LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

MINUTES

of the proceedings of the Meeting of the Council of the Borough held at 7.00 pm on 24 February 2020

Present:

The Worshipful the Mayor Councillor Nicholas Bennett MA J.P.

The Deputy Mayor Councillor Kira Gabbert

Councillors

Gareth Allatt	Peter Fortune	Angela
Vanessa Allen	Hannah Gray	Chris I
Graham Arthur	Christine Harris	Neil Redo
Kathy Bance MBE	Colin Hitchins	Will Ro
Yvonne Bear	Samaris Huntington-	Michael R
Julian Benington	Thresher	Richard
Kim Botting FRSA	William Huntington-	Suraj S
Mike Botting	Thresher	Colin
Mark Brock	Simon Jeal	Diane
Kevin Brooks	David Jefferys	Gary S
David Cartwright QFSM	Charles Joel	Melanie
Mary Cooke	Josh King	Harry S
Aisha Cuthbert	Christopher Marlow	Kieran
Peter Dean	Robert Mcilveen	Michael
lan Dunn	Russell Mellor	Pauline T
Nicky Dykes	Alexa Michael	Michael
Judi Ellis	Peter Morgan	Stephe
Robert Evans	Keith Onslow	Angela
Simon Fawthrop	Tony Owen	

a Page Pierce din FCCA owlands Rutherford Scoates Sharma Smith Smith Stevens Stevens Stranger n Terry l Tickner Tunnicliffe el Turner en Wells Wilkins

The meeting was opened with prayers

In the Chair
The Mayor
Councillor Nicholas Bennett MA J.P.

169 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Marina Ahmad, Katy Boughey, Will Harmer and Kate Lymer.

Council 24 February 2020

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Julian Benington, Aisha Cuthbert, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Russell Mellor and Michael Rutherford.

170 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Simon Fawthrop declared an interest in relation to minute 178 (TEC Amendment) as he was about to take delivery of an electric car.

171 To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 9th December 2019

RESOLVED that, subject to the addition of Councillor Michael Turner to the list of those present, the minutes of the meeting held on 9th December 2019 be confirmed.

172 Petitions

There were no petitions to consider.

173 Questions

Three questions had been received from members of the public for oral reply. The questions, with the answers given, are set out in <u>Appendix A</u> to these minutes.

Seven questions had been received from members of the public for written reply. The questions, with the answers given, are set out in <u>Appendix B</u> to these minutes.

Sixteen questions had been received from members of the Council for oral reply. The questions, with the replies given, are set out in <u>Appendix C</u> to these minutes.

Seven questions had been received from members of the Council for written reply. The questions, with the answers given, are set out in <u>Appendix D</u> to these minutes.

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

Two statements were made as follows -

(A) From the Portfolio Holder for Adult Care and Health, Councillor Diane Smith - The Council's vision for the future of the borough's Day Centres.

The Portfolio Holder began by explaining that the Council's strategy was clearly stated at the front of the Ageing Well Strategy - "We want to ensure that older people retain their independence for as long as possible, with the

assistance of family, friends, faith and community groups, the voluntary sector and, where necessary, the Council and Health Services."

In 2013, the Council had moved from commissioning the service through a block contract to spot purchasing arrangements, and had put in place transitional funding arrangements to help providers secure long-term sustainability. They were also encouraged to develop their offer to self-funders. Reports to Members in early 2013 showed that the Council's approach had been extensively discussed with providers for at least three years previously. In 2017/18, the Council had agreed a one year waiver of the full market rent for one of the Day Centre providers. In 2018/19 a similar waiver agreement was made, extending to the main Day Centre providers for older people at a cost to the Council of approximately £140k. A return to full market rent was due from 2019/20, but the Council, aware that commissioners were continuing to work with providers, agreed to reduce the rent for this financial year too.

With the support of Council commissioners, providers had taken measures to improve their sustainability, including by reviewing prices and developing new partnerships, development of a marketing strategy to promote the day centres and build up their private client-base, sharing of resources and successful business models, including reviews of pricing structures, staff ratios and work rotas, work on optimising the use of day centre buildings, and supporting care staff to study for vocational qualifications whilst working. In July 2019 a possible funding opportunity had been identified for one of the day centres, and this was just being actioned by the provider. Commissioners continued to work with the Day Centres to develop their offer in a way that was sustainable and met the changing needs of individuals.

Responding to questions, the Portfolio Holder stated that, in terms of the strategic view, Members would have the opportunity to comment on the action plan that was part of the Ageing Well Strategy. Residents did have the ability to choose where to go, and did not necessarily choose to use traditional day centres. As an example, Lewisham Council had recently reduced their day centres from three to one in view of the impact of direct payments and there being a different offer in the community. The Portfolio Holder agreed that day centres did give people choice, but they were not always choosing to use the Day Centres and there were vacancies. She also agreed that Day Centres were important for offering respite, and the views of carers needed to be taken into account. The Ageing Well action plan was due to be considered at the next Adult Care and Health PDS Committee meeting in March.

(B) From the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management, Councillor Graham Arthur - The proposed staff pay award for 2020/21.

The Portfolio Holder stated that, in six weeks' time, Bromley staff would be the only local government workers in London who would know what their salary was. While the national pay rise was likely to be 2%, Bromley's increase

would be 2.5%, payable from 1st April. The Council was also setting aside £200k for merit payments - over £1m had already been paid out since the beginning of the scheme. The Council was also giving an extra reward to those at the lowest end of the pay scale by eliminating spinal points 4-8, moving them into point 9.

The Council depended on the quality of its staff, and they deserved leadership and motivation. There were now 30 trained mental health first aiders, a break-out room and access to more than 20 staff benefits. These included a salary sacrifice leased car scheme (a suggestion from staff), a childcare deposit loan scheme to help parents get back to work (a suggestion from a Member), and the annual leave purchasing scheme (suggested by the PDS Committee.)

In November the first staff conference had been held to inform staff about the transformation programme and the investment in IT to facilitate flexible working. The roll-out of the £5.2m IT improvement had been shortlisted for a national award. The Departmental Representatives Forum continued to shape what was done - their work was much appreciated.

The Council was investing in the staff of tomorrow through the YES scheme and the Frontline scheme. Twenty four apprentices and four graduates had been recruited, and these were soon to be increased. Most had now been recruited to full-time employment, some in senior positions.

The Council would continue to motivate, consult and reward as it moved to becoming a dream organisation, a place of choice to work.

In response to questions, the Portfolio Holder agreed that the Council was competing with other boroughs for the same potential employees, particularly for social workers. While salaries were often higher in inner London, Bromley could emphasise that it was an attractive place to live and work, with excellent staff benefits and working environment. He considered that staff morale was high and that turnover and retention were improving.

175 2020/21 Council Tax Report CSD20019

Councillor Colin Smith, seconded by Councillor Graham Arthur, moved acceptance of the recommendations made by the Executive. In moving the recommendations, Councillor Smith confirmed that there were no changes to the final Mayoral precept.

The following amendments were moved by Councillor Angela Wilkins and seconded by Councillor Ian Dunn -

"The following amendments are proposed to the recommendations of the Executive set out in the Blue Book on pages 55-107.

