

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 29 September 2016

Present

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)
Councillor Angela Page (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors David Cartwright QFSM, Ian Dunn,
Ellie Harmer, Samaris Huntington-Thresher and
Melanie Stevens

Also Present:

Councillor Colin Smith and Councillor Lydia Buttinger

13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Cllr Terence Nathan, Cllr Sarah Phillips, and Cllr Catherine Rideout.

14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations.

15 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

There were no questions to the Committee.

16 PETITION - GREEN GARDEN WASTE

Report CSD16135

A petition with over 400 signatures was received on 14th April 2016 from Carol Jonas on behalf of residents in Biggin Hill and surrounding areas calling for the Council to reconsider the decision to discontinue the Green Garden Waste collection site at Charles Darwin School. Full details of the petition were appended to Report CSD16135. The Portfolio Holder responded to the petition on 20th April 2016, but the petitioners were not satisfied and wished to exercise their right to a hearing before Members.

As the petition had more than 250 verified signatures the lead petitioner or their nominee was entitled, under the Council's Petition Scheme, to address the Committee for up to five minutes. Members could then choose whether or not to recommend any further action.

The Lead Petitioner was not in attendance to address Members. Following a short discussion, the Chairman moved that no further action is taken in response to the petition, seconded by Cllr Page. Comments from Cllr Melanie Stevens (Biggin Hill) were noted so they could be considered when scrutinising the draft Portfolio Plan next year and how the Green Garden Waste service can best evolve going forward within budget constraints.

RESOLVED that no further action be recommended in response to the petition.

17 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 7TH JUNE 2016

The minutes were agreed.

18 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

Two questions had been received for oral reply with one question received for written reply. Details of the questions and replies are at **Appendix A**.

19 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

a BUDGET MONITORING 2016/17

Report FSD16054

Based on expenditure and activity levels to 31st May 2016, the latest 2016/17 budget monitoring position for the Environment Portfolio showed a balanced budget.

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

A Member suggested that the problem of fly-tipping appeared to be worsening and asked if there had been any increase in expenditure as a result. Officers offered to look at relevant figures, including occurrences and tonnages from fly-tipping, and respond.

RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the latest 2016/17 budget projection for the Environment Portfolio.

b CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 1ST QUARTER 2016/17

Report FSD16064

At its meeting on 20th July 2016, the Executive agreed a revised Capital Programme for 2016/17 to 2019/20. Changes in respect of the Environment Portfolio were outlined and a revised programme for the portfolio presented.

Report FSD 16064 also included first quarter spend against the 2016/17 Portfolio Capital Programme budget and comments on individual schemes. Additionally, details of the 2015/16 capital programme outturn for the Portfolio were included. A total of £998k net underspend from 2015/16 was re-phased into 2016/17 and as part of the first quarter monitoring exercise, £2,131k was re-phased from 2016/17 to 2017/18 to reflect revised estimates of when expenditure on the Beckenham Town Centre improvements scheme is likely to be incurred.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to note and confirm changes agreed by the Executive on 20th July 2016.

c TFL FUNDED WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2017/18

Report ES16047

Consistent with the Council's Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and a provisional formula allocation of £2.482m Transport for London (TfL) funding for 2017/18, approval was sought to develop a recommended list of detailed schemes for submission to TfL on 28th October 2016. This would be based on a programme of formula-funded projects for 2017/18 as appended to Report ES16047.

Ring-fenced funding would also be available to support other programmes including Local Transport Priorities, Principal Road Maintenance, Bridges and Structures, and the Beckenham Town Centre major scheme.

All schemes would be subject to normal consultation with residents and Ward Members and Portfolio Holder decision.

Cllr David Cartwright (Mottingham and Chislehurst North Ward) noted that there appeared to be more automated bus arrival time indicators at bus stops in neighbouring areas of L B Greenwich and L B Lewisham. Officers would enquire with TfL on the level of bus stop indicators in L B Bromley compared with other boroughs. On the basis that indicators could be sited at stops within areas of greatest bus use, the Portfolio Holder understood there may have been discussion at TfL on financial capping which could have impacted the installation of indicators before L B Bromley had been reached. The Chairman suggested finding some specific examples in the borough where indicators should ideally be sited; alternatively, the matter could be raised at the next Public Transport Liaison meeting.

