction relates to funding retained by the CCG resulting in a reduction of £102k in the Bromley element and the draft Central Contingency has been reduced to reflect this. Final allocations are awaited and any required changes will be reflected in the 2017/18 budget monitoring reports.

Members are requested to note that, since the last report to Executive the following items have been allocated from the Central Contingency to Portfolio budgets:

Impact of Pension Fund Triennial Valuation - £700k
Education SEN and Adult Social Care - £1,200k
Apprenticeship Levy - £350k
National Living Wage - £737k
Other Minor Variations - £10k

It is important to note that the 2017/18 Central Contingency sum includes significant costs not yet allocated to Portfolio budgets at this stage. Therefore, there will be further changes to the Central Contingency to reflect allocations to individual Portfolio budgets prior to publication of the Financial Control Budget.

The above changes will require the following proposed amendments to be made to the recommendations of the Executive:

Amended Recommendation (2.1)

(b) approves the draft revenue budgets for 2017/18 with the following amendments:

(iii) On 8th February 2017, Executive approved the drawdown of £1m from the Central Contingency Budget for 2017/18 to meet the impact of the National Living Wage and associated increase

in ceiling rates. Details are set out in a report entitled “Care Home and Extra Care Quality Monitoring Report 2016”.

- (iv) an increase of £85k in New Homes Bonus set aside to support the revenue budget;
 - (v) a reduction of £102k Better Care Fund to be deducted from provision set aside in the Central Contingency;
 - (vi) a reduction of £2,997k in the 2017/18 Central Contingency to reflect allocations to Portfolio Budgets.
- (d)** approves the following provisions for levies to include in the budget for 2017/18:

	£'000
London Pension Fund Authority	461
London Boroughs Grant Committee	281
Environment Agency (Flood defence etc)	241
Lee Valley Regional Park	338
Total	1,321

- (e)** approves a revised Central Contingency sum of £15,177k to reflect the changes in (b) and (d);
- (h)** sets a 3.99% increase in Bromley's council tax for 2017/18 (1.99% general increase plus 2% Adult Social Care Precept) compared with 2016/17 and a 1.5% increase in the GLA precept;
- (i)** notes the final position on the GLA precept, as accepted by the London Assembly on 20th February 2017.

Amended Recommendation (2.2)

Council Tax 2017/18 – Statutory Calculations and Resolutions (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).

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

	2016/17 £	2017/18 £	Increase % (note #)
Bromley (general)	1,050.67	1,072.00	1.99
Bromley (ASC precept)	20.60	42.02	2.00
Bromley (total)	1,071.27	1,114.02	3.99
GLA	276.00	280.02	1.46

Total	1,347.27	1,394.04	3.47
-------	----------	----------	------

in line with the 2017/18 Council Tax Referendum Principles, the % increase applied is based on an authority's 'relevant basic amount of Council Tax' (£1,071.27 for Bromley) – see paragraph 6 below.

Amended Recommendation (2.3):

- (3) that the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act):
- (a) £530,785k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
 - (b) £387,608k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- (4) to note that the Greater London Authority (GLA) has issued a precept to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.
- (6) That the Council hereby determines that its relevant basic amount of council tax for the financial year 2017/18, which reflects a 3.99% increase (including Adult Social Care Precept of 2%), is not excessive. The Referendums Relating to Council Tax Increases (Principles) (England) Report 2017/18 sets out the principles which the Secretary of State has determined will apply to local authorities in England in 2017/18. The Council is required to determine whether its relevant basic amount of Council Tax is excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.”

Councillor Stephen Carr, seconded by Councillor Colin Smith, moved acceptance of the recommendations, subject to the additional amendments -

“After allowing for the report from the Director of Finance the following amendments are proposed to the recommendations of the Executive set out in the Blue Book on pages 45-87.

Additional Recommendation (2.1):

- (I) (i) sets aside funding of £500k as an earmarked reserve for Environmental Initiatives to be funded from underspends in the 2016/17 Central Contingency as detailed in the supplementary item;

- (ii) agrees that the utilisation of this funding be delegated to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder.
- (m) (i) sets aside funding of £250k as an earmarked reserve for Planning/Planning Enforcement to be funded from underspends in the 2016/17 Central Contingency as detailed in the supplementary item;
 - (ii) agrees that the utilisation of this funding be delegated to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder.
- (n) (i) sets aside funding of £200k as an earmarked reserve for the Apprenticeship Scheme to be funded from underspends in the 2016/17 Central Contingency as detailed in the supplementary item;
 - (ii) agrees that the utilisation of this funding be delegated to the Director of Human Resources in consultation with the Resources Portfolio Holder.
- (o) (i) agrees to transfer £1,500k of the 2016/17 earmarked reserve set aside from the non-recurring Transition Funding to an earmarked reserve for Children's Social Care as detailed in the supplementary item;
 - (ii) agrees that the utilisation of this funding be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Education, Care and Health Services in consultation with the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder."

The following amendments were moved by Councillor Angela Wilkins and seconded by Councillor Ian Dunn (with supporting detail in an appendix) -

"After allowing for the report from the Director of Finance the following amendments are proposed to the recommendations of the Executive set out in the Blue Book on pages 45-87.

The following changes be made to the recommended budget for 2017/18:

Additional Recommendation (2.1):

- (I) sets aside funding of £3,225k from the growth/investment fund resources to meet one-off costs relating to:
 - (i) provision of temporary housing;
 - (ii) refurbishment of space for enterprise hub for start-ups;

(iii) economic growth and regeneration team and business investment fund.

(m) agrees that £1,670k be carried forward from underspends in the 2016/17 Central Contingency to fund costs in 2017/18 relating to:

- (i) domiciliary care charging income;
- (ii) transport services charging income;
- (iii) grants to voluntary organisations;
- (iv) foster carers allowances;
- (v) council tax support to care leavers;
- (vi) funding for street cleaning;
- (vii) public protection team staffing;
- (viii) staffing in planning (including enforcement).

(n) notes that any ongoing costs will be considered as part of the 2018/19 budget preparation.”

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

Accordingly, the recommendations of the Executive (with the changes proposed by the Director of Finance and as proposed by Councillor Stephen Carr and seconded by Councillor Colin Smith) were **CARRIED** as follows -

(1) **That Council -**

(a) **Approves the schools budget of £80.5 million which matches the estimated level of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) after academy recoulement.**

(b) **Approves the draft revenue budgets for 2017/18 with the following amendments:**

- (i) **As reported in the Draft 2017/18 Budget Report to Executive on 11th January 2017, dedicated resources will be required for the joint tendering of a number of Environmental Services contracts over the next two years and other commissioning projects particularly around Children's Services. The 2017/18 Central Contingency includes one-off funding of £500k towards these costs and it is requested that this be transferred to an earmarked reserve to ensure that the funding is available as and when the work is undertaken.**
- (ii) **Members are requested to agree that the utilisation of this funding be delegated to the Director of Commissioning in consultation with the Resources Portfolio Holder.**

- (iii) On 8th February 2017, Executive approved the drawdown of £1m from the Central Contingency Budget for 2017/18 to meet the impact of the National Living Wage and associated increase in ceiling rates. Details are set out in a report entitled "Care Home and Extra Care Quality Monitoring Report 2016".
 - (iv) an increase of £85k in New Homes Bonus set aside to support the revenue budget;
 - (v) a reduction of £102k Better Care Fund to be deducted from provision set aside in the Central Contingency;
 - (vi) a reduction of £2,997k in the 2017/18 Central Contingency to reflect allocations to Portfolio Budgets.
- (c) Agrees that Chief Officers identify alternative savings within their departmental budgets where it is not possible to realise any savings reported to the previous meeting of the Executive held on 11th January 2017.
- (d) Approves the following provisions for levies to include in the budget for 2017/18:
- | | £'000 |
|--|--------------|
| London Pension Fund Authority | 461 |
| London Boroughs Grant Committee | 281 |
| Environment Agency (Flood defence etc) | 241 |
| Lee Valley Regional Park | 338 |
| Total | 1,321 |
- (e) Approves a revised Central Contingency sum of £15,177k to reflect the changes in (b) and (d).
- (f) Notes that the 2017/18 Central Contingency sum includes significant costs not yet allocated and there will therefore be further changes to reflect allocations to individual Portfolio budgets prior to publication of the Financial Control Budget.
- (g) Approves the revised draft 2017/18 revenue budgets to reflect the changes detailed above.
- (h) Sets a 3.99% increase in Bromley's council tax for 2017/18 (1.99% general increase plus 2% Adult Social Care Precept) compared with 2016/17 and a 1.5% increase in the GLA precept.
- (i) Notes the final position on the GLA precept, as accepted by the London Assembly on 20th February 2017.

- (j) Approves the approach to reserves outlined by the Director of Finance (see Appendix 4).
 - (k) Notes that the Executive agreed that the Director of Finance be authorised to report any further changes directly to Council on 1st March 2017.
 - (l)
 - (i) Sets aside funding of £500k as an earmarked reserve for Environmental Initiatives to be funded from underspends in the 2016/17 Central Contingency as detailed in the supplementary item.
 - (ii) Agrees that the utilisation of this funding be delegated to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder.
 - (m)
 - (i) Sets aside funding of £250k as an earmarked reserve for Planning/Planning Enforcement to be funded from underspends in the 2016/17 Central Contingency as detailed in the supplementary item.
 - (ii) Agrees that the utilisation of this funding be delegated to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services in consultation with the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder.
 - (n)
 - (i) Sets aside funding of £200k as an earmarked reserve for the Apprenticeship Scheme to be funded from underspends in the 2016/17 Central Contingency as detailed in the supplementary item.
 - (ii) Agrees that the utilisation of this funding be delegated to the Director of Human Resources in consultation with the Resources Portfolio Holder.
 - (o)
 - (i) Agrees to transfer £1,500k of the 2016/17 earmarked reserve set aside from the non-recurring Transition Funding to an earmarked reserve for Children's Social Care as detailed in the supplementary item.
 - (ii) Agrees that the utilisation of this funding be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive and Executive Director of Education, Care and Health Services in consultation with the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder.
- (2) Council Tax 2017/18 – Statutory Calculations and Resolutions (as amended by the Localism Act 2011)

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

	2016/17 £	2017/18 £	Increase % (note #)
Bromley (general)	1,050.67	1,072.00	1.99
Bromley (ASC precept)	20.60	42.02	2.00
Bromley (total)	1,071.27	1,114.02	3.99
GLA	276.00	280.02	1.46
Total	1,347.27	1,394.04	3.47

in line with the 2017/18 Council Tax Referendum Principles, the % increase applied is based on an authority's 'relevant basic amount of Council Tax' (£1,071.27 for Bromley) – see paragraph 6 below.