The following changes be made to the recommended budget for 2020/21:

Amended Recommendation (2.1):

(e) Approves a revised Central Contingency sum of £12,081k to reflect the changes in (d) and (p) to (v);

Additional Recommendation (2.1):

- (I) Agrees that £635k be carried forward from underspends in the 2019/20 Central Contingency to fund costs in 2020/21 relating to:
 - implement light controlled pedestrian crossing at Chislehurst Crossroads at a cost of £350k;
 - install a 20mph speed limit for schools at a cost of £285k;
- (m) Requests that officers review options to revise CPZ charges to be based on emissions with higher charges introduced for second and subsequent vehicles at the same address. The scheme proposals to be self-financing;
- (n) Agrees to additional one off funding of £2m to be utilised over 4 years towards building maintenance with monies to be met from the Council's Invest to Save Fund earmarked reserve;
- (o) Agrees the removal of the payment of council tax by care leavers up to the age of 25 years funded from a further increase in the empty homes premium for properties empty for more than two years to 100% (assume changes from October 2020);
- (p) Provision of landlord and tenant support services at an annual cost of £70k to be funded from the Council's 2020/21 Central Contingency Sum:
- (q) Agrees to additional funding of £300k per annum for respite services to be funded from the IBCF monies set aside (£1,677k to support hospital discharge);
- (r) Apply London Living Wage as the minimum pay level for Council staff at an annual cost of £25k per annum to be funded from the Council's 2020/21 Central Contingency Sum. Also agree to commission a review at a cost of £25k to consider the implication of applying London Living Wage as a minimum pay for all LBB contractors. The review to be funded from the Commissioning Authority Programme earmarked reserve;
- (s) Agrees additional funding of £100k for mental health services with costs met from the Council's 2020/21 Central Contingency Sum;
- (t) Agrees additional funding of £250k for public health with costs to be met from the Council's 2020/21 Central Contingency Sum;

- (u) Agrees one off funding of £200k for installation of additional CCTV cameras to be funded from the Environmental Initiatives/High Street and Parks Improvement earmarked reserves. The ongoing running costs of £40k to be met from the Council's 2020/21 Central Contingency Sum;
- (v) Agrees additional funding of £100k for youth services/facilities with costs to be met from the Council's 2020/21 Central Contingency Sum;
- (w) Agrees funding of £50k per annum for Small Business Grants with the cost to be met from the Growth Fund Earmarked Reserve over a four year period;
- (x) Agrees one off funding of £5m from the Council's Invest to Save Fund earmarked reserve to provide Carbon Zero 2029 Target initiatives/investment;
- (y) Agrees funding of £250k per annum for additional staff to aid the housing development programme with the costs for four years to be met from the Council's Growth Fund earmarked reserve;
- (z) Notes that any ongoing costs will be reviewed as part of the 2021/22 budget preparation.

Further details are provided in Appendix 1 (Appendix E to these minutes).

Amended Recommendation (2.3):

- 3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2020/21 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act):
- (a) £545,579k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
- (b) £378,596k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates or the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act."

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

Accordingly, the recommendations of the Executive, as moved by Councillor Colin Smith and seconded by Councillor Graham Arthur were CARRIED as follows -

That Council -

(1) (a) Approves the schools budget of £79.506m which matches the estimated level of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) after academy recoupment;

- (b) Approves the draft revenue budgets (as in Appendix 2 to the report) for 2020/21 to include the following updated changes:
 - (i) minor variation of £27k relating to the collection fund surplus/ collection fund surplus set aside.
- (c) Agrees that Chief Officers identify alternative savings/mitigation within their departmental budgets where it is not possible to realise any savings/mitigation reported to the previous meeting of the Executive held on 15th January 2020;
- (d) Approves the following provisions for levies for inclusion in the budget for 2020/21:

	£'000
London Pensions Fund Authority *	447
London Boroughs Grant Committee	248
Environment Agency (flood defence etc.) *	252
Lee Valley Regional Park *	309
Total	1,256

^{*} Provisional estimate at this stage

- (e) Approves a revised Central Contingency sum of £12,666k to reflect the changes in (d);
- (f) Notes that the 2020/21 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 2020/21 revenue budgets to reflect the changes detailed above;
- (h) Sets a 3.99% increase in Bromley's council tax for 2020/21 compared with 2019/20 (1.99% general increase plus 2% Adult Social Care Precept) and notes that, based upon their consultation exercise, the GLA are currently assuming a 3.6% increase in the GLA precept;
- (i) Notes the latest position on the GLA precept, as above, which will be finalised in the overall Council Tax figure to be reported to full Council (see section 12 of the report);
- (j) Approves the approach to reserves outlined by the Director of Finance (see Appendix 4 to the report);
- (k) Executive agrees that the Director of Finance be authorised to report any further changes directly to Council on 24th February 2020.

(2) Council Tax 2020/21 – 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:

	2019/20	2020/21	Increase	Increase
	£	£	£	%
				(note #)
Bromley (general)	1,128.80	1,153.00	24.20	1.99
Bromley (ASC precept)	87.46	111.77	24.31	2.00
Bromley (total)	1,216.26	1,264.77	48.51	3.99
GLA *	320.51	332.07	11.56	3.61
Total	1,536.77	1,596.84	60.07	3.91

^{*} The GLA Precept may need to be amended once the actual GLA budget is set.

- (#) in line with the 2020/21 Council Tax Referendum Principles, the % increase applied is based on an authority's "relevant basic amount of Council Tax" (£1,216.26 for Bromley) see paragraph 6 below. Any further changes arising from these Principles will be reported directly to Council on 24th February 2020.
- (3) Council formally resolves as follows:
- 1. It be noted that the Council Tax Base for 2020/21 is 132,026 'Band D' equivalent properties.
- 2. Calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2020/2021 is £166,983k.
- 3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2020/21 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act):
- (a) £543,554k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
- (b) £376,571k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates or the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- (c) £166,983k 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) £1,264.77 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) 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
- (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 2020/21 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Valuation	London	Greater	Aggregate of
Bands	Borough of	London	Council Tax
	Bromley	Authority	Requirements
	£	£	£
Α	843.18	221.38	1,064.56
В	983.71	258.28	1,241.99
С	1,124.24	295.17	1,419.41
D	1,264.77	332.07	1,596.84
E	1,545.83	405.86	1,951.69
F	1,826.89	479.66	2,306.55
G	2,107.95	553.45	2,661.40
Н	2,529.54	664.14	3,193.68

- (6) That the Council hereby determines that its relevant basic amount of council tax for the financial year 2020/21, 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 2020/21 sets out the principles which the Secretary of State has determined will apply to local authorities in England in 2020/21. Any further changes arising from these Principles will be reported directly to Council on 24th February 2020. 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.
- (7) Set aside a sum of £2m in 2019/20 as an earmarked reserve for transformation funding for health and social care.
- (8) Set aside a sum of £993k in 2019/20 as an earmarked reserve for health estate development in Bromley.

The following Members voted in favour of the motion -

Councillors Gareth Allatt, Graham Arthur, Yvonne Bear, Julian Benington, Nicholas Bennett, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Mark Brock, David Cartwright, Mary Cooke, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Nicky Dykes, Judi Ellis, Robert

Council 24 February 2020

Evans, Simon Fawthrop, Peter Fortune, Kira Gabbert, Hannah Gray, Christine Harris, Colin Hitchins, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, William Huntington-Thresher, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Christopher Marlow, Robert Mcilveen, Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael, Peter Morgan, Keith Onslow, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Chris Pierce, Neil Reddin, Will Rowlands, Michael Rutherford, Richard Scoates, Suraj Sharma, Colin Smith, Diane Smith Gary Stevens, Melanie Stevens, Harry Stranger, Kieran Terry, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe, Michael Turner and Stephen Wells.

The following Members voted against the motion -

Councillors Vanessa Allen, Kathy Bance, Kevin Brooks, Ian Dunn, Simon Jeal, Josh King and Angela Wilkins.

176 Capital Programme Monitoring Q3 2019/20 and Capital Strategy 2020 to 2024

Report CSD20020

A motion to agree the inclusion in the Capital Programme of the new scheme proposals listed in Appendix C to the report was moved by Councillor Graham Arthur, seconded by Councillor Colin Smith and **CARRIED**.