Cllr Ellie Harmer (Plaistow and Sundridge Ward) also highlighted a problem at Sundridge Park railway station. Cllr Harmer considered the side of the station secluded and poorly lit, the location having become a trouble spot with a drugs problem understood to be present nearby. The station exit was considered dangerous in the dark. Cllr Harmer asked how it might be possible to take her concerns forward so they could be best addressed; dealing with TfL had been difficult and there seemed no staff presence at the station. Officers offered to look into the problem and with further details from Cllr Harmer would take the matter forward.

In response to a question from the Chairman concerning the Borough's Cycling Programme, there was doubt on whether further one-off TfL funding would be available for the programme as its funding stream supporting the (former) Mayor's Cycling Vision had now ceased. However, the proposed programme of formula-funded projects 2017/18 for LIP funding included cycling investment and this would continue. A Cycling Quietway route would be finalised in November 2016 and a further proposed Quietway might also be finalised although it had recently encountered design problems and might not qualify for TfL funding.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree that:

(1) the programme of schemes for 2017/18, outlined at Enclosure 1 to Report ES16047, be approved for submission to TfL; and

(2) the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, be authorised to make post-submission changes to the programme to reflect necessary changes to priority, potential delays to implementation following detailed design and consultation, or other unforeseen events.

d SEVENOAKS WAY JUNCTION ALTERATION AT MAIN ROAD

Report ES16038

Approval was sought to alter the design of the congestion relief and casualty reduction scheme at the junction of Sevenoaks Way and Main Road as implemented in 2014. There had been a significant increase in the number of vehicles turning right into Main Road, at times blocking north bound through traffic on Sevenoaks Way. With more than three vehicles waiting to turn right, a fourth vehicle protrudes into the path of northbound vehicles, often blocking the junction during peak periods.

Following complaints (from the local Residents Association, Gray's Farm school, and some parents) of no guard railings at the staggered crossing on Sevenoaks Way, south of Main Road, and this appearing to deter some parents from using the crossing and walking their children to school, it was proposed to remove the crossing and replace it with a straight direct crossing. By removing the central island for the staggered crossing the carriageway

would then be widened to create two northbound lanes and the new crossing would also remove parental concern on waiting in the centre of a busy road.

Since Report ES16038 had been drafted, Ward Member comments supporting the proposals had been received. In commenting on the scheme, Cllr Page (Cray Valley East Ward Member in addition to Committee Vice-Chairman) offered her full support for the proposals. Cllr Page added that the double yellow lines along Main Road appeared not to extend far enough back to enable the filter to work properly. As such, officers would look to incorporate measures in the amended scheme design to accommodate Cllr Page's comments.

RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) approve the junction alterations at the location, as per plan 11245-301;

(2) delegate to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, authority to approve the scheme's detailed design; and

(3) agree that the scheme cost of £74k be funded from the TfL LIP budget for Congestion Relief Schemes for 2016/17.

e **PENGE PARKING REVIEW**

Report ES16046

Following concerns from residents and Ward Members, a number of Penge roads have been identified with parking problems and informal consultation was undertaken on the level of support for local permit parking. A parking scheme for a road would only be considered where a majority of residents in the road considered it had a parking problem or might be adversely affected by a proposed scheme nearby.

The consultation indicated that a majority of residents in a number of roads supported permit parking (i.e. Crampton Road, Kingswood Road, Phoenix Road, Lucas Road, Southley Street, Raleigh Road, Cottingham Road, Kingsdale Road and Kenilworth Road) and to progress a parking scheme it was intended to formally consult residents in those roads, particularly as a petition against any form of permit parking for a number of the roads had been received in 2011. Formal consultation would detail proposed changes, costs, Controlled Parking Zone times, location of bays, waiting restrictions (yellow lines) and local amendments for the scheme's objectives.

For a number of other roads across the area, informal consultation indicated conflicting views on the need for permit parking, including a small majority against in St Johns Road, Wordsworth Road, and Royston Road, and a small majority supportive in Station Road, Torr Road, and Clevedon Road. Views from Barsons Close residents indicated an equal number in support and

against. Further consultation would include a number of such roads providing mixed feedback; any scheme might directly impact residents and cause displacement, creating other issues that could impact views.

Parking permits are not supported by residents of Penge Lane, Mosslea Road, Queen Adelaide Road, Montrave Road, Westbury Road and parts of the High Street, Penge as few parking problems are experienced. The roads would therefore be excluded from any scheme at this time.

A scheme would also need to consider other road users given the close proximity of Penge High Street and ensure that commuter parking is not displaced to other roads. As a result, additional Pay and Display parking is likely to be needed.