(3) Council resolves as follows:

- 1. It is noted that the Council Tax Base for 2017/18 is 128,523 'Band D' equivalent properties.**
- 2. It is calculated that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2017/18 is £143,177k.**
- 3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2017/18 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act):**
 - (a) £530,785k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.**
 - (b) £387,608k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.**
 - (c) £143,177k being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.**
 - (d) £1,114.02 being the amount at 3(c) above, divided by (1) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.**

(4) It is noted that the Greater London Authority (GLA) has issued a precept to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local

Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.

- (5) That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2017/18 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Valuation Bands	London Borough of Bromley £	Greater London Authority £	Aggregate of Council Tax Requirements £
A	742.68	186.68	929.36
B	866.46	217.79	1,084.25
C	990.24	248.91	1,239.15
D	1,114.02	280.02	1,394.04
E	1,361.58	342.25	1,703.83
F	1,609.14	404.47	2,013.61
G	1,856.70	466.70	2,323.40
H	2,228.04	560.04	2,788.08

- (6) That the Council hereby determines that its relevant basic amount of council tax for the financial year 2017/18, which reflects a 3.99% increase (including Adult Social Care Precept of 2%), is not excessive. The Referendums Relating to Council Tax Increases (Principles) (England) Report 2017/18 sets out the principles which the Secretary of State has determined will apply to local authorities in England in 2017/18. The Council is required to determine whether its relevant basic amount of Council Tax is excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

The following Members voted in favour of the motion –

Councillors Graham Arthur, Douglas Auld, Julian Benington, Nicholas Bennett, Ruth Bennett, Eric Bosshard, Katy Boughey, Lydia Buttinger, Stephen Carr, David Cartwright, Peter Dean, Simon Fawthrop, Peter Fortune, Will Harmer, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, William Huntington-Thresher, Charles Joel, David Livett, Kate Lymer, Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael, Peter Morgan, Keith Onslow, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Sarah Phillips, Tom Philpott, Chris Pierce, Neil Reddin, Catherine Rideout, Charles Rideout, Michael Rutherford, Richard Scoates, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Melanie Stevens, Tim Stevens, Teresa Te, Michael Tickner, Michael Turner, Pauline Tunnicliffe and Stephen Wells.

The following Members abstained –

Councillors Vanessa Allen, Kathy Bance, Kevin Brooks, Ian Dunn, Peter Fookes, Hannah Gray, Ian Payne, Angela Wilkins and Richard Williams.

(The meeting having lasted three hours, the Mayor proposed that it be extended for up to 30 minutes to deal with the remaining business, and this was agreed.)

76 Capital Programme 2017/18
Report CSD17020

A motion to approve an increase of £14,539k in 2016/17 to the Council's Property Investment Fund scheme to reflect the latest update on successful property acquisitions, an increase of £6896k in 2018/19 to the Basic Need Programme and inclusion of the new scheme proposals listed in Appendix C to the report in the Capital Programme was moved by Councillor Graham Arthur, seconded by Councillor Stephen Carr and **CARRIED**.

77 Treasury Management - Annual Investment Strategy 2017/18
Report CSD17019

A motion to note the report and agree and adopt the Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy for 2017/18, including prudential indicators and the Minimum Revenue Provision policy statement, was moved by Councillor Graham Arthur, seconded by Councillor Stephen Carr and **CARRIED**.

78 2017/18 Pay Award
Report CSD17016

A motion to approve a flat 1.2% pay increase for all staff (excluding teachers, who are covered by a separate statutory pay negotiating process) with an additional £300 (full time equivalent) paid to those members of staff currently earning less than £18,000 per annum, to approve an increase in standby allowances as set out in paragraph 3.7 of the report and to reject the Trade Union's claims including the 4% pay claim and the additional annual leave for staff was moved by Councillor Graham Arthur, seconded by Councillor Stephen Carr and **CARRIED**.

79 Pay Policy Statement 2017/18
Report CSD17017

A motion to approve the 2017/18 Pay Policy Statement was moved by Councillor Graham Arthur, seconded by Councillor Stephen Carr and **CARRIED**.

80 Members Allowances Scheme 2017/18
Report CSD17018

A motion to approve the 2017/18 Members Allowances Scheme, with allowances remaining at the current level, except for the allowance for

members of the Licensing Sub-Committee which shall be reduced to £335pa, and to maintain the Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral allowances at £15,698 and £3,575 for 2017/18, was moved by Councillor Tim Stevens, seconded by Councillor Diane Smith and **CARRIED**.

81 Updates to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers
Report CSD16173

It was proposed by Councillor Stephen Carr, seconded by Councillor Simon Fawthrop and agreed that on page 68 of the Scheme (agenda page 254) the following text would be added to the delegation relating to the European Communities Act 1972 –

“Prosecution proceedings may only be commenced under this delegation with the agreement of the relevant Portfolio Holder and the Leader of the Council.”

A motion to approve the updated Scheme of Delegation to Officers in respect of non-executive functions, and to note the updated Scheme of Delegation to Officers in respect of executive functions received from the Leader of the Council, was moved by Councillor Tim Stevens, seconded by Councillor Diane Smith and **CARRIED**.

82 Pension Fund - Bromley College Transfer Value
Report CSD17038

A proposal to note the latest indicative increase in transfer value relating to Bromley College was moved by Councillor Tim Stevens, seconded by Councillor Diane Smith and **CARRIED**.

83 To consider Motions of which notice has been given.

No motions had been received.

84 The Mayor's announcements and communications.

The Mayor announced that he had just returned from a weekend tour with the Council's twinned town, Neuwied, for carnival. He brought the personal greetings of the Lord Mayor, Nikolaus Roth his deputies and political groups. He reported that it was a most enjoyable time, and he was able to unveil a refurbished London phone box in the town centre that was going to be utilised as a book swapping kiosk.

On Friday 20th January 2017 the Charity Magic and Music Evening had been held at the Churchill Theatre. It was a huge success and the Mayor was very thankful to colleagues who had supported this event.

The Mayor's Annual Quiz Evening had been held in the Great Hall and the Mayor was grateful to all who had attended and helped make it a successful evening.

The House of Commons Charity Dinner was coming up on Thursday 9th March 2017 – those intending to come needed to get their names to the office by the next morning.

On Thursday 13th April 2017 the Mayor was hosting the Charity Preview, at Bromley Little Theatre, of Nick Dear's "Power" – about the glittering intrigues of the court of Louis XIV.

The Mayor's Golf Day would be on Wednesday 3rd May 2017, hosted by Langley Park Golf Club. This event has gathered a lot of interest already but if anyone else wanted to attend then they should contact the Office for further details.

The Mayor concluded by thanking everyone for their very generous support and invited them to contact the Mayor's office if they were interested in any of the forthcoming events.

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

It was moved by Councillor Ian Payne, seconded by Councillor Simon Fawthrop and -

RESOLVED that the press and public be excluded during consideration of the item 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 summary
refers to matters
involving exempt information**

**86 Pension Fund Triennial Valuation
Report CSD17033**

A motion to note the outcome of the Triennial Valuation report and recover the Pension Fund deficit over a period of twelve years was moved by Councillor Tim Stevens, seconded by Councillor Diane Smith, and **CARRIED**.

The Meeting ended at 10.22 pm

Mayor

This page is left intentionally blank

Minute Annex

Appendix A

COUNCIL MEETING

1st MARCH 2017

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(A) QUESTIONS FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Theo Sweeney to the Environment Portfolio Holder

(Mr Sweeney did not attend the meeting, so a written reply was sent)

I reported a ticket machine (MC:4004 in Orpington High Street) in October 2016, as it was not accepting coins. I was assured that it would be fixed, yet 3 months later it is not. On January 27th 2017 the machine is still not accepting coins. People can book a ticket by phone, but this should be a choice, not forced onto people.

Can the Council explain why this machine has not been fixed?

Reply:

Officers confirm that regular amounts have been collected from the machine each week since the beginning of October, suggesting that it is functioning properly.

I have however asked the Head of the Council's Parking Services to have the machine monitored over coming weeks and months to ensure that this remains the case.

2. From Andrew Viner to the Environment Portfolio Holder

What is the Council's policy with regard to the adoption of newly constructed residential roads in the borough, including those on major estates, and including those where new developments lead off un-adopted roads?

Reply:

When new housing developments are constructed in the borough, the developer can choose whether to have any roads and footways on their site built to a standard suitable for adoption by the local Highway Authority. If this is the case the construction works would be monitored by the Highway Authority and adopted, usually at the end of the guarantee period. The policy also applies to new roads leading off of an existing unadopted highway.

Supplementary Question:

Given that unadopted roads without a physical barrier or obvious prohibition on access are defined as roads by, for example, the case of Cox and White, can the Council confirm that it has implemented a programme to promote road safety and has taken steps to prevent accidents on such roads, as they are required to do under section 39 of the Road Traffic Act?

Reply:

My advice is that the Council is compliant with all aspects of road safety law.

3. From Jane Green to the Chairman of Development Control Committee.

Can you confirm that Items 14 and 15 at the last Renewal and Recreation PDS listed 87 applications in 2013-2016 recommended for permission by officers but overturned and refused by committee which were subsequently allowed on appeal, plus those for which costs totalling £220,300 were awarded against the Council in the same three years?

Reply:

There were about 87 such cases. These 87 overturned applications were drawn from around 8,700 applications determined in the same period which is about 1% of cases to put this in context. There were costs awards of about £220,300 arising from appeal cases including delegated decisions, enforcement and committee cases.

Supplementary Question:

What measures are being taken to ensure that planning committees when overturning officers recommendations for permission, provide substantive planning reasons for refusal to enable officers to make a robust case at appeal so that appellants are less successful in claiming awards of expensive costs against the Council

Reply:

The Council is required to put a robust case, and that is always complied with.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Tony Owen asked whether the Chairman accepted that the officer recommendation was taken into account by planning inspectors, so that planning committees may have shot themselves in the foot. He requested that "Members views" recommendations were brought back, as requested by many Members.

