

**ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY DEVELOPMENT  
AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held at 6.30 pm on 11 March 2021

**Present:**

Councillor Will Harmer (Chairman)  
Councillor Kieran Terry (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Mark Brock, Ian Dunn, Colin Hitchins,  
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Melanie Stevens,  
Harry Stranger and Michael Tickner

**Also Present:**

Councillor Mary Cooke, Councillor Simon Fawthrop,  
Councillor William Huntington-Thresher, Councillor Keith  
Onslow, Councillor Tony Owen, Councillor Will Rowlands  
and Councillor Stephen Wells

**88 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF  
SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

No apologies for absence were received.

**89 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**90 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14th JANUARY 2021**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> January were agreed as a correct record.

**91 QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIRMAN OR THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions received for the Chairman or the Committee.

**92 MATTERS ARISING AND WORK PROGRAMME**

**CSD21024**

Members noted the report regarding Matters Arising and the Work Programme.

A Member referred to an item on the Work Programme that had not been allocated a meeting date yet. This was the item relating to maintaining the quality of card and paper—he asked when a meeting date for this report

*11 March 2021*

would be forthcoming. The Director of Environment and Public Protection said that he would look into this and report back to the Committee.

**RESOLVED that**

- 1) The Matters Arising and Work Programme report be noted**
- 2) The Director of Environment and Public Protection would investigate when the report relating to the maintenance of card and paper quality would be reported back to the Committee**

**93 PORTFOLIO HOLDER UPDATE**

There was no update from the Portfolio Holder on this occasion.

**94 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

Three questions were submitted to the Portfolio Holder for oral response, and 23 questions were received for written response. Questioners received a response to their written questions on the day following the meeting. All the oral and written questions and answers are published as an appendix to the minutes.

**95 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**a BUDGET MONITORING 2020/21**

**FSD 22021**

Members were briefed by the Head of ECS Finance that the current projected underspend was £372k. This had reduced from the last report, as the previous underspend with respect to 'Highways' was now intended to be used on carriageway repairs. It was explained that the budget report did not detail the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the Portfolio's budget, as this was reported separately to the Executive.

A Member asked what the reasons were for the £255k disputed cost with respect to Waste Services. The Member also noted that there was a £56k underspend with respect to vacancies in the Traffic and Road Safety Service and asked if there was a plan to fill any vacancies that may exist, given the current level of interest with respect to road safety.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking responded to the question regarding the £56k underspend for the Traffic and Road Safety Service. He explained that this was funding that was held in reserve, as it was not clear if TfL capital funding for certain LIP funded positions within the service would be

available. He promised to check on this and report back to the Committee if required.

*(Post meeting note: with respect to the matter of the £255k disputed cost figure, a response was previously disseminated to Members on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2021)*

**RESOLVED that**

**1) The Portfolio Holder endorse the 2020/21 revenue budget monitoring for the Environment and Community Services Portfolio.**

**2) The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking would check on the matter relating to the £56 underspend still needed to be held in reserve, and if the relevant TfL capital funding had been released.**

**96 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING REPORT**

**FSD21016**

The Chairman pointed out that this report was primarily for noting. This was because the Leader had agreed a revised Capital Programme for the five year period 2020/21 to 2024/25. The report highlighted the changes that were agreed by the Leader in respect of the Capital Programme for the Environment and Community Services portfolio.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder notes and acknowledges the changes agreed by the Leader on 10th February 2021.**

**a TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENTS AT THE JUNCTION OF BROMLEY ROAD, WITH SCOTTS LANE AND DOWNS BRIDGE ROAD**

**ES20080**

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking explained that the report had been generated to put forward options to improve traffic and pedestrian safety at the junction where Scott's Lane and Downs Bridge Road crossed Bromley Road. This was a location where accidents had occurred for many years; most of these accidents had been non-serious but a few were serious. This particular location had been on a list for possible safety scheme improvements for some time. Members had asked officers to look into the possibility of what could be done, because this area was on the periphery of the Shortlands Liveable Neighbourhood, and therefore funding was available from TfL for improvement works to be undertaken. The Assistant Director felt that in the main, Ward Members were supportive of the application, although he was aware that they had their own comments and suggestions to put forward.

*11 March 2021*

The report suggested that a mini roundabout be installed at the junction, and this would therefore mean that traffic would have to reduce speed, thus minimising the risk of accidents and avoiding injuries. Members had also asked officers to consider what could be done for the benefit of pedestrians, as many pedestrians crossed in that area. The Assistant Director informed the Committee that current pedestrian counts were not available due to the Covid 19 lockdown and so therefore the pedestrian counts had to be estimated.