Welcoming the review, and supporting recommendations in Report ES16046, Cllr Peter Fookes (Penge and Cator) highlighted the level of consultation response, preferring to see a higher level of feedback in future consultations. Thanking officers for work to date, Cllr Kevin Brooks (Penge and Cator) highlighted that not all residents in the area were aware of the likely £80 cost of a parking permit operating in excess of four hours or for all day use.

Members were advised that the consultation questionnaire was bland in order to gauge views on whether parking is a problem in Penge roads. Should a majority of residents in a road consider parking a problem, more detail on a proposed scheme could be provided in a second, more formal, consultation. Historically, response levels to consultations had been low, and a response rate above 20% was considered reasonable. The rate of response had not improved significantly with online consultation. The Portfolio Holder welcomed any Ward Member input on the wording of questions for the second consultation and a further report would be brought to the Portfolio Holder via the Committee following the further consultation.

A Member questioned whether the roads listed at paragraph 4.7 of Report ES16046 should be excluded from any scheme design as they appeared to be in the centre of the proposed scheme area. For residents in roads not expressing parking concerns, the Portfolio Holder suggested a further communication listing roads where it was intended to proceed with a scheme and highlighting the potential for parking displacement. The Head of Traffic and Road Safety saw no difficulty in going back to residents on this basis. The Portfolio Holder felt that a scheme should be progressed in roads such as Kenilworth Road where there is a clear majority in support. But in other cases with a small majority/minority, the Portfolio Holder implied that residents should be approached again as there might be specific reasons for the views of residents e.g. possible parking in Royston Road associated with the nearby Citroen dealership. Although this would amount to a re-consultation, the Chairman suggested that no scheme plans are drawn up for roads having no overall support e.g. those roads at paragraph 4.7 of report ES16046 but should there be parts of such roads where residents would like a permit scheme it was suggested that this be considered.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree that:

(1) Crampton Road, Kingswood Road, Phoenix Road, Lucas Road, Cottingham Road, Kingsdale Road, Southey Street and Raleigh Road be further consulted on the possibility of a Controlled Parking Zone for the area with the required plans showing the proposed changes;

(2) Torr Road, Wordsworth Road, St Johns Road, Station Road, Barsons Close and Lucas Road are also further consulted with appropriate plans on the possibility of a Controlled Parking Zone / permit parking scheme being implemented;

(3) Clevedon Road and Royston Road be further consulted on the possibility of a permit parking scheme also being implemented, given the likely introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone to Kenilworth Road and other adjacent roads within the area;

(4) any minor adjustments to the consultation to be delegated to the Executive Director of Environment & Community Services with the input of Ward Members and the agreement of the Portfolio Holder; and

(5) further to the formal consultation to be carried out, any scheme suggested for implementation be scrutinised by the Environment PDS Committee.

f ELMSTEAD LANE (PRIVATE STREET WORKS) - FIRST RESOLUTION

Report ES16018

Footfall is high along the eastern footway of Elmstead Lane, between its junction with Walden Road and Grange Drive, due to the proximity of Elmstead Woods railway station, a school, and a bus stop. Currently, the footway is not made up to adoption standards and the Council is not responsible for its maintenance and repair. To adopt and make-up the footway, a First Resolution was sought under the Private Street Works Code, covered by the Highways Act 1980.

The Council originally proposed to construct a footway on the basis that it fell within the corridor of maintainable highway. This was challenged by owners of premises fronting Elmstead Lane but subsequently it was understood that all but one of the owner/occupiers of the eight properties fronting Elmstead Lane between Walden Road and Grange Drive accepted the necessity of a new, paved footway. In view of the challenge to the status of the land for the footway and ongoing opposition from an owner of one of the properties, legal advice referred to action under the Private Street Works Code as the most appropriate approach in the circumstances. This would allow the Council to carry out works in a street not adopted as highway and would enable an owner to raise an objection to the Council's proposals on specific grounds contained in s.208 of the Highways Act 1980.

S.236 of the Highways Act 1980 permits the Council, as the Street Works Authority, to resolve to bear the whole of the cost of the street works, rather than recharge the whole or a portion of the cost to the frontage owners. In this instance, it was proposed to use Section 106 funding in respect of the Ravensbourne College development (provided to improve the footway area between Walden Road and Grange Drive, including the alighting point at the bus stop) for the cost of the works at £20k.