Reply:

I do not agree that an appeal inspector's view is influenced by the recommendation of officer. Furthermore, "Members views" is an option currently available to officers.

4. From Andy Richardson to the Care Services Portfolio Holder

(Answered by the Leader of the Council)

Has the Portfolio Holder for Care Services any evidence that recent cuts of £10m in the Social Care Department has had a detrimental effect on Bromley Adult Social Care to help patients in our local hospitals quickly back to their homes and community?

Reply:

No, not really. Social care provides a personal budget based on the assessed eligible unmet need of an individual which is agreed on a daily basis for people ready for discharge to avoid delays by social care. The assessment process involves a joined up approach with colleagues in the CCG and other health providers to ensure effective, timely and safe discharges for those leaving hospital.

Supplementary Question:

Would the Councillor agree with me that one piece of evidence produced by NHS England in their delayed transfers of care statistics - the fact that Bromley has been the worst London

council for delayed hospital stays due to public funding - in November 2016, being 169 days and in December 2016 105 days, are indicative to drastic cuts in Bromley's social care budget.

Reply:

I do challenge the premise of the question. Exceptional amounts of work have been done at my request as a result of conversations I have had with Dr Andrew Parsons at the CCG and with the Chief Executive, who has been particularly helpful in that in addressing some of the issues that were brought before us in the later part of last year and over Christmas. The numbers that we hear quoted today we believe are an exaggeration and confused about some of those delayed discharges that may effectively have been as a result of insufficient work being put in by some of our neighbouring boroughs. I take the issue very seriously and we want to do all we can to help the CCG and the acute sector come back within balance and we will do as much as we can to ensure that these things do not happen in future.

5. From Dr John Courtneidge to the Care Services Portfolio Holder
(Answered by the Leader of the Council)

Please supply details as to how the 2016 Adult Social Care Precept was spent and how the same 2017 is to be spent; including details of any funds that were released, as a result of such Precepts, to General Funds, along with details as to how any such-released funds were spent.

Reply:

In 2016/17 the precept has protected social care from cost pressures and the need to make further efficiencies in 16/17. For example, we have not made the reductions in spending on day opportunities for older people or people with learning disabilities in 2016/17, which was one of the options brought before Members some time ago.

In 2017/18 the precept will be used to cover the additional costs of the national living wage, inflation and protecting services from further reductions. Looking at our Section 151 Officer, regarding the second part of your question, there was no such funds returned – that is correct.

Supplementary Question:

I have it on reliable information, confirmed by telephone at 6pm this evening, that the direction of local government funding is away from the receipt of grants from central government towards a position where local authorities are required to make payments to central government. Is Bromley aware of this direction of travel, and are they planning for it?

Reply:

We have been aware of it for some time and we are making very serious preparations to deal with it.

6. From Richard Gibbons to the Care Services Portfolio Holder

(Answered by the Environment Portfolio Holder)

“Are cars the new tobacco?” posited the Journal of Public Health six years ago, concluding that “the public health community should advocate strongly for effective policies that reduce car use and increase active travel”. Given the level of car use in Bromley and rising health costs associated with inactivity, how has the Portfolio Holder responded to the warnings?

Reply:

Councillor Colin Smith, Environment Portfolio Holder, read out the following answer on behalf of the Care Services Portfolio Holder -

Although the transport aspects of this answer might be more fully answered by my colleague, the Portfolio Holder for Environment, I can state that Bromley has an excellent record of providing cycle training and continues to improve cycling and walking routes through in the Borough.

I am aware that he will be pleased to address any supplementary question that you might have.

Supplementary Question:

This was a public health question, not an environment question. Can the Portfolio Holder afford to ignore the savings that could be made by reducing car dependency and embracing active travel on public transport to achieve the recommended twenty minutes exercise per day? I say this quoting from the JSNA report 2016 which says “Increasing rates of obesity present a major challenge to the health of local people and failure to tackle this will have a significant impact on the Council, NHS and other public service providers and budgets.”

Reply:

I am advised that we in Bromley have one of the highest proportions of the twenty minutes activity across the entire country. Also, many of our citizens do stay mobile into their old age as we know around the cost of Freedom Passes – some 65,000 adults. In terms of the walking and cycling agendas, everything is centralised through the Environment with feed-in from other silos, and not the other way round.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Simon Fawthrop asked whether the Portfolio Holder would comment on the fact that when the buses were on strike London had one of its best air quality days for years, and whether any conclusions could be drawn from that, and whether all cars are bad? For example, if electric cars are used presumably the effect is zero, so it is not all cares that are bad, but the type of cars, such as diesels.

Reply:

Councillor Fawthrop will appreciate one of the answers coming up on this subject. I believe there is a necessary healthy balance between the use of public transport, cars, walking and cycling. There is a place for all and all must learn to share and work with each other.

(The Mayor noted that the 15 minutes allotted to public questions had expired, but he announced that he would allow the questions to continue.)

7. From Andrew Viner to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Given that the Council's Road Safety Team is not responsible for private roads and offers no advice in respect of them, does the Council have any concerns regarding the safety of road users, including pedestrians, on un-adopted residential roads in the borough?

Reply:

The Council's road safety team investigates and takes action, where deemed appropriate, in respect to collision clusters on all highways in the Borough, be they adopted or un-adopted, apart from on the TLRN, which is the responsibility of TfL.

8. From Mrs Jane Green to the Chairman of Development Control Committee.

Can you provide data in table format for the years 2013-2016 and broken down by committee, showing those applications with officers' recommendation for refusal but which were overturned and granted permission in committee?

Reply:

A table has been circulated showing these cases. There were 16 out of a total of over 1,300 cases considered by committee in this period (FY 13-14 to FY15-16).
(See Appendix 1 attached)

Supplementary Question:

There was one application that I was expecting to see on the list, but I will take this up with officers.

9. From Dr John Courtneidge to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Please supply details of the number of LB Bromley households that have been in receipt of Council Tax Benefit/Support over the past ten years and are planned to be so served in the next three Financial Years, including the number of households in such receipt: analysed by Ward and Council Tax Band.

Reply:

The answering of this question would involve me reading out pages of statistics which would seriously eat into the time allocated for this meeting. I have therefore produced a paper containing as much of the requested information as is available. The Council Tax and Benefits system does not record the Council ward and I have therefore broken down the information by post code. (See Appendix 2 attached)

Unfortunately, there are too many variables to provide estimated numbers of claimant households for future years, with some such as possible legislative change being outside of the authority's control.

Supplementary Question:

We know that Council Tax is a deeply iniquitous tax because it is not based on ability to pay; the question arises of whether the Council is considering either a re-banding and re-valuation of properties within Bromley, or an alternative which might be a local income tax as a more equitable approach to raising Council funds?

Reply:

The two suggestions you make are totally beyond our control, in terms of local income tax or re-valuation, which would be a national concern. What we do do is identify as many initiatives as we can to avoid pain and suffering for our residents and taking them to a point where they have to face as homeless. Some 90% of the people who present as potentially homeless are able to avoid that by the initiatives that we take. We are well aware of the initiatives, and the need for them. If you look at the statistics over the last ten years they are very consistent in terms of their spread across postcodes and they are also pretty consistent in terms of their numbers, if anything it is a slightly reducing total number.

10. From Richard Gibbons to the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder

Less than 1 mile in 2016 - the proximity distance average of 45 Primary Schools in Bromley. Notwithstanding School Travel Plans, walk/scoot/cycle initiatives and sterling work of Road Safety Unit, what barriers prevent 20-30% children travelling to school by car from adopting active travel and/or public transport modes for their journey?

Reply:

This Council has no powers to compel children or parents to use means of transport other than the car to travel to school, and that is regardless of the proximity. However, the fact that proximity distances have generally fallen in the borough makes it easier for primary pupils to walk or cycle to school.

Parents have freedom of choice over how they transport their children to school. Some may have practical reasons for using the car - for example work commitments, or a place of residence that makes it more difficult for pupils to utilise other travel options.

This Council continues to do all it can to encourage parents to use alternative transport methods to the car where it is practicable and for the health benefits it can bring. This includes free public transport for all primary age pupils, most without the need for an Oyster card or similar; and it includes supporting all schools to put in place accredited School Travel Plans.

The Council also supports a range of Road Safety initiatives to encourage children and families to take up more active travel for school journeys, including reward schemes and safety training for bicycles and scooters.

Supplementary question:

What reductions in the 20-30% can we expect in the next few years from those strategies?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that, in terms of the road safety initiative, this was a question more properly handled by the Environment Portfolio Holder. Councillor Colin Smith added that nobody could say – it was a function of how many houses were built in the borough and how many schools were built, and where they might go.

11. From Mrs Jane Green to the Chairman of Development Control Committee.

As there is no right of appeal for third party objectors for permitted applications, residents have to accept the consequences of these overturned decisions. Why, contrary to the 2006 Planning Code of Conduct, are the reasons for overturning officers' recommendation for refusal by granting permission not always recorded in committee minutes?

Reply:

Between 2003 and 2013, there was a duty on local planning authorities to give reasons for the grant of planning permission. From 6 December 2003, article 22(1)(b)(i) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (SI 1995/419) and subsequently article 31(1)(a)(i) and (ii) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (SI 2010/2184) provided this new statutory duty. That is why we did do it. However, this was effectively repealed in 2013 and currently article 35(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, provides that reasons are only required if permission is refused. If granted subject to conditions, then reasons are required in relation to each such condition. We will in any event keep this under review.

12. From Dr John Courtneidge to the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder

Does the LB Bromley have a statutory duty to provide and plan the number of Infant, Junior, Primary, Secondary and any other school and college places within the LB Bromley; if so, is there at present and, over a five-year plan, any shortfall, and of what sizes, if any, in terms of numbers and by forms of entry, as compared to the present provision, of such provision?

Reply:

Yes, the Council does have a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places in its area for primary and secondary education as well as securing diversity in the provision of schools, and increasing opportunities for parental choice.

We publish both a Primary School and Secondary School Development Plan annually that reviews the need for school places up to 2031 and identifies options for meeting this need. Currently, following the addition of 700 permanent school places since 2010 through school expansions and Free School developments, there are sufficient places in the primary school sector. However, there are additional forms of entry which will be required in the secondary sector for future years and it is proposed this demand will be met through a combination of expansions and Free Schools, the first of which, Eden Park High School, is opening in 2017. There are initial discussions beginning around options elsewhere with a view to meeting and matching a defined educational need.