177 Crystal Palace Park Report CSD20041

A motion to approve the addition of the Crystal Palace Subway project to the Capital Programme at a cost of £3.141m on the basis of the scheme costs being fully funded by grants from the Strategic investment Pot, Historic England and TfL, and a contribution from the Friends of Crystal Palace Subway, was moved by Councillor Peter Morgan, seconded by Councillor Colin Smith and **CARRIED.**

178 TEC Amendment to allow London Councils a Collaborative Role in Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Report CSD20025

A motion to agree the proposed Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) amendment as requested, authorising the Director of Environment and Public Protection to sign the amendment as required, was moved by Councillor William Huntington-Thresher, seconded by Councillor Kieran Terry and CARRIED.

179 Treasury Management - Annual Investment Strategy 2020/21 and Quarter 3 Performance 2019/20 Report CSD20021

A motion to note the report and adopt the Treasury Management Statement and the Annual Investment Strategy for 2020/21 (Appendix 4 to the report) including prudential indicators (summarised on page 41 of the report) and the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy statement (page 20 of the report),

was moved by Councillor Graham Arthur, seconded by Councillor Colin Smith and **CARRIED**.

2020/21 Pay AwardReport CSD20023

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Vanessa Allen and seconded by Councillor Angela Wilkins -

"That all Bromley staff should receive the London Living Wage as a minimum."

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

A motion to approve -

- (i) A flat 2.5% pay increase for all staff (excluding teachers who are covered by a separate statutory pay negotiating process.)
- (ii) The removal of the equivalent of spinal points 4-8 (affecting BR1, BR2, and BR3 grades) with assimilation to equivalent spinal point 9 (BR3.)
- (iii) The introduction of a 4p electric car lease mileage rate for business mileage.
- (iv) That the Trade Unions' pay claim for staff be rejected (see paragraph 3.7 of the report)

and to note that, as in previous years since coming out of the nationally/regionally negotiated frameworks, Bromley staff will receive the 2020/21 pay increase in time for the April pay, was moved by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, seconded by Councillor Stephen Wells and **CARRIED**.

181 Pay Policy Statement 2020/21 Report CSD200

A motion to approve the 2020/21 Pay Policy Statement was moved by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, seconded by Councillor Stephen Wells and **CARRIED**.

182 Members Allowances Scheme 2020/21 Report CSD20024

A motion to approve the Members Allowances Scheme 2020/21 and the Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Allowances, on the basis of a 2.5% increase in all allowances, in line with the recommended increase for Council staff, with the allowance for the Leader of the Council increased to £40,000 and the allowances for the Leaders of the minority groups increased by similar percentages to £9,333 and £4,667 was moved by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, seconded by Councillor Stephen Wells, and **CARRIED**.

The following Members voted in favour of the motion -

Councillors Gareth Allatt, Graham Arthur, Yvonne Bear, Julian Benington, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Mark Brock, David Cartwright, Mary Cooke, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Nicky Dykes, Judi Ellis, Robert Evans, Simon Fawthrop, Peter Fortune, Hannah Gray, Christine Harris, Colin Hitchins, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, William Huntington-Thresher, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Christopher Marlow, Robert Mcilveen, Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael, Peter Morgan, Keith Onslow, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Chris Pierce, Neil Reddin, Will Rowlands, Michael Rutherford, Richard Scoates, Suraj Sharma, Gary Stevens, Melanie Stevens, Harry Stranger, Kieran Terry, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe, Michael Turner and Stephen Wells.

The following Members voted against the motion -

Councillors Vanessa Allen, Kathy Bance, Kevin Brooks, Ian Dunn, Simon Jeal, Josh King and Angela Wilkins.

The following Members abstained -

Councillors Nicholas Bennett, Kira Gabbert, Colin Smith and Diane Smith.

183 Local Pension Board Annual Report Report CSD2042

A motion to receive and note the Local Pension Board Report 2019 was moved by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, seconded by Councillor Stephen Wells and **CARRIED**.

184 Appointment of Independent Person Report CSD20026

A motion approve the appointment of Mr Ken Palmer as Independent Person until the end of the current Council in May 2022, to reaffirm the appointment of Dr Simon Davey as Independent Person until the end of the current Council in May 2022 and to confirm that Mr Palmer and Dr Davey be co-opted to the Standards Committee, was moved by Councillor Vanessa Allen, seconded by Councillor Michael Tickner and **CARRIED**.

185 To consider Motions of which notice has been given.

No motions had been received.

186 The Mayor's announcements and communications.

The Mayor reported that efforts to contact Dina Asher-Smith to invite her to a reception at the Civic Centre had not been successful yet.

The Annual Charity Quiz had been held on 14th February and the Mayor thanked Ian Payne and his family for their assistance. The Mayor added congratulations to the Deputy Mayor, whose Team had won the Mayor of Sevenoaks' Quiz.

The Mayor reminded Members of the following events -

- The Charity Dinner at Corza Restaurant in West Wickham on 27th February.
- The Mayor of Bromley Awards on 11th March.
- The Mayor's final charity event at Chapter One on 22nd April.
- A ceremony at 3pm on 8th May, to mark the 75th anniversary of VE Day.
- The end of term Thanksgiving Civic Service on 10th May at St Joseph's Church, Plaistow Lane.

The Meeting ended at 9.55 pm

Mayor



Minute Annex

Appendix A

COUNCIL MEETING

24th February 2020

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Nelson Pallister to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families

In the event of a disciplinary foster panel, under what government legislation or local rules, regulations or guidance -

- (a) is the panel permitted to hold a pre-meeting with Social Services from which the accused foster carers are excluded, and
- (b) are the accused foster carers forbidden to have anyone speak on their behalf, bearing in mind that foster carers, whose expertise is in offering care not engaging in legal activities, may well be totally unfamiliar with the formality and confrontational approach of a panel meeting, whilst Social Services has access to all the legal and other resources of the Council as well as having individuals trained in appearing before a panel?

Reply:

In response to parts (a) and (b) of the question, the legislation is the Fostering Services (England) Regulations 2011 - Regulation 28 covers the Reviews and Terminations of Approval - and in terms of the national minimum standards for fostering, we are looking at standard 22, which is Handling Allegations and Suspicions of Harm, and 14 - Fostering Panels and the fostering service's decision-maker.

Supplementary Question:

If an account by a foster parent and a child agrees and has never differed, do you have any guidelines for the social worker to base an allegation on the basis of their assumptions rather than the eye witness accounts of those present?

Reply:

In terms of the processes and mechanisms of these things, the regulations cover most things that could occur. If anyone is unhappy with what happens during those meetings it can be referred to an independent review mechanism. I am aware that parts of this question may be based on a live case so if there are any further details feel free to write to me and I will follow up any specifics.

2. From Sheila Grace to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

Why, when there is a widely accepted Climate Emergency and the Council has committed to achieving net zero from its own emissions by 2029, is the Council's Annual Investment Strategy completely silent on the impact and risks of fossil fuel

investments on the climate and makes no moves to divest from such harmful investments?

Reply:

It is not the authority's intention to divest of any fossil fuel investments which we have because we have not got any.

Supplementary Question:

The ex-Governor of the Bank of England, Mark Carney, has warned of the risk of fossil fuel dependent investments and those at risk of a changing climate. Has the investment strategy heeded this warning?

Reply:

His warning is extremely correct, which is why we have already done so.

3. From Sheila Grace to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

Is the Council satisfied with the PDS scrutiny of the Annual Investment Strategy, given that it dismisses consideration of the environmental policies of organisations in which it invests on the grounds that 'it would be a significant piece of work to conduct the necessary due diligence' and 'the market was "doing a good job" filtering out companies that had a more negative impact on the environment'? (Page 156, 2nd paragraph)

Reply:

The Council prepares an annual Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy in line with the requirements of the CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Services. The Council also published Prudential Indicators and a Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) statement, as it is required by statute to do. Therefore, the Council complies fully with its statutory obligations as well as CIPFA management in relation to Treasury Management. As stated above, the Council has no direct investments relating to fossil fuels.