Members supported the recommendations in Report ES16018. It was intended to bring the Second Resolution for Portfolio Holder approval via the Committee's meeting on 8th November 2016.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) approve the layout of a footway on the eastern side of Elmstead Lane, between Walden Road and the northern boundary of number 36 Elmstead Lane, as shown on drawing number 11429-03 Rev A;**
- (2) approve the layout of a footway on the eastern side of Elmstead Lane, between the northern boundary of number 36 to the junction with Grange Drive, as shown on drawing number 11429-05;**
- (3) make a First Resolution under S205 (1) of the Highways Act 1980 in respect of Elmstead Lane as follows –**

The Council do hereby declare that the eastern footway of Elmstead Lane, between the junctions with Walden Road and Grange Drive is not levelled, paved, metalled, flagged, channelled, made good and lighted to its satisfaction and therefore resolves to execute street works therein, under the provisions of the Private Street Works Code, as set out in the Highway Act 1980.

Schedule of works

Part 1 - From the street junction with Walden Road, along the eastern side of the street to the northern boundary of number 36 Elmstead Lane, all as more particularly shown on drawing number 11429-03 Rev A.

Part 2 – From the northern boundary of number 36 Elmstead Lane, to the street junction with Grange Drive, all as more particularly shown on drawing number 11429-05.

g INSTALLATION OF A PLAY AREA IN QUEENS GARDENS

Report ES16044

Following construction of the new restaurant terrace alongside Queens Gardens, Bromley, proposals were outlined for a new play area to replace the

former maze at the Gardens. Intu had provided a sum of £60k which would be used to install the play area, including design, purchase and installation of play equipment, fencing and landscaping.

Following consultations with Intu Bromley and Ward Members, a rustic/naturalistic space was proposed to produce an imaginative and functional play space. Design and Build tenders had been sought to develop the project site with the aims of the project being:

- to provide an imaginative, natural and coordinated play experience for children and young people within an existing public open space;
- to create a play space that will please, excite, challenge and stimulate children's imagination and senses, utilising the play space as well as the surrounding environment; and
- to promote positive attitudes to children and young people in the community through play opportunities and providing a safe environment for play.

In discussion, Members were handed design images for the play area. It was the intention to use synthetic grass which would significantly help to protect the nearby restaurants from mud being walked on to floor areas during winter months.

Members supported the recommendation in Report ES16044.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree the installation of a new play area in place of the former maze at Queen's Gardens, Bromley, funded from Intu's £60k donation.

20 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE

a HIGHWAYS INVESTMENT

Report ES16048

Members considered alternative funding arrangements for highways maintenance.

Planned highways maintenance reduced reactive maintenance, improved value for money and customer satisfaction, reduced unplanned network disruption, and contributed to a reduced level of damage claims. As carriageways deteriorate through weathering and traffic, the requirement for protective or structural maintenance could be predicted with some accuracy.

Sustained annual investment had helped to keep the principal (A) road network in good condition. The non-principal (B/C) network had also been a revenue funding priority in recent years having a condition indicator of 3%. However, the unclassified road network had a road condition indicator of 17%.

Footways were in a better structural condition with the main causes of deterioration - root damage from street trees and over-running vehicles - both being effectively managed through reactive and minor works.

Although funding through revenue budgets had allowed non-principal and unclassified roads to be maintained in a stable condition, it had been insufficient for improvement so that expenditure on reactive works could reduce. Roads with the highest priority had been put forward for planned works programmes in accordance with expected budget provision.

Recent benchmarking with neighbouring boroughs showed that prices within the Council's current Major Works contract for planned highway maintenance projects are at least 28% lower than similar recently awarded contracts. The Council's contract has recently been extended to June 2018 and contract prices were anticipated to increase when the contract is re-tendered.

To fund improvement works during the next two years and allow conditions to significantly improve in the short term using existing contract prices, £11.8m of upfront funding was proposed for release from capital receipts. The funding would allow revenue expenditure to reduce by £2.5m per annum for five years from 2017/18, at a total of £12.5m (£11.9m from planned works and £0.6m from reactive maintenance). This would be partly offset by a total reduction in treasury management income of some £167k over the five year period. After five years, the benefits of upfront funding would be reviewed and a decision taken on whether future funding is delivered from capital receipts (subject to future availability) or from revenue budgets.

The latest treatment survey suggested that future investment was best focussed on carriageway maintenance to obtain long-term benefits, with footway maintenance continuing to rely on reactive and minor works funding.