13. From Richard Gibbons to the Environment Portfolio Holder

An inactivity crisis affecting the health of children and adults is highlighted in TfL's Healthy Streets for London document. Does the Portfolio Holder acknowledge the negative impacts of car use and will he embrace the Healthy Streets Approach prioritising walking, cycling and public transport to reduce congestion, improve air quality, and help create a healthier Bromley?

Reply:

There remains a valid place for walking, cycling, the use of public transport and of private motor vehicles across Bromley.

I have long since encouraged anybody minded to walk, cycle or use public transport to do so, but it ultimately remains a fundamental matter of personal choice and I personally wouldn't seek to coerce or unreasonably restrict anybody from using a private vehicle who prefers to do so.

Supplementary Question:

Does the Portfolio Holder agree with the chair of the London Council's Transport and Environment Committee, of which he is a member, that most car trips made by Londoners could be walked or cycled and that as London boroughs are responsible for 95% of London's roads, the boroughs will need to be at the forefront of the Healthy Streets initiative?

Reply:

No, I do not. The head of the London Councils Transport and Environment Committee fails, like so many inner London politicians, to understand the distinct and different needs of outer London compared to inner London. Until inner London politicians begin to grasp this, unfortunately this particular subject matter is going to go round in circles without getting anywhere positive.

Point of Order

Councillor Nicholas Bennett suggested that public questioners should not have to read their questions, in the same way that for Councillor questions the relevant Portfolio Holder went straight into the reply. The Mayor responded that he understood the point, and this had been considered, but he felt that it was important for people to be able to exercise their democratic right to ask their questions.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Tony Owen asked whether the London Councils Transport and Environment Committee had considered that 20mph zones caused journeys to take 50% longer, so that cars were on the road longer and in a lower gear spewing out nasty substances, and did he think that 20mph zones were as clever as people made them out to be?

Reply:

Councillor Smith responded that this was a difficult question. In inner London where there are many 20mph zones, drivers would do very well to be able to drive at 20mph, because everyone is driving much more slowly already. It could be suggested that the sign-posts and signs are a complete waste of taxpayers' money. In outer London, where we have generally bigger, wider roads, you would actually be encouraging some vehicles to slow down unnecessarily and use lower gears and perhaps produce excessive particulates that they might not otherwise need to. Everything has to be evaluated on a case by case basis, rather than as one size fits all, which always leads to differences and difficulties to negotiate.

(B) QUESTIONS FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. From Sam Webber to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

What progress has been made on reopening the Bell Hotel pub in Central Bromley either as a new venue or for community purposes whilst permanent paying tenants are sought? Could the Council update residents on talks with the freeholders and leaseholders of the building? It is shameful that this building in the centre of our town is boarded up and has been by my count since before the 2012 Bromley Town by-election when residents first raised this issue with me.

Reply:

The Council originally supported a community led option with the Bromley Arts & Community Group, this originally looked for funding from the Heritage Enterprise scheme run by the Heritage Lottery Fund, which has had some success in other locations around the country although ultimately this was not successful. As Green King are relatively new owners the Council is writing directly to their estates department to ask what their plans are for the building, including immediate maintenance, and to draw their attention to this source of possible funding.

2. From Sam Webber to the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder

What contact have councillors or council staff had with the Home Office or other Government departments and agencies about taking in any unaccompanied refugee children under the so-called Dubs Amendment since it was accepted by the Government in 2016? If so how many will be rehoused by the borough?

Reply:

LB Bromley has signed up to the Dubs Amendment and to date no children have been placed under this agreement.

3. From Dr Juliet Corbett to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Could you please provide figures for the amount of waste collected by Bromley Council which is successfully recycled as a percentage of the total collected, and what is rejected because it is unfit for recycling?

Reply:

During the most recent full year period in 2015/16, we recycled 48 % of all waste collected, from which ~5% was rejected as being contaminated.

4. From Dr Juliet Corbett to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Does the Council derive any income from recycled waste or what is the net cost involved in its collection?

Reply:

Yes it does.

5. From Dr Juliet Corbett to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Has the Council considered whether the adoption of "wheelie bins" for the collection of recyclables, paper and compostable waste, as well as better management of local recycling centres, would keep all materials clean and dry and increase the volume of waste successfully recycled?

Reply:

Yes it has, as recently September 2016, when an independent survey, 'Examining opportunities for greater consistency in household waste and recycling collections – South East London' commissioned by WRAP and Resource London, confirmed that Bromley's current collection methodology ensured the best value for money service of other comparator Boroughs was already being achieved locally.

Semi recent design improvements at both Churchfields and Waldo Road have contributed to a 56% recycling rate across the two sites.

**Appendix 1
(Question 8)**

Application Number	Address	Overturned?	Method of Decision	Decision	Date of Decision	Date of Appeal Lodged	Appeal Status
13/01097/FULL3	Land South West Side Of Chislehurst Railway Station Bickley Park Road Bickley Bromley	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	08.07.2013		
13/01392/FULL2	15 Moorfield Road Orpington BR6 0XD	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	25.09.2013		
13/02719/FULL6	4 Weller Place High Elms Road Downe Orpington BR6 7JW	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	21.11.2013		
13/03805/FULL6	The Lodge The Drive Scadbury Chislehurst BR7 6PP	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	15.01.2014		
14/00848/FULL3	43 High Street Chislehurst BR7 5AF	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	05.08.2014		
14/02447/FULL1	51 - 53 High Street Chislehurst BR7 5AF	O - Overturned	Delegated Decision	Application Permitted	28.10.2014		
14/04315/FULL1	4 - 5 Market Square Bromley BR1 1NA	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	22.12.2014		
14/04487/FULL6	14 Pickhurst Park Bromley BR2 0UF	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	02.03.2015		
14/04955/FULL6	Uplands Single Street Berrys Green Westerham TN16 3AA	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	25.03.2015		
15/03298/FULL1	228 Main Road Biggin Hill TN16 3BD	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	27.10.2015		
16/01330/FULL1	Jacanda Lodge North Drive Beckenham BR3 3XQ	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	10.10.2016		
16/03539/FULL6	23 Perry Hall Road Orpington BR6 0HT	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	25.10.2016		
16/03842/FULL5	Land Adjacent St Marys Church Hall St Mary's Avenue Shortlands Bromley	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	25.10.2016		
16/04100/FULL1	Unit 5A Lagoon Road Orpington BR5 3QX	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	23.11.2016		
15/03053/FULL1	Flamingo Park Club Sidcup By Pass Road Chislehurst BR7 6HL	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Called in by Secretary of State	29.06.2016	04.07.2016	Appeal In Progress
16/02685/FULL1	Land Adjacent 2 (demolished) Main Road Biggin Hill	O - Overturned	Committee Decision	Permission Subject to Legal Agreement	05.01.2017		

Appendix 2 (Question 9)

2006/2007	Band								
Count of account_ref	Column Labels								
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	103	429	1,194	423	308	87	29	3	2,576
BR2	158	322	852	936	219	104	33	1	2,625
BR3	74	397	961	715	342	66	33		2,588
BR4	38	54	172	106	142	53	8		573
BR5	164	1,016	1,882	1,950	236	56	16		5,320
BR6	70	188	479	832	282	92	23	2	1,968
BR7	7	54	225	253	108	30	29		706
BR8				4	1				5
CR6					1				1
DA14	13		3	9	1				26
SE19	22	196	283	39	11	2			553
SE20	167	1,202	1,310	869	82	17	2		3,649
SE26	5	160	234	38	16	8	2		463
SE9	2	386	970	73	31	3	3		1,468
TN14	1	1	2	5	6	1	3		19
TN16	24	28	108	138	83	26	9		416
Grand Total	848	4,433	8,675	6,390	1,869	545	190	6	22,956

2007/2008

	Band								
Count of account_ref	Column Labels								
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	118	425	1,184	431	288	84	30	3	2,563
BR2	168	322	841	913	210	97	30	1	2,582
BR3	73	394	968	705	338	60	25		2,563
BR4	42	57	161	117	137	46	8		568
BR5	178	1,022	1,931	1,935	214	53	15		5,348
BR6	62	191	480	823	278	103	19	1	1,957
BR7	10	54	236	254	107	33	22		716
BR8				4	2				6
CR6					1				1
DA14	12		3	7	1				23
SE19	19	195	277	36	12	2			541
SE20	161	1,205	1,290	828	76	14	2		3,576
SE26	5	152	237	34	15	8	2		453
SE9	3	392	946	72	31	3	2		1,449
TN14	1	1	3	3	5	1	3		17
TN16	25	30	120	141	90	31	8		445
Grand Total	877	4,440	8,677	6,303	1,805	535	166	5	22,808

2008/2009

	Band								
Count of account_ref	Column Labels								
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	115	433	1,237	448	293	94	37	1	2,658
BR2	163	338	880	986	227	102	36		2,732
BR3	71	412	1,017	772	343	63	33		2,711
BR4	39	60	167	119	156	50	7		598
BR5	168	990	2,017	1,986	231	53	16		5,461
BR6	60	189	523	859	291	109	22		2,053
BR7	9	61	239	273	117	31	26		756
BR8	1			4	2		1		8
CR6					1				1
DA14	11		3	7	1	1			23
SE19	20	206	278	46	14	1			565
SE20	161	1,231	1,329	838	81	16			3,656
SE26	6	155	231	35	19	7	2		455
SE9	3	425	991	73	29	5	3		1,529
TN14		2	3	3	8	3	3		22
TN16	26	29	130	164	103	43	7		502
Grand Total	853	4,531	9,045	6,613	1,916	578	193	1	23,730

2009/2010

Count of account_ref	Band								Grand Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
Row Labels									
BR1	126	474	1,321	510	334	101	42	3	2,911
BR2	159	337	950	1,037	240	111	37		2,871
BR3	81	463	1,095	860	403	74	38	2	3,016
BR4	37	58	177	128	171	57	11		639
BR5	169	1,036	2,091	2,087	262	64	17		5,726
BR6	64	205	593	946	340	116	28	1	2,293
BR7	9	66	257	280	138	33	28		811
BR8	1			4	3		1		9
CR0	1								1
CR6					1				1
DA14	16		3	8	1	1			29
SE19	26	246	293	44	10	1			620
SE20	168	1,351	1,418	911	83	17	2		3,950
SE26	8	167	259	53	19	8	2		516
SE9	3	441	1,050	78	29	5	5		1,611
TN14		2	3	5	7	3	2		22
TN16	27	32	146	186	115	44	9		559
Grand Total	895	4,878	9,656	7,137	2,156	635	222	6	25,585