COUNCIL MEETING

24th February 2020

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. From Peter Holyoake, London Energy Risk, to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Residents with children in Borough schools are all in support of "improving the air quality and reducing emissions" – particularly outside schools. At present Bromley has no PM2.5 air quality monitors accessible on-line. What initiatives will Bromley take to install on-line PM2.5 monitors outside schools and other traffic hot spots?

Reply:

Currently London Boroughs are expected to report on PM 10 (in relation to particulate matter) only and there is no requirement to report on, or monitor PM 2.5. However, whilst Bromley meets the current objectives set for both PM 10 and PM 2.5 ($35 \, \mu g/m^3$), the limits set by the WHO are lower ($10 \, \mu g/m^3$), and there is a requirement for London Boroughs to work towards meeting the lower limits by 2030. Bromley's levels are below 13 $\,\mu g/m^3$ and it is anticipated that by 2030 that the lower limits will be met. As such, there are no specific plans to install these particular monitors. The draft Air Quality Action Plan is due to go out for consultation in early April 2020, and this will include all action points to meet particulate matter, and to improve air quality around schools in general.

2. From Dave Marshall to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Will the Portfolio Holder consider an amendment to the times of parking restrictions near to the Bromley Reform Synagogue at Highland Road? On Saturdays the Shabbat services starts at 10:30 and does not usually end until 13:00, but parking restrictions restrict parking between 12-2. It would be helpful to the community who use the Synagogue if the times of this restriction could be changed to e.g. 13:00 to 15:00.

Reply:

The parking restrictions are in place in the main to protect parking for residents living in this vicinity, so changing the hours to allow for Synagogue visitors to park would negate this purpose. Also, Highland Road is part of the much wider Bromley Town Centre CPZ, which has standard hours of operation across the whole outer zone, so changing this in just one part would not be possible.

There is however a fair amount of free parking in the area and The Hill Car Park, which has plenty of available space on a Saturday, is approximately a 10 -15 minute walk from the Synagogue.

1

3. From Dave Marshall to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families

What progress has been made about appointing a Director of Children's Services to replace Ade Adetosoye?

Reply:

The Director of Children's Services role is currently being held by an interim who with her leadership team successfully transformed our children's services. The leadership roles are permanently staffed apart from the Director role which is currently being readvertised, having not being able to appoint first time following the selection interview late last year. The Current advert for the post closes on 3rd March 2020 followed thereafter by the officer and Member/Council interviews. The latter is scheduled for the week commencing 30th of March.

4. From Chloe-Jane Ross to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families

What percentage of social workers currently employed in Bromley's Children's Services are on permanent contracts and what percentage are on temporary contracts?

Reply:

Currently, we are averaging 82% permanent children's Social workers.

No local authority would have 100% permanent staff and across London the average permanent workforce is around 68% so for us in Bromley we have done incredibly well.

5. From Chloe-Jane Ross to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families

An initial special-needs assessment with a Development Paediatrician is a crucial step towards assessing any special-needs provision for a child. Would the Portfolio Holder please provide average and maximum waiting times for Development Paediatrician appointments in the borough from 1 Oct – 31 Dec 2020?

Reply:

Not every child that has additional needs will require a specialist Paediatric Assessment and this would be determined by health colleagues.

Our CCG colleagues have confirmed the following:

The Community Paediatrics Service offers advice for every child undergoing an education, health and care (EHC) needs assessment.

For the very limited time period in question 61% of assessments were carried out within the target of 6 weeks. However the preceding period showed rates of 90.4% and 91.9%. Performance is monitored regularly through CCG contract monitoring to understand the data and where there is a change this is remedied quickly.

Average wait for an appointment for Community Paediatrician following receipt of referral for EHC Needs assessment: 3.7 weeks.

Maximum wait for appointment for Community Paediatrician following receipt of referral for EHC Needs assessment: 16 weeks.

The Designated Clinical Officer for SEND is working very closely with the service to ensure that it complies with statutory requirements for health.

Children with special education needs who are being supported but who **do not** have an education, health and care plan can access a range of different health services including Community Paediatrics. Not all children will require a developmental assessment from community paediatrics as this will be dependent on individual presentation and professional judgement.

In this instance the average waiting times for an initial assessment with a Community Paediatrician in a Bromley (for all children and young people) is 8.8 weeks with the longest wait time recorded as 17.29 weeks.

6. From Julie Ireland to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

At the Council meeting in December 2018, the Portfolio Holder undertook to liaise with the parents with children at the Unicorn school who had been campaigning for a weatherproof path from where the lollipop lady stands at the junction of South Eden Park Road with Cresswell Drive across the grass to Eden Park Avenue between the two football pitches exiting by the side of St Johns Church. Please state how much contact he has had with this parents' group (for whom I provided email addresses) and what progress has been made towards providing this path.

Reply:

Bromley's Road Safety team are currently working with the school on updating their plan and have encouraged them to work towards gold this year. However, the current School Travel Plan does not mention the proposal for the path, so perhaps parents have not discussed the matter with the school nor sought support.

7. From Julie Ireland to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

What assistance has the Council been able to offer the residents of Northpoint who have the same type of cladding as Grenfell Tower on their building? While this is a central government issue there is still a role for the Council including supporting the residents and ensuring interim safety measures are in place with the fire service.

Reply:

Officers in Planning, Building Control and Public Protection have worked closely with Northpoint Directors, not only to ensure that safety measures (which fall within the Council's remit) were progressed, but also to assist with progression of the ACM funding application with government.



COUNCIL MEETING

24th February 2020

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Cllr Kieran Terry to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

How much debt interest did the London Borough of Bromley pay during 2019? In answering please indicate how much debt the London Borough of Bromley carries and a comparison to other neighbouring local authorities.

Reply:

No debt interest was paid by Bromley Council in the year 2019. The Council remains debt-free and has retained an adequate level of reserves and provisions to allow for any unforeseen costs and risks. This contrasts with neighbouring Councils who have spent over £40m in the year to service their debts, which are now running at one and a third billion pounds. So the legacy that we will leave our children is debt-free status and a prudent and well-run Council; they will be leaving their young people coming along after them debts of over a billion pounds. I think we have probably got it right. (Appendix 1)

Supplementary question:

Will the Portfolio Holder join me in expressing absolute horror around the sheer levels of debt some of these other authorities carry. Debt levels generations of people will be paying back, and huge debt interest payments these Councils are paying which are being diverted from vital frontline services. Debt levels of one and a third billion pounds are clearly unacceptable. Will he also join me in welcoming the zero interest payments, congratulating the staff and Members involved in maintaining this record given Bromley is one of the lowest funded Councils in London?

Reply:

The answer is yes, but I would like to add that, yes, we are not paying £50m interest, but we are also receiving, in the year, according to the forecast, £14.9m interest received. I can now announce that is actually going to be £15.5m.

2. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Is he confident that the provision of £875k in 2020-21 (with no funding provision for future years) is adequate to deliver this Council's target of its direct activities being carbon neutral by 2029?

Reply:

The Council's Carbon Neutral by 2029 Policy is now considered business as usual for Council activities. At the current time, I am satisfied that this revenue budget heading will provide sufficient pump priming. For further detail I refer you to the 2029

Net Zero Carbon Strategy report presented to the Environment and Community Services PDS Committee in January.

3. From Cllr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

The Library Service recently had an issue with online renewals where items were not renewed for the expected period. Can the Portfolio Holder give dates when GLL were aware of the issue and when Library Contract managers were informed.