A proposed Working Group of the Committee would agree service levels and treatment options. Future work programmes funded by the investment would then be considered by the Portfolio Holder following the Committee's scrutiny.

In discussion, it was confirmed that treatment priorities would normally depend on the extent of a road's use. Cllr Samaris Huntington-Thresher (Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom) referred to a high number of unclassified roads in her ward, suggesting they might benefit from surface dressing. However, some surface dressings were not durable and could only be considered short term solutions; consideration of various treatment options could be considered by the Working Group. Given the current contract costs (and a reduced level of reactive maintenance in future), savings would accrue by undertaking the works from next year. The Portfolio Holder felt the recommendations made financial sense given a limited return on investment elsewhere. A further Highways report would be presented to the Committee's next meeting on 8th November 2016.

Roads can be resurfaced quickly and officers would look to co-ordinate improvement works with emergency services to minimise disruption for road users. Member input would be valued on whether it was now considered necessary to treat a number of cul-de-sacs in the borough. Closes had previously been treated with surface dressing using funds from the reactive maintenance budget and it was necessary for Members to consider where a change was needed to the types of roads considered for treatment. If part road treatment was considered, a Member suggested treating the whole road for longer term savings should the remaining part need treatment in a further three to four years.

Members supported the recommendations to the Executive.

RESOLVED that Executive be recommended to:

(1) approve capital funding of £11.8m for investment in planned highway maintenance, to be funded from capital receipts, and to add the scheme to the Capital Programme, subject to approval by Full Council; and

(2) subject to the above approval, the revenue budget for highways works would reduce by £2.5m per annum for the period 2017/18 to 2021/22, partly offset by an estimated reduction in treasury management income of £167k over the five year period.

21 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME, MATTERS ARISING AND CONTRACTS REGISTER

Report ES16042

Members considered the Committee's Forward Work Programme and progress on requests made at previous meetings.

Details of Environment contracts from the Corporate Contract Register were also provided (as presented to the Contracts Sub-committee meeting on 24th August 2016) along with a summary of contracts having a total value greater than £50k (i.e. duration in years multiplied by annual value). The summary also covered changes since the Contract Register was produced along with other relevant information.

The On-Street Posters contract was now for tender with feedback due in mid-November. The position had also progressed for all other Portfolio contracts having a Red or Amber rating in August. A gate report for monitoring the landfill site at Coney Hill, Oxsted, would be presented to the Committee's next meeting.

Concerning the outcome of tendering for Parking Services, officers were looking to present a report in November. If it was not possible to report to the Committee's next meeting, a report could be considered by the Executive and

Resources PDS Committee on 23rd November 2016 with Environment PDS Members invited to the meeting.

As it was not possible for the Portfolio Holder to attend the Committee's next meeting scheduled for 8th November 2016, consideration was given to moving the meeting to 16th November 2016. However, as at least three Members were unable to make this date it was agreed to proceed with the original 8th November date.

Three Working Groups were established by the Committee at its previous meeting to cover Street Scene, Highways and Footways and Congestion. Memberships for the Street Scene and Highways/Footways Working Groups were confirmed and it was agreed that the Street Scene Working Group would meet on 11th October 2016 at 5pm and 25th October 2016 at 6pm. The Highways/Footways Group would meet after October followed by meetings of the Congestion Working Group.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the Forward Work Programme be noted;**
- (2) progress concerning previous Committee requests be noted;**
- (3) the Corporate Contract Register extract and commentary related to Environment Portfolio contracts be noted;**
- (4) membership of the Street Scene Working Group comprise –**

Cllr Ian Dunn, Cllr William Huntington-Thresher, Cllr Chris Pearce (Non-Committee Member), Cllr Sarah Phillips and Cllr Catherine Rideout (membership of the group would also remain open to other Committee Members);

- (5) membership of the Highways/Footways Working Group comprise –**

Cllr David Cartwright, Cllr Ian Dunn, Cllr Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Cllr William Huntington-Thresher, Cllr Angela Page and Cllr Melanie Stevens.

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

23 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 7TH JUNE 2016

The minutes were agreed.

24 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF A PART 2 REPORT TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

a SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS UPDATE: HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORTATION AND LANDSCAPES

Report ES16026

An update was provided on Section 106 (S106) Agreements where funding related to schemes involving highways, transportation mitigation, and landscape management and maintenance.