2010/2011

	Band								
Count of account_ref	Column Labels								
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	127	472	1,361	502	354	110	39	2	2,967
BR2	158	322	980	1,046	273	118	41		2,938
BR3	80	457	1,123	890	412	69	34	1	3,066
BR4	43	52	195	137	156	64	10		657
BR5	183	1,021	2,109	2,098	265	60	17		5,753
BR6	68	202	610	969	325	113	33	1	2,321
BR7	9	63	271	290	137	31	29		830
BR8	1			4	2				7
CR0	2								2
CR6				1	1				2
DA14	17		2	8	1				28
SE19	30	262	306	48	12				658
SE20	170	1,357	1,405	930	83	18	1		3,964
SE25					1				1
SE26	5	163	273	53	21	8	1		524
SE9	4	430	1,072	77	30	4	5		1,622
TN14	1	2	3	3	7	2	2		20
TN16	26	28	143	197	120	42	8		564
Grand Total	924	4,831	9,853	7,253	2,200	639	220	4	25,924

2011/2012

	Band								
Count of account_ref	Column Labels								
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	128	505	1,377	532	339	112	40	1	3,034
BR2	151	298	1,072	1,068	303	132	39		3,063
BR3	90	455	1,141	890	415	66	34		3,091
BR4	46	56	195	136	166	65	12		676
BR5	173	973	2,129	2,144	273	63	17		5,772
BR6	67	216	613	967	352	108	33		2,356
BR7	13	64	259	293	147	30	36	3	845
BR8	1			5	1				7
CR0	2								2
CR6				1	1				2
DA14	18		2	9	1	1			31
SE19	30	253	297	47	11	1			639
SE20	170	1,392	1,484	921	80	18	1		4,066
SE25					2				2
SE26	8	171	257	47	21	9	2		515
SE9	6	444	1,101	69	28	1	7		1,656
TN14	1	2	3	3	7	3	4		23
TN16	21	31	150	218	138	41	9		608
Grand Total	925	4,860	10,080	7,350	2,285	650	234	4	26,388

2012/2013

Band

Count of account_ref Column Labels

Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	124	470	1,385	523	332	101	36	1	2,972
BR2	144	288	1,074	1,098	300	130	39	2	3,075
BR3	92	472	1,169	882	394	64	38	1	3,112
BR4	45	58	198	127	156	61	7		652
BR5	179	961	2,100	2,081	273	63	20		5,677
BR6	69	204	651	964	330	103	29	1	2,351
BR7	12	59	260	288	152	36	40	2	849
BR8	1			6	1				8
CR0	1								1
CR6				1	1				2
DA14	17		5	11	1	2			36
SE12					1				1
SE19	35	242	284	46	12	1			620
SE20	180	1,372	1,448	928	80	18	1		4,027
SE25					1				1
SE26	11	166	222	35	15	9	1		459
SE9	5	438	1,085	76	31	2	8		1,645
TN14	1	2	3	3	6	2			17
TN16	21	34	144	208	147	43	9		606
Grand Total	937	4,766	10,028	7,277	2,233	635	228	7	26,111

2013/2014

	Band								
Count of account_ref	Column Labels								
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	122	448	1,307	461	314	90	31		2,773
BR2	146	261	1,040	1,018	285	118	37	2	2,907
BR3	92	459	1,105	805	358	70	38	1	2,928
BR4	47	51	188	120	143	56	7		612
BR5	170	946	1,961	2,030	265	59	16		5,447
BR6	63	207	628	906	289	97	29	2	2,221
BR7	12	56	246	276	140	40	45	1	816
BR8	2			4	1				7
CR0	1								1
CR6				1	1	1			3
DA14	17		4	10	1	1			33
SE19	25	214	274	44	12	1			570
SE20	173	1,318	1,411	881	78	17	2		3,880
SE25					1				1
SE26	6	160	224	32	8	8	2		440
SE9	5	418	1,000	77	31	2	5		1,538
TN14	1	2	3	3	5	2			16
TN16	16	35	137	185	148	43	7		571
Grand Total	898	4,575	9,528	6,853	2,080	605	219	6	24,764

Page

19

2014/2015

Count of account_ref	Band								Grand Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
Row Labels									
BR1	116	445	1,212	439	266	83	29		2,590
BR2	142	255	959	932	259	99	36	1	2,683
BR3	95	422	1,028	709	332	63	32		2,681
BR4	45	45	165	100	121	47	9		532
BR5	165	899	1,816	1,874	246	49	14		5,063
BR6	63	188	595	837	254	91	25		2,053
BR7	13	62	231	241	129	47	41		764
BR8	2			4	2				8
CR6				1	2	1			4
DA14	19		3	10		1			33
SE19	22	194	246	36	11				509
SE20	162	1,181	1,267	830	71	14	2		3,527
SE25					1				1
SE26	7	144	202	33	11	6	1		404
SE9	5	405	929	68	29	2	4		1,442
TN14	1	1	3	3	5	2			15
TN16	18	32	133	174	131	33	7		528
Grand Total	875	4,273	8,789	6,291	1,870	538	200	1	22,837

2015/2016

	Band								
Count of account_ref	Column Labels								
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	122	411	1,139	395	246	71	27		2,411
BR2	135	251	886	853	249	86	29	1	2,490
BR3	99	410	976	673	294	57	28		2,537
BR4	48	45	161	88	103	42	6		493
BR5	157	860	1,697	1,755	214	44	13		4,740
BR6	62	181	549	785	232	77	20		1,906
BR7	14	58	209	226	113	41	34		695
BR8	2			3	1				6
CR0	3								3
CR6				1	2	1			4
DA14	19		3	8					30
SE19	15	173	226	37	11				462
SE20	157	1,084	1,181	757	67	12	2		3,260
SE25					1				1
SE26	8	133	196	31	9	4	1		382
SE9	2	399	876	67	27	5	3		1,379
TN14	1	1	3	3	4	3			15
TN16	17	32	127	152	110	33	6		477
Grand Total	861	4,038	8,229	5,834	1,683	476	169	1	21,291

2016/2017

Count of account_ref	Band								Grand Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
Row Labels									
BR1	111	398	1,027	354	220	64	20		2,194
BR2	135	224	837	783	215	73	21	1	2,289
BR3	80	395	863	622	267	46	18		2,291
BR4	44	48	145	73	93	33	9		445
BR5	199	795	1,563	1,602	193	35	13		4,400
BR6	53	166	511	724	207	72	15		1,748
BR7	13	52	204	210	100	39	28	1	647
BR8	2			3	1				6
CR0	3								3
CR6				1	2	1			4
DA14	14		3	7					24
SE19	14	145	201	34	9				403
SE20	139	977	1,024	693	60	13	2		2,908
SE26	4	127	168	22	10	4	1		336
SE9	4	369	782	64	20	3	2		1,244
TN14	1		3	1	2	2			9
TN16	16	31	119	138	92	29	4		429
Grand Total	832	3,727	7,450	5,331	1,491	414	133	2	19,380

COUNCIL MEETING**1st MARCH 2017****QUESTIONS FOR ORAL REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL****1. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Resources Portfolio Holder**

What has been the increase in pay scales and other benefits in cash and percentage terms since the establishment of local pay terms and conditions and how does this compare with what would have been paid to staff had they remained in National Conditions?

Reply:

The Council came out of the national pay negotiation arrangements in November 2012. Since then the Council has successfully implemented its own local pay arrangement with Bromley staff generally better rewarded for their performances and better remunerated than their national colleagues.

Between April 2013 (which is when the 1st local pay award was made) and now, the average pay award for Bromley staff is circa 7% compared to 5.2% for Local Government staff on national terms and conditions of service.

The local arrangement has served the Council very well, freeing up managers and supervisors to properly recognise and reward exceptional performances and discretionary efforts. To date, a total of 522 merited rewards have been made including 167 in the current year linked to appraisals. In addition this year a further 252 “mini” merited rewards of a lower cash value were also awarded for a one off exceptional performance.

Whilst the local arrangement allows us to flex our pay and other terms and conditions of employment like never before the Council has not make any changes to staff terms and conditions of employment.

Supplementary Question:

Does the Portfolio Holder recall the petition presented on 25th June 2012 by Glenn Kelly, supposedly on behalf of the staff, in which he asked that we did not introduce local pay and conditions, and would he like to circulate to all staff the benefits of not taking any notice of Mr Kelly and indeed the Labour Party who opposed it at the time.

Reply:

I do recall that very clearly and I certainly recall the Labour Group at the time warning staff and saying that if they went down this path they would end up worse off – they would certainly lose out in terms of pay and also implementation of all sorts of different onerous conditions. There were members of staff who listened to that and did not trust us. They numbered 2%. The 98% who actually saw through what the Labour Party were trying to tell them and came with us and trusted us have been amply rewarded, and I am very pleased that they have been rewarded. I would hope that at some point the Labour Group will have the honour and grace to recognise that they tried to take our staff down the garden path and abandon them, and apologise for what they said.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Peter Fookes asked whether, given that 90% of staff were opposed to introducing the new pay and conditions, the Portfolio Holder would now re-consult staff on the proposal?

Reply:

If any member of staff says they would rather accept the 1% national pay award instead of the 1.2% plus the £300 from the Council then I am sure that we could accept that on behalf of the taxpayer with some degree of gratitude.

2. From Councillor Angela Wilkins to the Leader of the Council

What will the council do to make sure council tax payers are informed about the financial challenges which central government policy purports to impose on this council?

Reply:

Each year, as part of the budget setting process, we hold a public meeting and meetings with residents' associations to engage representatives of the local community in a public consultation process on priorities for the Council's budget. The impact of government funding reductions is one of the key topics discussed. We also conduct an online survey seeking residents' views.

We provide a range of supporting information on line including a Leader's open letter, detail about the Council's budget, the level of savings required as well as those already achieved and our strategy for setting the budget. A comparison of spending and funding levels across London is also provided.

Further detail about the financial challenges we face is provided in the annual Draft Budget and Update on the Council's Financial Strategy report to Executive in January and the annual Council Tax report to Executive in February. As well as the impact of significant and ongoing funding reductions these reports set out the Council's approach to budgeting, the financial context and economic situation which can impact on public finances. Details relating to cost pressures arising from new burdens and the impact of Government policy changes including welfare reforms and the new Living Wage are also included as well as the risks, and opportunities, arising from the full devolution of business rates.