Reply:

When did I know about this? The answer is when I had your question. The same applies to GLL - there have been no issues or system faults relating to online renewals for items issued to borrowers, therefore no problems were reported either to GLL from customers or from GLL to us.

Supplementary Question:

If such an incident did occur, would you expect a penalty to be levied, and at what level would you expect?

Reply:

I am sure that if something like this did happen we would look at the contract and do whatever the contract tells us. Your question may have been promoted by the annual membership renewal process, which is a GDPR requirement. A lot of people had to renew their library membership, and some of them did not do it on time and therefore their renewal process was delayed.

4. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing:

Can the Portfolio Holder explain why councillors are not invited to the Tackling Homelessness meeting or Forum on 11 March 2020?

Reply:

The Homelessness Forum is an open multi-agency forum to take forward the key priorities set out in the homelessness strategy. The forums are advertised on the Council's website as well as notifications being sent to all agencies who have expressed an interest in attending. Councillors are very welcome to attend the Forum meetings.

Supplementary Question:

Is there a list of such forums and meetings that Councillors might find of interest and want to attend. I did get an invite to this particular forum, but that was through a third party, and it would have been nice if all councillors were aware of it.

Reply: I do not disagree - It is on the website.

5. From CIIr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

How many freedom passes issued to Bromley residents have been deactivated since the start of the year, and why was this done ahead of their stated expiry date in March?

Reply:

In total, 2,330 disabled Freedom Pass holders were written to by Bromley, ahead of the expiry of their current passes in March 2020. This is normal practise and is directed by London Councils and happened right across London.

The purpose of the letter was to re-confirm continued residency in the borough, and ongoing eligibility to the scheme ahead of new passes being sent out which run until March 2025. Pass holders were given 4 weeks to respond with the necessary evidence, and advised that if the information was not supplied then the pass would be stopped.

By the deadline set by London Councils of 24th January, the passes belonging to anyone who didn't respond, and a number of letters returned by Royal Mail as 'gone away,' were ceased. In total 1,345 were deactivated, as we had received responses from 985 pass holders.

London Councils requires the deactivation process to happen by a deadline in January, in order to ensure new 5 year passes are produced and received before the March 2020 expiry of current passes, and are not sent to people who are no longer eligible for the scheme, or have moved boroughs or out of London.

Supplementary Question:

I have received quite a few contacts from residents who have either been given incorrect information by Liberata, have not received the forms to renew their passes or for other reasons are still awaiting renewal of their pass. Will he agree to review these cases with a view to understanding what has gone wrong and why it appears that some Bromley residents had their passes deactivated wrongly.

Reply:

I am clearly concerned by what you are saying, and I will undertake to look into that. If you let me have any information you can I will come back to you.

6. From CIIr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

When were you first aware that the Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Elm Road Conservation Area, where Beckenham Library stands includes the following words:-

"All the principle buildings are deemed to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and therefore the Council will resist demolition of any building".

Reply:

This document to which you refer dates from 2005 and has been in the public domain since this time. The wording in relation to demolition is standard for these documents. It is worth noting however that, as per committee report no. ELS0509, Historic England, then English Heritage, were of the opinion that the area was not worthy of conservation area designation.

Supplementary Question:

Can you tell me why there was no mention of this paragraph from the Supplementary Planning Guidance in the Executive paper on Beckenham Library in November, given that it is a document that has been in the public domain for fifteen years?

Reply:

Frankly I have no idea, I did not write the report and I was not aware that it was a conservation area until this came up. I will make sure that, in future, it is very much up front and centre.

7. From CIIr Vanessa Allen to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee

The report on Members' Allowances states "the allowance for Leader of the Council should be increased to £40,000 to reflect the extent of the responsibility, the pressures and the competencies required for the role". Please would the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee describe the competencies required?

Reply:

The competencies required are the knowledge, skills and abilities to perform the job successfully and would include the following -

To show leadership, to be a competent decision maker, to have responsibility for decisions made, and also to have communication skills, to be trustworthy, to work as part of a team, to have commercial awareness, to be results orientated, to have emotional intelligence, to be able to resolve conflicts, to show initiative, to be a great negotiator, to be motivated and to be able to delegate successfully, and finally to show adaptability in any given situation.

In short competency is defined as -

"The quality of being competent having the possession of the skill, knowledge, qualification and capacity to perform the job."

Supplementary Question:

Given that these skills are also needed by the Portfolio Holders and, to some extent, the chairs of committees, should the increase not have been applied to them as well?

Reply:

While our portfolio holder allowances are currently much in line with most other London boroughs, the Leader's allowance has dropped substantially behind. I would point out that the recommendation to increase the payment to £40,000 is still £17,000 below the London Councils recommendation of £57,000.

8. From Councillor Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder Adult Care and Health

Will the Portfolio Holder please provide an update on how far Penge residents will have to travel to see a G.P if the Trinity Medical Centre in Croydon Road closes?

Reply:

The CCG's response is as follows -

"Bromley CCG's plans do not and never have expected Trinity patients to travel outside the Penge or Anerley areas to access a GP practice. We would not expect patients to travel into Beckenham or outside the borough of Bromley. Of course, patients are welcome to travel further afield if they choose this for themselves, or if there is a practice closer to where they live. A number of Penge residents are already registered with Cator Medical Centre at Beckenham Beacon instead of a Penge practice.

If dispersal of patients of Trinity becomes necessary, we know that there is adequate space within the remaining four GP practices in Penge and Anerley to register all the Trinity patients. We would naturally support those practices to manage both a short and long term influx of patients onto their lists, by helping to fund additional clinical and administrative staff. These practices are Robin Hood Surgery, Anerley Surgery, Oakfield Surgery and Park Practice. Our first choice remains to keep Trinity Medical Centre open as long as it can provide safe, high quality and accessible care to its patients. If the location of Trinity does change and patients are unable to manage the additional distance, say from one side of Penge to the other, the GP contract that is put into place mandatorily includes an obligation to provide patients with home visits where clinically appropriate. "

Supplementary Question:

I do welcome what the CCG says, but Yeoman House, which sits right next to Trinity Medical Centre, has had a series of plans in the past for use as a site for residents. At the moment, the four practices that you mention are extremely full - I know people who go to Beckenham Beacon because it is easier to find an appointment than in Penge. How are you going to ensure that in future there are enough places in practices in the area?

Reply:

The provision of GP services is down to the CCG, and not the Council. Obviously, we will do everything that we can to support them if they need to identify further sites, and I have already suggested to them that if they want to have our input they need to get us on board in good time.

9. From Cllr Kieran Terry to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

How much waste did Bromley Council send to landfill during the period September-December 2019?

Reply:

In September, October and November 2019, no waste was sent from Bromley to landfill for disposal. In December 2019, 0.3%, or 20 tonnes, was sent to landfill from a total of 6,985 tonnes of non-recyclable waste.

Supplementary Question:

I welcome the steps that the Council is taking to reduce its landfill waste, including removing plastic bottles from Council meetings. Can the Portfolio Holder please provide an update around the amount of waste Bromley is recycling and how we compare to other boroughs?

Reply:

(The Mayor suggested that the Portfolio Holder send the information to Councillor Terry.)

10. From CIIr Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation & Housing

Indoor bowling facilities at the Cyphers Club in Penge have ceased and Crystal Palace Indoor Bowls Club (CPIB) are facing the prospect of closing within the next two years because of increasing costs. Both clubs provide valuable social and health benefits for our Borough, and in particular for our older residents.

The CPIB own their own site, one that has the potential to provide in excess of 50 new housing units which, if 'affordable', could assist the Council in meeting the policy requirement of the Mayor of London in relation to housing development proposed by LBB for Crystal Palace Park.