The Executive and Resources PDS Committee had previously asked for such reports to be presented to PDS Committees.

The Chairman noted that sometimes S106 agreements can be tightly worded, not allowing for any subsequent change in plans for highway schemes, and it was agreed to raise this with the Development Control Committee.

Members resolved to note progress in the use of funds received from S106 agreements along with S106 funds which were awaited. Recommendations were also made for the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services to have delegated authority for expenditure of S106 funds up to £20k; that S106 funds be used for suitable schemes that had or were being developed (tabled within Report ES16026); and that certain other funds tabled within Report ES16026 be earmarked for potential return to developers.

25 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF A PART 2 REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE

a FORMAL CONSULTATION ON OUTLINE SERVICE PROPOSALS AND PROCUREMENT STRATEGY - ARBORICULTURAL MAINTENANCE CONTRACT 2017-2019

Report ES16049

Procurement options were presented for arboriculture services to maintain the Council's tree stock across the borough. The current contract expired in July 2017.

The Meeting ended at 8.35 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

Appendix A

QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ORAL REPLY FROM MR RUPERT MORRIS

1. Five years ago 77% of residents of Wordsworth Road opposed any scheme for their road. In this year's survey only 43% wanted a scheme. With no mandate for a scheme, can we ask for Wordsworth Road to be taken out and treated like Penge Lane and Queen Adelaide?

Reply

Subject to possible further thoughts emerging later this evening, Southey Street and Raleigh Street will be approved for inclusion within the emerging Penge Controlled Parking Zone.

If that is confirmed, residents of Wordsworth Road would then be advised accordingly and asked whether in light of the changed facts on the ground, similarly the risk of additional displaced parking the change would likely cause them, they wished to re-consider their original position.

The Council will respect that expressed opinion, whatever it might be, and a subsequent decision as to whether Wordsworth Road itself would join the scheme too, will be based solely on the majority of wishes expressed in response to that consultation.

Supplementary Question

Noting specific road by road consultation results outlined in Report ES16046 (to be later considered by Members during the meeting), Mr Morris sought confirmation that of all roads listed in the consultation results, Wordsworth Road secured the highest number of residents (at 21) expressing opposition to permit parking in their road, so indicating the strongest level of opposition to such a scheme for a road in the area of consultation.

Reply

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that Wordsworth Road was the most strongly opposed road to a parking permit scheme.

2. In Wordsworth Road we don't have a parking problem, apart from Friday am when worshippers are attending the mosque for prayers. We fear the scheme will create a parking problem if introduced into neighbouring roads. Can you reassure residents that it is not the intention to transfer the problem?

Reply

I would respectfully refer you to my previous response. There will almost certainly be displacement of parking into Wordsworth Road, were residents living there to vote against joining the scheme being implemented in neighbouring roads.

Supplementary Question

Mr Morris thought there would not be that much displacement, taking account of low kerbs in reaching his conclusion.

Reply

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that ultimately it would be a choice by local residents. If a majority wanted assistance, the Council would provide support and any displacement would be managed by permit parking.

QUESTION TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR WRITTEN REPLY FROM TRACY SPEECHLEY

I would like to pose a question regarding the dangerous junction where Parish Lane meets Lennard Road. This is in no way linked to the accident there recently. I have not put a question forward before, however I would like the Council to review the junction with regards to the safety aspect which has been raised on numerous occasions over the years.

1. What traffic calming measures are available which could facilitate the following:

- Reduction of speeding on Lennard Road & Parish Lane;
- Poor visibility when pulling out from Parish Lane onto Lennard Road.

Reply

It is important to note that investment in any traffic calming engineering works, is strictly driven by the number of recurring personal injury related accidents happening at any given location to ensure maximum return is made on the limited public monies provided for such measures.

To that end, prior to the tragic crime committed locally on 31st August, I am advised that there have thankfully only been 2 personal injury accidents at this junction since 2011 (in January and February 2016), which would in all candour exclude it from any list requiring early engineering intervention.

To answer your specific questions:

1. Were speeding assessed to be an issue on either road, the Council could provide additional signage (either rotational posters or Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS). Furthermore, if either road were deemed to be a 'Ward Priority' by the local Safer Neighbourhood Panel and Team, it could then benefit from periodic spot checks enforcement by the Police.

2. Save possible future redevelopment of either property most adjacent to the junction, the only obvious opportunity to improve the sightline(s) would be to build out the entrance by increasing the area of what is currently pavement.

This page is left intentionally blank