Finally, further information about our spending and funding and what we are doing to maximise income and secure more funding for Bromley is included in the annual 'Guide to your Council Tax' which accompanies all council tax bills.

Supplementary Question:

Will you take solace in the fact that the Labour Party will do some of this work for you?

Reply:

I am not one to look a gift-horse in the mouth – if we can do anything more efficiently I am sure we will be keen to do that.

3. From Councillor Vanessa Allen to the Environment Portfolio Holder

There was an article in the Bromley Times last week about the Bakerloo Line extension, the northern section of which to Lewisham is out for consultation again by TFL as the new Mayor of London Sadiq Khan is pushing ahead with this in which the Portfolio holder stated that "it is utterly untrue and typically mendacious of the Labour Party to suggest that Bromley Conservatives are opposed to the Bakerloo line coming into the town". In view of the fact that this is followed by four quotes from the Portfolio Holder stating that Bromley council does not support this would the Portfolio Holder like to take this opportunity to clarify his position on the Bakerloo Line extension?

Reply:

Cllrs Wilkins and Allen remain misinformed at best on this subject matter.

What I said, to requote even their own selectively highlighted passage of my address was:

“However, should it be possible to bring the Bakerloo Line to Bromley town centre via New Beckenham without the loss of any of the existing rail services then the Council could be prepared to support this in principle.”

Cllr Allen’s question this evening further highlights the Labour Group’s continued misrepresentation of this Administration’s position on key transport related matters and also unhelpfully serves to undermine our continuing priorities of achieving a direct link to Bromley North (and ideally Bromley South) as well as an extension of Tram-link from Clock House Ward to Crystal Palace.

They really should stop playing such petty party political games on such an important matter.

I have appended and circulated a copy of the article in question to these minutes for colleagues’ perusal.

http://www.bromleytimes.co.uk/news/mayor_of_london_committed_to_extending_the_bakerloo_line_past_lewisham_and_into_bromley_1_4889838

Supplementary Question:

I cannot understand how he can call us mendacious when we are quoting from the records of Council meetings. How can he not accept what is written in Council minutes.

Reply:

I certainly do accept what is in the Council minutes, I just quoted them. What I said was –

“However, should it be possible to bring the Bakerloo Line to Bromley town centre via New Beckenham without the loss of any of the existing rail services then the Council could be prepared to support this in principle.”

This is not the same as saying, as the Labour Party are, that “Bromley Conservatives are opposed to the Bakerloo Line coming into the town.”

If Labour are confused and cannot understand that, they have bigger problems than I thought they had.

4. From Councillor Ian Dunn to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Can the Portfolio Holder provide an update on the clearance of the Waste for Fuel site?

Reply:

The latest situation at the Waste4Fuel site on Cornwall Drive is that 16,200 of the originally estimated 18,000 tonnes have now been removed.

Works were halted several weeks ago upon discovery of what is technically described as being ‘hazardous’ waste, to enable plans to be made for its assessment, treatment and removal, as well for the Environment Agency to arrange sign off on the extra funding required to process same, in addition to the additional extra tonnage since established to exist on site.

I am advised that the authorisation process is almost complete, and therefore remain extremely hopeful that works to finalise the job in hand will recommence shortly, and shortly could be as early as Monday next week.

Supplementary Question:

The talk about additional funding is what concerns me here. In the original Executive minutes when this was agreed Councillor Smith said that in purely financial terms risk had been strictly contained. Can you re-confirm that this Council's liabilities as far as Cornwall Drive is concerned is strictly contained in the £300k which was committed at the beginning of September?

Reply:

It might be. Equally, we have a funding formula where the Environment Agency has been paying at a ratio of approximately 6:1 for the waste removed so far. That could mean that instead of purchasing an asset worth an estimated £1.6m for £300k, we may have to pay up to £450k for an asset worth £1.6m. That could potentially leave us with a profit of £1.15m were Councillors minded to sell it for whatever purpose. If getting assets at a discount is a sin, then I am guilty.

5. From Councillor Kevin Brooks to the Chairman of Development Control Committee

What is the current backlog of outstanding Planning Enforcement items?

Reply:

There are currently 509 live cases, comprising of the following:

- Currently under investigation – 294
- Authorised formal enforcement action – 150
- Planning applications received after investigation – 50
- Enforcement cases currently subject to appeal – 15

Supplementary Question:

There seems over a period of time to have been a lack of investment within the Enforcement Team. With such a backlog of cases, over 500, will the Chairman explain how residents are to feel reassured that if developers exceed their brief they will be held to account?

Reply:

500 cases does seem rather a lot. Investment has been made in the Enforcement Team over the last eleven months. In April last year, the live cases numbered in excess of 800, so the reduction of 300 reflects that investment. If developers or anyone else who has sought and obtained planning permission breaches that planning permission they will be held to account by the legal process available to us.

**6. From Councillor Kathy Bance MBE to the Care Services Portfolio Holder
(Answered by the Leader of the Council)**

How many severely disabled people are living in inappropriate housing in Bromley? What is being done to address the shortfall in meeting their needs, other than isolating them in new remote locations?

Reply:

I am not sure that I can be precise about the first part of the question about how many severely disabled people are living in inappropriate accommodation. This can be a matter of subjective opinion.

Bromley does have a dedicated Housing OT who works with housing associations and housing developers to ensure that at least 10% of new builds are built with accessibility standards in line with the London Plan. The OT also works with households requiring adapted properties and housing associations to make best use of existing adapted units. This work will also include facilitating adaptations in non-adapted properties where these properties have the potential for adaptations to meet the household's needs and preventing the removal of adaptations in void properties to maximise availability.

Supplementary Question:

Officers are still directing this group of very vulnerable people to use the bidding system. Can you explain why that is when our housing officers have explained have categorically admitted that there are no suitable properties available to bid on?

Reply:

I cannot be specific on that, I am not the Portfolio Holder, but I will ensure that we get you a suitable response as soon as we can.

7. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Environment Portfolio Holder

What is the Council policy on TfL taking over London train routes?

Reply:

The Council's position on the running of local train services is that the franchise should be run by the most efficient and reliable Train Operating Company which chooses to tender for the contract when the time comes to do so, whoever that might be.

Supplementary Question:

There seems to be a lot of confusion over Tory transport policy in this borough. Does he support Bob Neill, the local MP on this matter, or the Secretary of State, Chris Grayling?

Reply:

On this particular matter, Chris Grayling.

8. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

If he will make a statement on future plans for West Wickham Leisure Centre?

Reply:

The Council has previously looked at how to enhance or renew the West Wickham leisure facilities and has been working with Mytime Active, the current operator, as to how best to deliver these in the most optimal design to satisfy demand and in an affordable manner to ensure viability on the delivery of a new scheme. Unfortunately these discussions did not result in a new scheme being identified and the Council is therefore now commissioning a separate feasibility study through our consultants, Cushman and Wakefield, to look at the potential development to include a new leisure centre. This should take around two months complete.

9 From Councillor Angela Wilkins to the Care Services Portfolio Holder
(Answered by the Leader of the Council)

Please provide the rate of return which the Council will earn on its investment in the Manorfields facility.

Reply:

The current financial position was set out in the Manorfields post works completion report to Care Services Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee on 10th January 2017.

In summary, it quoted:

GLA grant contribution: £430,564
LBB capital contribution: £384,616

Leading to an annual revenue saving against comparative cost of alternative temporary accommodation of £370,096, with the added benefit of more residents being placed in the borough.

Supplementary Question:

I was hoping for a percentage figure. Can the same thing be expected if the Copers Cope application for a similar project is approved by Plans Sub-Committee tomorrow evening?

Reply:

Yes, I am informed that the business case for that potential solution, at least in the short term, dealing with some of our temporary accommodation problems, would have a significant benefit for the local authority.

10. From Councillor Kevin Brooks to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Whilst Penge is undergoing a Parking Review which may help parking pressures to a certain degree, what action can the Council take to maximise usage of the car park above the Blenheim Centre which would make a huge difference in easing parking pressures.

Reply:

I am a keen and eager studier of your web-page, and I know that this has been discussed on the Penge Councillors website for several years now, and they are quite clear that the ownership and the running of it is not by the Council or the Council's contractors.

To summarise, the formal answer is, I regret, that the Blenheim Centre carpark is privately run and as such is responsible for its own parking regime. If it is currently being under-utilized, it is possible that local businesses and local websites might be able to advertise its presence more widely than is the case at present.

Supplementary Question:

The reason for the question was more to do with the supplementary. Will the Portfolio Holder support, as part of the New Homes Bonus, the purchase of a ticket machine for the car park, as the company running it has indicated that if this was done they would invest in someone to collect the money, and so this would be a one-off payment?

Reply:

I obviously would not immediately commit to an unfunded spending promise. This is more a case for Renewal and Recreation. Potentially, if there is a business case, and were the Council to be given its money back over time as part of the revenue churn, it would be a

possibility. I do not make promises that I cannot keep, but let's take a look at it, and if it is viable, then possibly. We will follow up after this meeting, perhaps.

11. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Care Services Portfolio Holder
(Answered by the Leader of the Council)

What are the latest figures for households in temporary accommodation?

Reply:

1,398.

Supplementary Question:

What are the Council doing about this problem, particularly for those residents who are sofa-surfing with friends and relatives?

Reply:

I think Councillor Fookes already knows what we are doing, and that is quite a considerable amount. We have heard reference this evening to Bellegrove, Manorfields, the issue around potential temporary accommodation in Copers Cope Road, our Mears project and much more. I will be alluding to this later in my budget speech.

12. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder

How many children receive boarding education funded by the Council?

Reply:

The Council only funds boarding education in specific circumstances: for children with Special Educational Needs as part of their agreed statutory Education, Health & Care Plan; and for Looked After Children.

As of this month, there are 31 SEN children with EHC plans attending boarding school, funded through the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant.

Supplementary Question:

Is he aware that in The Times on 4th February there was a report from Buttle UK, a charity that provides help for children who are not necessarily disabled or special educational needs, but under privileged, to get a boarding education, and that in many cases this had been blocked by social workers on ideological grounds? Can he assure the Council that this has never happened in Bromley?