Is he prepared to give his assurance that he will undertake to explore the range of options available to both retain indoor bowling facilities in the Crystal Palace / Penge area and to think imaginatively about how the potential of much needed housing provision can be simultaneously delivered?

Reply:

The Indoor Bowls Club has already liaised with the Regeneration Team to see if there are any opportunities for collaboration on that site. This conversation is ongoing.

11. From Cllr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

A recent report (https://brave.com/ukcouncilsreport/) has shown that some councils' website allow firms to track user information when users seek assistance. When did the Portfolio Holder become aware of this and what is being done to rectify this?

Reply:

The Council does not "allow firms to track user information when users seek assistance." We do however, use several embedded Google products to help us deliver the wider website functionality across the board. By necessity these collect data and statistics in order to function. Some place cookies on users' browsers, and these are fully and openly listed and associated with our cookie banner, so that users are aware of their presence, and importantly, have the choice <u>not</u> to set them.

The report surmises that we have five Google products, it does not define what these are, but it does refer to one Google product as being classed as "Other Adtech" which possibly is referring to Google AdSense, which was embedded in the website as part of the old advertising banner product. This was removed some time ago, as part of a wider technical update, so depending on at which point in time the research was undertaken, this is probably what is being referred to.

12. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

The new LBB Housing IT system demands that everyone on the Housing Register must reapply via the new portal. Why haven't we been able to exclude people with severe mobility issues in this reapplication?

Reply:

It is not possible to transfer data from the old housing IT system, and as such all residents have to re-register onto the new system. Officers are available to assist all applicants to complete the registration and to ensure that everyone is registered. Where required, home visits can also be made to assist. Applicants do not lose their priority through this process.

Supplementary Question:

Is there a deadline for this?

Reply:

I do not believe that there is a deadline. Clearly, it is best if everyone does it as quickly as possible.

13. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

What has been the annual cost of the Council's Carbon Monitoring Unit from its inception to the end of this financial year?

Reply:

As even an occasional attendee, of the Environmental Services PDS will know the Council does not have a Carbon Monitoring Unit. As I have previously briefed, the Council has been successfully delivering meaningful change to our Carbon emissions through Carbon Management Programmes since 2007.

14. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

How did the Council respond to the recent public consultation on the Bakerloo Line Extension?

Reply:

I have circulated the letter sent by the Leader of the Council in response to that consultation. (Appendix 2)

Supplementary Question:

Why was this response not sent to the Environment and Community Services PDS Committee for scrutiny prior to being sent?

Reply:

The response is just a re-statement of a past response, already detailed in our LIP, and our LIP did go through the PDS and indeed public scrutiny in the borough. The response is entirely consistent with our LIP policy which was fully scrutinised, and with past responses.

Comment by the Leader of the Council:

The reason that there was no need for this to go to the Environment PDS is that it is this Administration's policy, as TfL have been told twice previously, that we do not want a replacement for the perfectly adequate Hayes Line, we want additional functionality into Bromley town centre, and ideally Bromley South, to provide extra, new infrastructure to support new housing in the town centre and to assist Bromley town centre in becoming a back-office hub of excellence.

Additional Supplementary Question from Councillor Vanessa Allen:

Why does the Leader ignore the feedback from residents in Bromley, most of whom supported the Bakerloo Line extension to Hayes?

Reply:

You will recall that we had this question about four years ago, the last time this show rolled into town. The answer then, as now, is that if you ask a question in a certain way, promising fantastic new services, you will get the answer you want to the question. As I explained last time, you can factor the question depending on the answer you want. I know what the residents of Hayes, West Wickham, Eden Park and Elmers End want. I am a Hayes resident, and I have actually asked real people in the real world, not people on the end of a TfL consultation.

15. From Cllr Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Will the Portfolio Holder be able to ensure idverde provide the necessary repairs to Alexandra Recreation Ground's paddling pool in time for summer?

Reply:

The Council has been working with the service provider, Amey FM, to provide a cost effective permanent repair and associated pump works. These repairs do not fall within the scope of the parks and grounds maintenance contract with idverde. Amey have identified a solution and arrangements will be made for the repairs to be completed for the summer season.

Supplementary Question:

So I can confirm that those repairs will be fully made for the start of the summer, because it was only open for five days last year?

Reply:

That is the plan. If there are any issues with the re-instatement there may be some delays, but that is the plan.

16. From Cllr Vanessa Allen to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation & Housing

LBB adopted its Local Plan a year ago, and has an agreed 5 Year Housing Land Supply. Please will the Portfolio Holder outline what he is doing to encourage and enable housebuilding on the sites identified in these documents?

Reply:

Many of the sites identified in the Local Plan have been discussed with developers and housing associations to encourage the development of those sites. The Council is also currently reviewing all of the identified sites which it owns to seek to progress development. Current examples include the development of Anerley town hall overflow car park, Bushell Way in Chislehurst, York Rise in Orpington and Burnt Ash Lane in my own ward.

Outstanding Borrowing by I	-	-	
(Source: MHCLG Quarterly I	Borrowing & In	vestment Sta	tistics)
	Short	Longer	Total
London Borough	Term	Term	Borrowing
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Barking & Dagenham	111,000	804,281	915,281
Barnet	20,000	384,080	404,080
Bexley	0	223,487	223,487
Brent	0	394,122	394,122
Bromley	0	0	0
Camden	0	329,436	329,436
Croydon	267,315	1,088,001	1,355,316
Ealing	10,000	621,404	631,404
Enfield	103,000	812,541	915,541
Greenwich	0	382,945	382,945
Hackney	77,000	67,600	144,600
Hammersmith & Fulham	0	212,841	212,841
Haringey	0	415,762	415,762
Harrow	0	402,261	402,261
Havering	16,151	210,234	226,385
Hillingdon	10,000	248,699	258,699
Hounslow	46,500	206,304	252,804
Islington	44,000	297,665	341,665
Kensington & Chelsea	0	268,841	268,841
Kingston upon Thames	0	308,150	308,150
Lambeth	0	541,658	541,658
Lewisham	0	217,148	217,148
Merton	0	113,010	113,010
Newham	30,000	803,867	833,867
Redbridge	0	298,252	298,252
Richmond upon Thames	1,628	120,275	121,903
Southwark	89,500	585,134	674,634
Sutton	22,000	309,521	331,521
Tower Hamlets	0	73,293	73,293
Waltham Forest	20,000	233,737	253,737
Wandsworth	970	77,408	78,378
Westminster	0	221,209	221,209



Councillor Colin Smith Leader of Bromley Council LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

20th December 2019

Alex Williams
Director of City Planning
Transport for London

Dear Alex

Bakerloo consultation response

Further to your most recent consultation about the proposed Bakerloo extension, I felt it might be helpful to re-state again Bromley Council's policy position. This remains unchanged, with much of the commentary pasted from previous consultation responses.

The Council's priorities are detailed in our LIP and include specifically improving transport links into Bromley Town Centre to support it as part of building and maintaining thriving town centres. Rather than merely undertaking template consultation, I would encourage TfL to engage in meaningful dialogue with the Council to bring forward proposals which will improve transport infrastructure for Bromley town centre.

I refer to previous consultation responses and our news release of October 2019 which outlined our position. To quote from previous correspondence on the matter, "the extension of the Bakerloo line to <u>Lewisham</u>, we are also broadly supportive, mindful of the fact that it offers Bromley residents further options and transport choices in addition to those currently provided by DLR".

What is needed is extra capacity and connectivity for Bromley town centre rather than unnecessary alternatives at great cost.

At that point however, I regret that our respective visions do appear to diverge.

To quote directly from the Council's LIP, "The Council, therefore, supports the efforts of LB Lewisham to extend the Bakerloo line to Lewisham and would consider options for a further extension into the Borough where this provides genuinely new connectivity and capacity. For example, a phase 2 Bakerloo Line extension to Bromley North could be acceptable to the Borough if it contributed to improving connectivity on one or more of the identified corridors."