However, pre-existing vehicle counts were available which could be taken into consideration. It was felt that a refuge was needed for the deflection of traffic on the mini roundabout. The Assistant Director explained that it may also be possible to install a zebra crossing for the benefit of pedestrians. So various options were being considered in the report, and it was hoped that the Committee could feedback to the Portfolio Holder before he made his final decision on how to proceed and which option should be implemented.

A Member (who was also a Ward Councillor) explained that the Ward Councillors had been campaigning for changes at this location for some time and so he was delighted that a scheme was being planned. He said that the Ward Councillors, (broadly speaking), were in favour of the recommendations of the report. However, the Ward Councillors felt strongly that the 227 bus shelter should be re-located. It was felt that if the bus shelter stayed where it was, it would hold up traffic--which was likely to tail back to the roundabout. It was suggested that the bus shelter be moved further forward and that this should be costed in to the plans.

The Member (and Ward Councillor) addressed the matter of whether or not a refuge should be installed—or a pedestrian crossing. He preferred the option to install a pedestrian crossing, as he felt that this would have a more calming effect on the traffic flow. He stated that he was sceptical as to the value of the cost benefit analysis undertaken. He concluded by saying that the recommendation of the Ward Councillors would be for the installation of the mini roundabout with a Zebra Crossing. There was no preference regarding the use of tegular or granite paving. This would therefore mean that the preference would be for option 1 as outlined in the report, with the caveat that the bus shelter be relocated.

A Member noted that the proposed scheme was being developed outside the normal Department for Transport guidance and so he queried the significance of this. He also drew attention to the fact that the stage one safety audit had not been undertaken and asked if this would pose any risk to the completion of the project. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking responded that it had to be borne in mind the guidance from the Department of Transport was not of a statutory nature but it was in fact just guidance. In this case the roundabout was being developed with four arms, and it was acknowledged that generally speaking, mini roundabouts would work better with three arms, so there may be some limited imbalance in traffic flows. However, it was definitely the case that the proposed development of the mini roundabout with

four arms would be preferable to the current situation and would address the safety concerns that had been raised by Ward Councillors and residents.

With reference to the safety audit, when the detailed design was completed then a second stage road safety audit would be undertaken by an independent consultancy. At this stage any other additional safety concerns would be flagged up. From past experience it was noted that generally speaking a second stage safety audit did not normally derail a project, in fact it could result in tweaks that made the project better. Any recommendations from the second stage safety audits would be considered before the implementation of the scheme.

Members were informed that bus shelters were not built or designed to be relocated after being taken down, but rather a new bus shelter would need to be constructed at a new location if it was agreed that this was the way forward. The cost of construction of a new bus shelter was in the region of £20,000.

The Chairman commented that a 40% contingency figure had been factored into the plans, and he wondered why this was the case, as 40% seemed to be rather excessive for a standard road traffic improvement scheme. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking answered that this had been advised by the scheme designers as due to time constraints, not as much initial site investigation had been undertaken as would normally be the case. This could therefore mean that as the project progressed, an issue with utility infrastructure could be detected, and this was the reason for the 40% contingency figure being factored in to the project. If no issues of this nature were encountered, then it was expected that the contingency figure would reduce.

A discussion took place concerning the usefulness or otherwise of the  $PV_2$  calculations used, where P equated to pedestrians and V equated to vehicles.

**RESOLVED that:**

- 1) The project design should move forward and that the option to be implemented would be 'option 1', which was the option to install a mini roundabout with a zebra crossing and tegular paving.**
- 2) The 227 bus shelter should, if possible, be relocated in consultation with TfL.**
- 3) The costs of the scheme should be met from TfL funding for the Liveable Neighbourhood Transport Scheme.**
- 4) Delegated authority with respect to design amendments be granted to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.**

**b WESTGATE ROAD AND ALBEMARLE ROAD TRAFFIC  
MANAGEMENT CHANGES**

**ES 20079**

The Committee was presented with a report seeking approval for the installation of traffic signals on either side of Westgate Road Bridge and to retain and modify experimental cycle lanes on Albemarle Road, Beckenham.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking explained that a cycle route had been installed previously in Albemarle Road, and this had been actioned as funding had been available from central government to support cycling during the pandemic lockdown. The scheme had been introduced as an experimental scheme as there had not been time for a full consultation process to be undertaken. The scheme had been operational since November 2020. It was felt that the scheme could be improved with the installation of traffic lights on the Westgate Road Bridge. The purpose of installing the traffic lights would be to allow two way traffic to flow over the bridge once more, but avoiding the issues of traffic coming over the bridge nose to nose as was currently the case.