Reply:

Yes, I investigated this matter with the new Director of Services, and we are reassured that this has not happened in Bromley. In Bromley, we are dedicated and committed to supporting first class education for all of our children. That is evidenced by the fact that, hot off the press, we have figures for the national offer day for parents, and despite 77 more applications we have 72% getting their first preference, which is more than the London average. So we are committed to supporting schools and pupils in this borough.

13. From Councillor Angela Wilkins to the Renewal & Recreation Portfolio Holder

Given that the library locker facility installed at Anerley Town Hall is to be removed, will he now concede that the Council has closed a library and can no longer claim otherwise?

Reply:

In August 2014 the new Penge Library opened in Green Lane, Penge, which replaced the former Penge and Anerley Libraries. In order to test the need for some continued provision in the Anerley Town Hall the following were installed -

- 7 computers for public use providing internet access
- An automated locker allowing customers to collect pre-ordered books via self-service, and to return items.

From the opening of the new library in Green Lane it was clear that the majority of users of the two replaced libraries had transferred to the new library. Usage figures showed that more was being borrowed from this library than the combined totals of the Maple Road and Anerley libraries. In addition, many new people became members at the new library. For example, we had an increase of nearly 150% of new members joining, an increase of 84% plus of items borrowed, and an increase of more than 12% of the number of visits. That is against the combined totals of the two previous libraries.

Following its introduction the service that continued to be provided at Anerley Town Hall was widely promoted online, by way of an open day and through a publicity drive targeting local community groups and organisations. Nevertheless, only one person has used the locker to collect a requested item in the last 12 months. During this period 22% more items have been borrowed from the new Penge Library than the combined totals of the two old libraries.

In the light of this evidence it was decided that we should no longer waste public money with this, and the decision has been taken to remove the under-used equipment from Anerley Town Hall.

Supplementary Question:

I would like to congratulate Penge Library, which has been a huge success. We had two libraries, we now have one. That means that we have closed a library, doesn't it?

Reply:

Yes, indeed we have. We now have fourteen libraries in the borough, which is far more than our adjoining boroughs. We are very proud of our library service – we have improved it very greatly with new libraries at Biggin Hill, Orpington and indeed at Penge, and we have plans in the future to have a new library at Chislehurst. We are investing in our libraries, we are very proud of them, they are all doing very well, particularly the new ones. The fact that the one in Anerley is no longer needed means that we have closed it, and yes, we have only got fourteen, instead of fifteen, but I don't mind.

14. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder

How much have Bromley schools lost due to education cuts in 2017/18?

Reply:

Education is funded primarily through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). It is currently split into three blocks called High Needs, Schools and Early Years. Funding has remained static in the Schools block and there have been small increases in Early Years and High Needs.

The funding in each of these blocks is not in silos and are used across Education to fund expenditure where necessary. Schools will experience some change in funding in 2017/18, agreed with the Schools Forum, resulting from increasing pressures in the High Needs Block (mainly around SEN places) that have had to be funded.

Schools are protected by the minimum funding guarantee limiting any reductions in funding to -1.5% on a per pupil basis.

Supplementary Question:

Perhaps it could be better if the Portfolio Holder could report the full details to the Education Select Committee?

Reply:

Yes, I will make sure that happens.

Appendix 1 – Question 3

Mayor of London ‘committed’ to extending the Bakerloo line past Lewisham and into Bromley

11:30 14 February 2017 [Emily King](#)



London Mayor Sadiq Khan

He has stated he is currently trying to build a financial case for further extension

Comment

The mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, has stated he is “committed” to developing the Bakerloo line past Lewisham and towards Bromley.

His statement comes after it was announced last week that the Bakerloo line will be extended to Lewisham via Old Kent Road and New Cross Gate, in a bid to meet London’s growing population. The capital is expected to house 10 million people by 2030, compared to today’s eight and a half million.

Mr Khan and Transport for London (TfL) have said they see a second phase of the extension beyond Lewisham in the future, and work is continuing to build a case for this.

A spokesperson for the mayor of London said: “Sadiq is delighted to be pushing ahead with the Bakerloo line extension, two years earlier than originally planned. It will provide substantial benefits for thousands of Londoners and a real boost to the local economy. He remains committed to delivering a further extension of the line beyond Lewisham, and work is continuing to build a financial case for this.”

Bromley labour councillor, Angela Wilkins, has also shared her support for the extension towards Bromley.

She said: “Labour councillors in Bromley would totally support the extension of the Bakerloo line to Bromley - we know first hand the benefits the overground line brought in terms of regeneration when it opened up Crystal Palace and Penge.

“I’m really surprised the Tories oppose this extension - infrastructure investment like this is much needed in the borough and TfL’s consultation in early 2015 showed the vast majority of our residents want it too. Time they listened to locals if you ask me!”

Deputy leader of Bromley Council, Colin Smith, said: “It is utterly untrue and typically mendacious of the Labour Party to suggest that Bromley Conservatives are opposed to the Bakerloo line

coming into the town as they well know and anyone else can see for themselves by googling the historical debate.

"What we have long been seeking is an additional service, rather than a second rate replacement of the Hayes Line which appears to be the limitation of Labour's ambition, which serves Bromley North (and ideally Bromley South) to further boost our Town Centre and support trade, business and commuters across the Borough by providing direct links to Docklands and the Thames corridor beyond.

"Our second strategic Borough wide transport priority has been to see Tramlink extended from Elmers End to Crystal Palace to serve residents living across the North West of the Borough, a vision which Labour no longer seem to share either."

Ms Wilkins came back again, however, saying: "When Cllr Smith accuses Labour of being "mendacious" he verges on slander. I would like to remind him of his own words, as recorded in council minutes on numerous occasions. Please see some examples..."

Examples provided by Ms Wilkins:

- Council meeting July 21 2014, answer to oral question: "What we are not supportive of and have told TfL repeatedly is their intention to push the Bakerloo line all the way down to Hayes which would deny a lot of people of the south-western part of the Borough the opportunity to have direct access to Cannon Street and London Bridge."

... "without any apparent desire at TfL to do anything other than to run the Bakerloo Line down to Hayes at twice the price of the DLR which we do want, as opposed to the Bakerloo Line, which we do not."

- Council meeting Oct 13 2014, answer to oral question: ..."this proposition is neither the London Borough of Bromley's first (DLR extension to Bromley North) nor second (Tramlink extension to Crystal Palace) preferred transport solution for which we have been lobbying for as a Borough for a number of years. It is therefore safe to say that we hold considerable reservations over the extent of the proposal at present..."

- Council meeting Feb 23 2015, statement on TfL consultation: "He...explained that the council was broadly supportive of the extension of the Bakerloo line to Lewisham, but not an extension to Hayes which would see the existing national rail lines subsumed by the Bakerloo Line extension and the ultimate loss of direct connectivity to London Bridge, Cannon Street and Charing Cross. However, should it be possible to bring the Bakerloo Line to Bromley town centre via New Beckenham without the loss of any of the existing rail services then the Council could be prepared to support this in principle."

- Council meeting June 29 2015, answer to oral question: "I do not accept the premise of the assertion that "the people of Bromley have come out strongly in favour of the extension of the Bakerloo line to Beckenham Junction & Hayes." The figures quoted are an arbitrary, small number of self-selecting respondents to TfL's survey which do not accord with the findings of myself and others when seeking opinion both on the ground, and indeed on the very trains themselves, when the pros and cons of the question have been properly explained to them. "

In a poll conducted by the Bromley Times found that 86 per cent of the people that voted would like to see "as much public transport as they can get" in Bromley, and would welcome the extension of the Bakerloo line.

Appendix C

COUNCIL MEETING

1ST MARCH 2017

QUESTIONS FOR WRITTEN REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

What representations he has received about parking in Ravenswood Avenue and what has been his response?

Reply:

The only representation I recall receiving in recent times was copied in to you by email, along with my reply timed at Monday 22/08/2016 13:56.

2. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

If he will set out in table format for the each of the past three years the following:

- i. the number of people provided with accommodation as a result of being declared homeless;
- ii. the number of family units this represents;
- iii. the number who were or are Looked After Children ;
- iv. the principal reasons for them becoming homeless;
- v. the average length of time a person stayed in homeless accommodation
- vi. the average cost
- vii. the total cost?

Reply:

		2014/15	2015/16	2016/17 Q1-3
i	No of people provided with accommodation	1933	1956	1474
ii	Number of family Units	814	813	611
iii	Former looked after/ reason for homelessness	0	3 Main Reasons: Loss of private rented accommodation Loss of accommodation with relatives/friends	1 Reason: Domestic Violence
iv	3 main causes of homelessness	Loss of private rented accommodation Loss of accommodation with relatives/friends Relationship Breakdown/domestic violence	Loss of private rented accommodation Loss of accommodation with relatives/friends Relationship Breakdown/domestic violence	Loss of private rented accommodation Loss of accommodation with relatives/friends Relationship Breakdown/domestic violence
v	Average length of in homeless accommodation	428 Days	398 Days	455 Days

vi & vii: The accommodation costs relate to Nightly Paid placements only:

Average Costs Nightly Paid Accommodation Types per Week

Year 2016/17 (Dec 16)

Bed Size	Landlord Charge	HB Subsidy	Personal Charge	Cost to LBB
Room	193.87	164.40	16.10	13.37
Rooms	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Studio	235.41	194.11	0.00	41.30
1 Bed	267.78	182.25	0.00	85.53
2 Bed	327.64	208.20	0.00	119.44
3 Bed	384.73	227.10	0.00	157.63
4 Bed	474.95	342.28	0.00	132.67

Year 2015/16 (Year End)

Bed Size	Landlord Charge	HB Subsidy	Personal Charge	Cost to LBB
Room	208.93	167.57	16.10	25.26
Rooms	569.33	155.75	30.80	382.78
Studio	233.80	191.67	0.00	42.13
1 Bed	283.61	184.85	0.00	98.76
2 Bed	345.65	211.95	0.00	133.69
3 Bed	404.19	234.45	0.00	169.74
4 Bed	472.33	323.37	0.00	148.96

Year 2014/15 (Year End)

	Average Annual Cost			
	Landlord Charge	HB Subsidy	Personal Charge	Cost to LBB
Room	218.06	168.39	16.10	33.57
Rooms	362.62	155.76	30.80	176.06
Studio	243.71	193.64	0.00	50.07
1 Bed	295.08	192.30	0.00	102.78
2 Bed	351.74	221.88	0.00	129.85
3 Bed	435.83	264.62	0.00	171.21
4 Bed	486.53	344.65	0.00	141.87

Year 2013/14 (Year End)

	Average Annual Cost			
	Landlord Charge	HB Subsidy	Personal Charge	Cost to LBB
Room	196.01	167.73	16.10	635.10
Rooms	350.02	190.34	30.80	6,719.65
Studio	261.07	204.68	0.00	2,940.32
1 Bed	294.98	194.27	0.00	5,251.17
2 Bed	349.55	227.64	0.00	6,356.48
3 Bed	447.15	274.11	0.00	9,022.44
4 Bed	490.03	310.05	0.00	9,384.15

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17 to date
NPA 744006 3640	£6,789,464.03	£8,414,061.59	£10,662,181.00	£7,689,882.00
NPA 744006 9008	-	-	-	-
	<u>£4,607,703.78</u>	<u>£5,678,322.30</u>	<u>-£7,403,325.00</u>	<u>-£4,086,348.00</u>
	<u>2,181,760</u>	<u>2,735,739</u>	<u>3,258,856</u>	<u>3,603,534</u>

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

In 2017-18 budget what is the percentage of Council revenue accounted for by:

- i. Council tax
- ii. Government grant
- iii. Income from charges and fees
- iv. Interest on investments?