It is also the case that were such a link to be established, it would provide Bromley Town Centre with an opportunity to develop into a back office hub of excellence, providing further job opportunities for people in the sub region, a key local aspiration.

Such a connection would of course also serve to considerably reduce pressure on the Jubilee Line.

In addition to the scheme replacing existing infrastructure which works well, rather than providing extra/new capacity, we are simply unable to support the proposal, certainly in full, as it would deny direct access to London termini to a vast swathe of Bromley residents living along Hayes Line corridor, a significant number of whom purchased their properties with that connectivity in mind.

We also cannot accept that the Hayes line's access to London Bridge should be taken away to create extra capacity for other services travelling in from deeper Kent.

It is completely unacceptable that the interests of local people paying significant amounts in Mayoral precept should be set aside for benefit of others who do not.

That said, if it were possible to extend the Bakerloo line down as far as New Beckenham, to then spur off towards Bromley South, this could be something we could get behind and support, providing the existing direct links were maintained in some form of a track sharing arrangement.

Yours faithfully,

Colin Smith

Leader of Bromley Council London Borough of Bromley

Oslin & Smith

COUNCIL MEETING

24th February 2020

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. From Cllr Tony Owen to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

Can you please confirm the name of Bromley's monitoring officer for Biggin Hill Airport, the job description for the post and how they can be contacted by me and members of the public by email or telephone?

Reply:

The contact details for the monitoring officer are available on the council's website www.bromley.gov.uk/bigginhillairport, with the email address being airport.monitoring@bromley.gov.uk. The Officer who had been seconded to this role has recently left the Council and we will now be moving forwards to recruit someone to this role. I am happy to forward details, including job description, when they are finalised.

2. From Cllr Kieran Terry to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

In light of the recent blight of emergency roadworks undertaken by utility companies in Chislehurst, what powers does the Council have to act against antisocial emergency roadworks?

Reply:

Utility companies have statutory powers to install and maintain their apparatus, and while the council has powers to co-ordinate planned works we do not have any control when emergency works are required. All works on the highway require a permit, although in the case of emergency work these can be submitted retrospectively. When emergency works are required the council will challenge the duration of the permit where the timescales requested are considered to be excessive.

3. From Cllr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

On what dates in the last 12 months has fouling by pigeon on the pavements, central reservation and road around Birkbeck been cleaned and what dates in the same period has this area been inspected by council officers?

Reply:

Response provided is based on the assumption this is around Birkbeck Station, Elmer's End Road.

Whilst no specific cleansing for Pigeon Fouling is organised via the baseline street cleansing service, it will be attempted through ordinary scheduled work that is predicated on a dry sweep – either manually or via a mechanical sweeper. The schedule for Elmer's End Road sees footway cleansing undertaken twice weekly (Tuesdays and Fridays) and carriageway cleansing weekly on a Tuesday.

Our attempts to insist Network Rail erect some pigeon netting have not led us anywhere, and whilst prevention would be better than cure, it seems they will not install any.

We are investigating if we can undertake a cyclical jet-wash of this area (and other railway bridges that are affected by the same issue) utilising the graffiti removal service that also falls within Lot 3 of the Environmental Service Contract within the budget constraints of this service area and locations.

Since January 2019, Elmer's End Road has been inspected 10 times, using the randomised inspection system that we utilise in Neighbourhood Management. Dates and grades are below. The Neighbourhood Officer is aware that this location is a hot spot area and is working with the Service Provider to ensure cleansing standards improve, including the use of parking suspensions due to the high volume of parked cars in the area.

```
28/01/2019 - Carriageway - B
28/01/2019 - Carriageway - B
20/08/2019 - Footway - C
16/10/2019 - Carriageway - D
20/11/2019 - Footway - C
20/11/2019 - Carriageway - B
18/12/2019 - Footway - D
18/12/2019 - Carriageway - D
22/01/2020 - Footway - B
22/01/2020 - Carriageway - B
```

4. From Cllr Vanessa Allen to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation & Housing

Please provide the number of visitors to and books borrowed from every library for calendar years 2018 and 19, broken down by library, year and month.

Reply:

(See Appendix 1 attached.)

5. From CIIr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Environment & Community Services

Please provide a list of the requests for new infrastructure to enhance walking and cycling and reduce road danger received in the last two years, including the source of the request and the outcome.

Reply:

Requests are recorded, but it is not possible to present the data in the form you request. If you can highlight particular locations I will ask Officers to go through their data and where possible without breaching data protection requirements to list the requests you are interested in. When requests are made, the evidence included, departmental knowledge, possible interventions and costs are assessed, before applying a prioritisation to the location, which ultimately decides when/if they will receive further attention. Past requests of this type will also be reviewed, when locations are highlighted through the approved prioritisation methodologies, such as KSI frequency, school travel plans, larger planning applications etc.

6. From CIIr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Please provide a list of activities required to complete the Air Quality Action Plan.

Please also confirm that sufficient officer time will be made available so that the draft Air Quality Action Plan can come to the March meeting of the PDS for scrutiny.

Reply:

The draft 2020 - 2025 Air Quality Action Plan is now complete and scheduled to come before the March meeting of the PDS for scrutiny. Subject to approval from the committee, the AQAP will immediately go out to consultation prior to final review and publication.

7. From Cllr Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Will the Portfolio Holder please explain what the current situation is with Parking Permits in Wordsworth Road, Penge as they were going to be initiated, now have been suspended without any timeline provided?

Reply:

In August 2019 a consultation with residents of Wordsworth Road was carried out to discover if the majority wished to be included in the recent CPZ that includes many nearby streets in Penge. The majority of those who responded were in favour of being included. Therefore, in December, the Traffic Order was advertised in the newspaper. During this period, a petition was received containing 53 names of people in Wordsworth Road who objected to being included in the scheme, with the petition including more addresses than the August consultation. I have therefore asked Officers to carry out another survey of views, to establish what the majority of residents want. This will be conducted in the coming weeks and following analysis of the results we will consult with Ward members and then move to a conclusion.

Monthly Visitors to Bromley Libraries (2018 and 2019)
People counters were replaced in all libraries through October and November 2018.
Central Library was fully closed for refurbishment between 25th November and 1st December 2019, and partially closed from 2nd December to 31st December 2019.

		Deckennan	Biggin Hill	Burnt Ash	Central	Chislehurst	Hayes	Mottingham	Orpington	Penge	Petts Wood	Shortlands	Southborough	St Paul's Cray	West Wickham	Grand Total
	Jan	11,035	18,654	2,214	27,436	6,108	1,991	1,971	31,180	8.126	6.789	1812	2 527	7 730	0 000	201 101
24	Feb	9,924	19,940	2,031	25,346	5,931	1,789	1,803	25.548	7.655	802.9	1 950	136,2	2,730	0,000	131,120
	Mar	10,762	22,095	2,254	27,254	7,410	1.825	1.800	30 902	R 192	2170	1,000	2,434	2,029	8,187	120,714
Name of	Apr	10,972	19,178	1,971	25,528	5.241	1,775	1 748	30 622	7 890	624,1	1,002	2,633	2,337	060'6	135,765
	May	11,094	21,417	1,921	28,794	5,124	1.626	1.768	30,049	2808	7107	1,505	2,423	2,149	1,929	124,558
2018	Jun	10,780	19,163	2,203	26,960	5,611	1,803	2,137	27,908	8.449	070.7	1 979	2,233	055.5	9197	130,961
	Jol	11,833	20,353	2,548	26,523	8/0/9	2,047	2,168	32,483	8.581	8.707	2,644	2,500	7 797	0.725	120,000
	Aug	13,191	18,249	2,075	26,785	5,451	2,020	2,296	36,117	8,821	8.935	2.096	7 897	7766		141 555
	Sep	10,801	19,972	2,412	27,076	6,292	1,878	2,565	32.306	8.853	10.468	1 938	2 2 2 3	1777	10,410	0C0/T+T
	Oct	11,761	19,727	2,429	30,408	7,234	1,821	2,261	33.020	8.661	8 533	1 995	570 6	2,2/1	Tac's	119,910
	Nov	9,404	20,892	1,970	37,483	7,400	1,314	1,439	18.717	5.776	5 198	1 201	2,0,2	125.1	650,6 67C 3	142,812
Contract of the Contract of th	Dec	7,673	15,521	1,682	29,521	5,717	1.107	1 244	16.084	4766	AAAC	103(1	157	1,102		17T'001
2018 Total	ital	129,230	235,161	25,710	339,114	73.597	20.996	23,200	345,736	92.955	30	066	1,0/1	7651		97,576
ALC: NO.	Jan	10,128	20,843	1,752	38,105	6,494	1.345	1 429	19 279	5 830		1,100	1,022	06/17	F	1,553,348
Stanis	Feb	9.527	19 404	1876	35.056	00/7	1 44 4	1 444	00000	2000	con's	COTT	1,923	E//T	096'9	122,092
	M 4	0100	101 (01	200	00000	674'0	*T*/T	1,41	796'/1	155,5	4,863	1,151	2,055	1,583	6,875	115,987
	Mar	05501	21,646	1,962	38,339	2,090	1,601	1,997	19,656	6,075	5,318	1,327	2,381	1,852	7,109	126,703
	Apr	10,204	19,288	1,942	41,184	606'9	1,528	1,363	18,897	6,057	5,245	1,094	1,896	1,763	6.267	123,637
	May	10,622	20,776	1,647	40,439	6,853	1,501	1,535	19,342	5,929	5,407	1.128	2.097	1627	5 794	124 697
2019	nnſ	9,334	19,344	1,702	35,803	5,840	1,399	1,403	16,522	5,902	4,708	1.198	1.977	1,805	5 596	112 533
	틷	10,446	18,661	1,948	38,163	6,894	1,729	1,610	19,002	6,560	5.706	1.709	2,374	1 874	5 963	172 630
	Aug	10,677	16,747	1,814	39,044	6,726	1,763	1,527	20,351	6,993	6,240	1,637	2.303	1 837	7.747	125,033
	Sep	9,532	18,936	1,718	36,606	6,544	1,373	1,617	18,367	5,984	5,143	1.442	2,421	1 937	6 2 2 2	117 744
	Oct	10,144	20,350	1,705	38,416	7,059	1,491	1,507	20,568	5,942	5,219	1179	2.276	1 897	6 350	124 113
	Nov	10,074	19,511	1,651	27,109	6,761	1,515	1,681	18,035	6,057	4.625	1.333	7.077	1,658	6 103	100 100
	Dec	8,716	13,157	1,559	10,000	2,667	1,072	1,308	16,163	5.304	4.163	1 193	1819	1 440	E 122	75 500
2019 Total	ital	119,754	228,663	21,276	419,264	79.266	17.731	18.418	224144	71 993	61 670	15.574	DE AGG	44.047	000000	500'01

Monthly Item Issues at Bromley Libraries (2018 and 2019)

Central Library was fully closed for refurbishment between 25th November and 1st December 2019, and partially closed from 2nd December to 31st December 2019. Issues attributed to libraries include all physical media (books, music CDs and DVDs).

'Digital' issues include eBooks, eAudiobooks, eComic, eMagazines, Music streams and downloads, and Hardware (tablets at Central and Orpington).

Monthly record for music streams and downloads not currently available for January to July in 2018 and 2019.

'Other' includes issues attributed to Bromley Histroic Collections, the Stock Services Unit, and the Calipoint and online renewals services.

Due to a change in Library Management System in February 2018, items previously renewed via the Callpoint and online renewals services begin to be attributed to the library it was originally loaned from.

i	CIIISIEII	Cuisien	Central Cilisten	
2,087	5,165 2,087	5,165 2,087	18,098 5,165 2,087	18,098 5,165 2,087
	5,727 2,146	5,727 2,146	23,689 5,727 2,146	1,420 23,689 5,727 2,146
	6,564	6,564	27,185 6,564	1,450 27,185 6,564
	6,248	6,248	27,625 6,248	27,625 6,248
	6,352	6,352	27,195 6,352	1,023 27,195 6,352
	6,143	6,143	24,801 6,143	1,520 24,801 6,143
	7,282	7,282	30,292 7,282	1,847 30,292 7,282
7,830 3,127	7,830	7,830	33,322 7,830	2,061 33,322 7,830
	6,445	6,445	28,161 6,445	1,842 28,161 6,445
	6,617	6,617	29,025 6,617	1,787 29,025 6,617
	6,809	6,809	26,681 6,809	1,777 26,681 6,809
	5,509		24,332 5,509	1,318 24,332 5,509
6,691 30,352	76,691	76,691	320,406 76,691	19,289 320,406 76,691
	6,279	6,279	26,953 6,279	1,469 26,953 6,279
	6,050	6,050	24,992 6,050	1,417 24,992 6,050
	6,279	6,279	28,138 6,279	1,544 28,138 6,279
	6,319	6,319	27,547 6,319	1,474 27,547 6,319
	5,858	5,858	26,791 5,858	1,534 26,791 5,858
	5,850	5,850	24,196 5,850	1,310 24,196 5,850
	7,344	7,344	27,998 7,344	1,609 27,998 7,344
	116'/	116'/	30,03/	1,911
	6,534	6,534	24,991 6,534	1,627 24,991 6,534
	6,595	6,595	25,970 6,595	1,465 25,970 6,595
6,125 2,561	6,125	6,125	18,398 6,125	1,494 18,398 6,125
5,249 1,954	5,249	5,249	15,379 5,249	1,382 15,379 5,249
5,393 31,815	76.393	2000	201 200 75 200	

No	Title	Value	Rec /	Funding
			non rec	
1	Implement light controlled pedestrian crossing at	£350k	Non rec	2019/20 Central
	Chislehurst Crossroads.			Contingency
				Underspends
2	Install a 20 mph speed limit outside 95 schools in the	£285k	Non rec	2019/20 Central
	Borough which don't have them (30 already do).			Contingency
				Underspends
3	Revise CPZ charges to be based on emissions. Introduce			Cost Neutral
	higher charges for second & subsequent vehicles at one address.			
4	Instigate building maintenance programme.	£500k pa for 4 years	Non rec	Invest to save
5	Charge maximum possible Council Tax for long term	£43k in 20/21, £87k	Rec	
	empty properties	in 21/22		
6	No Council Tax for Care Leavers till age 25.	Funded from item 5	Rec	Item 5
7	Landlord & tenant support	£70k	Rec	Revenue
8	Respite Services from IBCF, early years/Sure Start facilities	£300k	Rec	IBCF
9	London Living wage for all LLB staff, implications for	£25k pa for LBB staff,	Both	Revenue. Review
	contract staff.	£25k for		funded from
		report/review		Commissioing reserve
10	Mental Health Service.	£100k	Rec	Revenue
11	Public Health	£250k	Rec	Revenue
12	CCTV inc monitoring	£200k capital, £40k	Both	Earmarked Reserve &
		staff		Revenue
13	Youth Services / facilities	£100k	Rec	Revenue
14	Small business grants	£50k pa for 4 years	Non rec	Growth fund
15	Carbon Zero 2029 target	£5million	Non rec	Invest to save
16	Housing construction	£250k pa for 4 years	Non rec	Growth fund