Reply:

The 2017-18 Draft Revenue Budget includes the following:

	£m	£m	%
Council Tax		143.2	27.0
Business Rates Retention		36.5	6.9
Government Grants			
Housing Benefit	132.3		
Dedicated Schools Grant	80.4		
Other Specific Grants	33.1		
Revenue Support Grant	<u>10.9</u>	256.7	48.3
Fees and Charges		46.1	8.7
Interest and Investment Income			
Rental Income from Investment Properties	9.8		
Interest on Balances	<u>2.9</u>	12.7	2.4
Other Grants, Reimbursements and Contributions		35.6	6.7
Total Income		530.8	100.0

4. From Councillor Ian Dunn to the Chairman of Development Control Committee

On how many planning permissions for new residential units from calendar years 2014 and 2015 has work not yet started? Please break down the response by year and by number of bedrooms. Please also provide the number of residential planning permissions granted in these two years, broken down by number of bedrooms?

Reply:

This information is not available at present but similar information will be prepared and forwarded to Cllr Dunn.

5. From Councillor Ian Dunn to the Leader of the Council

Further to his mail dated 12 January 2017, can the Leader explain how the Council's Policy Development & Scrutiny arrangements will apply to the responsibilities for Children's Services which were transferred from the Care Services Portfolio to the Education Portfolio?

Reply:

As Leader, I can make changes to Portfolio responsibilities, but any changes to PDS Committees will require approval by full Council. For the moment, PDS arrangements remain unchanged, but the Constitution Improvement Working Group has been looking at this issue and I anticipate that whatever changes are considered to be necessary can be put in place at the annual meeting of the Council.

6. From Councillor Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

How many of Bromley's homeless are armed forces veterans and has LBB a policy in place which gives specific ongoing support to them as they make the transition from institutional living to independent living?

Reply:

The Allocations Scheme is framed with specific provision to comply with the covenant and legislation regarding members of the armed forces and their family. The wider policies around homelessness and housing advice also seek to ensure the ongoing support for all households presenting and requiring assistance from the Support and Resettlement service with specific reference to those leaving the armed forces. This work seeks to support assistance provided directly to those leaving the armed forces to ensure they are able to secure accommodation.

There have not been any applicants accepted as homeless having left the armed forces in the past 5 years. Housing Register: 5 applications where the applicant has identified themselves as a former armed services personnel or family member.

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

What is the Council doing to anticipate the impact of the introduction of Universal Credit on the number of people applying to join the Housing Register? Please provide information on the number of people on the Homeless Register at the end of each month from January 2016 to now?

Reply:

The Council has a dedicated Welfare Reform Team within the Housing Department. The team work closely with housing benefits, the DWP and a range of agencies to raise awareness regarding the changes arising from welfare reform and support households through these changes to reduce the risk of homelessness.

This work includes identifying those households affected, to target advice and assistance. This work has included assisting households with benefit, financial and

budgeting advice, access to training, education and employment and moving to more affordable homeless.

The framework for UC provides for managed payments of the housing element in certain circumstances. Extensive work has been done to ensure that this process operates smoothly for those more vulnerable clients to ensure the rental element continues to be paid directly to the landlord.

Work is currently underway to prepare for the universal credit digital roll out in Bromley and this includes, as with all tranches data analysis to inform the likely impact on levels of housing need.

The Number of Households on the Housing Register:

Jan16	Feb 16	Mar 16	Apr 16	May 16	Jun 16	Jul 16	Aug 16	Sept 16	Oct 16	Nov 16	Dec 16	Jan 17
2731	2743	2853	2859	2976	3061	3140	3199	3329	3301	3380	3431	3544

8. From Councillor Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection

Have we any cases of radicalisation in the past 3 years and if so, how many and what was the date of the last case?

Reply:

We do not report on the detail of cases received relating to the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015. This is exempt from information requests and Home Office guidance states that we should not disclose detail around referrals.

Within Bromley the Council has a robust process in place to deal with any concerns that are raised around radicalisation. This referral process is aligned with all other safeguarding pathways and ensures that, in partnership with the police, risks to the individual and the public are firmly managed.

9. From Councillor Richard Williams to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Network Rail have felled a large number of trees at Anerley station without consultation with local residents. This has created loss of privacy for many. What is the process for the felling and should Network Rail have consulted with Bromley Council and residents?

Reply:

I am advised that Network Rail felled the trees on their own land and that it is not a requirement for them to consult with local residents or the Council.

I emailed them for more details on your behalf upon receipt of your enquiry and mid-afternoon today received the following response:

"A letter drop was not carried out on this occasion which was an oversight on our part (Network Rail) and we would like to apologise for that and any inconvenience this caused. Any future works will involve a letter drop to local residents"

Albeit disappointing, I hope that is helpful information for local residents.

10. From Councillor Richard Williams to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Once a report has been made on Fix My Street what is the target time for investigating & resolving issues which are the Council's responsibility? How does the Council monitor its contractors' compliance with these targets? What percentage of issues were resolved within target during 2016?

Reply:

Timescales vary depending on the service and the issue. Our service standard aims are outlined at:

<http://www.bromley.gov.uk/fixservices>

A twice weekly report of all open FMS reports is then generated with a RAG assessment being applied against each item.

In 2016 95.17% of all reports (phone and FMS – we monitor all together and FMS only cannot be split out independently) were dealt with within the expected status service times

11. From Councillor Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

Please supply copies of the equalities impact assessments undertaken in relation to the changes made to the non-residential contributions policy agreed by the Executive on 10th January 2017.

Reply:

The completed equalities impact assessment will be presented to Care Services PDS on the 21st March and will be published online at the same time.

12. From Councillor Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

There is evidence of extremely poor administration of utility and other bills which should have been passed on to tenants in relation to both Anerley Town Hall and Crystal Palace Museum. As a consequence, the council has not received considerable sums it is owed.

Given that the council also failed to pass on rent increases to Liberata for space they occupy at the Civic Centre site, please provide details of all such similar uncollected debts from across the Borough.

Please also clarify whether these sums are to be included in the additional income generated by Amey (of which the council will receive only a percentage) under the terms of the recently implemented TFM contract.

Reply:

It is accepted that a number of issues have come to light with regard to the billing of telephone bills for Anerley Town Hall business units and work is on-going to quantify this position. The significant point here though is that now the Council has moved to appoint Amey and Cushman and Wakefield, a major review of leases and licences is being undertaken to ensure the Council receives all income it is due under the terms of the leases. A number of workshops have taken place with the both organisations in conjunction with finance and legal leads from the authority to ensure that as we move forwards leases are and remain fit for purpose, this exercise was always envisaged as part of the commissioning of the Total Facilities Management contract with Amey and Cushman and Wakefield bringing a significant commercial approach to property management that did not exist before.

The additional income committed by Cushman and Wakefield will not comprise any monies owed to the Council as a consequence of existing leases.

13. From Councillor Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

What assurance can the Council give to residents thinking of becoming Street Friends that they are providing an additional service and not replacing council services?

Reply:

I am very happy to confirm that volunteer Street Friends serve their neighbourhoods and supplement the Council's Area Inspection function, either by taking direct action themselves between scheduled visits, and/or by reporting faults, ideally on Fix my Streets, the data from which assists line managers in their contract management function.

14. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for Environment

Will he produce a car park strategy for Penge that ensures that motorists do not receive unfair parking tickets in the Blenheim Centre in Penge?

Reply:

The Council is in the final stages of completing a parking review across a large swathe of Penge as you are already aware.

It is not within the Council's gift to dictate the parking ticket strategy operating within privately run Blenheim Centre Car Park.

I believe that the Penge & Cator Ward Councillors have actually covered this ground previously on their own website:

<https://pengeandcatorcouncillors.wordpress.com/2015/11/10/iceland-car-park-unjust-parking-fines-information/>

15. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

What cuts to the smoking cessation and sexual health services in Bromley are going to take place in 2017/18?

Reply:

The Council will not commission any smoking cessation service from 1 April 2017.

Bromley is part of a pan London Smoking Cessation Transformation Project which will deliver a Proactive Telephone Counselling pilot between May and October 2017.

In relation to sexual health services, the Council is in the process of re-procuring the community sexual health services.

The re-procured sexual health service focuses on early invention and enablement as well as encouraging services to be more integrated. The new service continues to have current elements of sexual health except sex education in schools. While we have not continued with direct delivery of sex education in schools, the specification requires the new provider to support and enable schools to develop and incorporate their own programme into the wider PHSE curriculum, where schools have expressed a wish to do so.

16. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services

What is the waiting time to see an occupational therapist and how many people are currently on that list?

Reply:

There are currently 145 people waiting to see an Occupational Therapist. Waiting time for non-urgent referrals is 3 months. These are people who need more than information, advice and guidance e.g. can access facilities to wash but cannot get in the bath or access their shower. The list is prioritised after an initial screening and those who need urgent support are seen within 5 working days. e.g. 1 day for safeguarding or those who cannot access the toilet?

We are addressing the waiting list by piloting mobile working, developing appointments at Lewis House. The Team Leaders are continually reviewing practice and systems to implement improvements to work flow which should reduce non urgent waiting times.

This page is left intentionally blank