Some issues had arisen in the lower west end section of Albemarle Road, where a one way system had been installed to support the cycle route. Because of this, it meant that more traffic was going past Harris Beckenham School. Officers had observed the operation of the cycle lane and felt that the situation could be improved by reverting the road back to two way traffic, while still supporting cyclists. One of the ways that this could be achieved would be to suspend parking bays to help improve the traffic flow.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking said that it was decided that a local public consultation was needed to see whether the experimental cycling lane should be discontinued, or whether the Council should try and develop and improve it. To this end, a local public consultation was undertaken and the views of local residents were sought. The Assistant Director said that a copy of the consultation document was provided with the agenda papers. Members noted that the report recommended that traffic lights should be installed on the bridge and the western section of Albemarle Road should be returned to two way traffic, whilst at the same time retaining a segregated route for cycling.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking noted that a separate consultation had been undertaken by Ward Councillors, which had also been incorporated into the agenda papers and which he was aware they would be speaking in respect of in due course. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking stated that the results of the consultation undertaken by officers was that generally speaking the public was still supportive of the scheme.

A Member and Ward Councillor expressed the view that what was lacking from the officers' survey was that members of the public had not been asked what they wanted to do with respect to the Bridge at Westgate Road. He agreed that the public seemed to want to continue with the trial of the existing scheme.

A Member mentioned that a previous report had been brought to the Committee with respect to the 'Quiet Way' which seemed to run more or less on the same route as the cycle lane. He sought assurances that the proposed scheme would not affect adversely any plans with regard to the 'Quiet Way'. He also asked for assurances that if Albemarle Road reverted back to two lanes (plus the cycle lane) that this reversion would still be safe for cyclists.

The Assistant Director responded that the proposed route for the 'Quiet Way' had been disputed for several years but had now been superseded by this new route. A route that would help continue this scheme would be to take the cycle route to Beckenham Junction and then Rectory Road, Blakeney Road, Bridge Road and join up with the cycle route near to Kent House Station and then progress up to Greenwich.

The Assistant Director stated that with respect to the last section of Albemarle Road, the carriage-way width had been measured and was found to meet the TfL guidance required to provide adequate safety for cyclists. Observations seemed to indicate that with two lanes of traffic and a segregated lane for cyclists, this should result in slower moving traffic.

A Member asked if alterations could be made to Westgate Road Bridge which could include the addition of an independent lane for pedestrians. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking answered that any plans that would include the construction of a new bridge, or any major structural changes to the existing bridge would be far too expensive and would incur costs of a far greater magnitude—and there was no budget for this.

A Member and Ward Councillor asked the Committee and the Portfolio Holder to support the three recommendations that were proposed in the Ward Councillors report (page 95 of the agenda pack). He also recommended the adoption of the recommendations outlined in sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 of the officers' report.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking and the Portfolio Holder made closing comments before the resolutions were agreed.

**RESOLVED that:**

**1) The Albemarle Road Experimental Cycle Scheme be left in place for the present time, but with the amendment of the re-introduction of two-way traffic between the junctions at Westgate Road and St Georges Road, whilst retaining the segregated cycle lane, along with associated junction priority changes.**

**2) The railway bridge in Westgate Road continues to have one-way traffic over the bridge and that traffic be one-way South (as present).**

**3) The Albemarle Road Experimental scheme be subject to further review(s) and consultation(s) within 18 months so that post-lockdown traffic can be measured and residents' views re-evaluated.**

**4) That funding for this work be allocated from the TfL Liveable Neighbourhood Budget.**

**5) The Director of Environment receive delegated authority to deal with design amendments across the whole scheme in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and in line with the requirements of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order.**

#### **c PLANNED HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE**

##### **ES20084**

Members were presented with a report regarding the work planned for the maintenance of highways in the borough.

The Assistant Director for Highways explained that some LBB funding had become available for highway maintenance projects because of previous underspends, and that funding was expected to be reinstated by TfL. So what was now required was to submit a bid to TfL for the funding of planned highway maintenance; the Council was allowed to submit a bid to the value of £1.5m. In reality it was probable that approximately half of this would be received.

It was clarified that this highway maintenance was not directed primarily at any holes or damage caused by utility works, but was for general structural planned maintenance.

Councillor Hitchins declared an interest at this point in view of the fact that he regularly travelled on two of the roads that were mentioned in the appendix to the report.

Members supported the recommendations as outlined in the report.

#### **RESOLVED that:**

**1) The Portfolio Holder agreed that the schemes listed in Appendix 'A' should be included in a programme of planned highway maintenance for 2020/21, to be undertaken by the Council's existing highway term maintenance contractor, up to a maximum cost of £0.6m, subject to available funding from underspending on other Highways revenue budgets.**

**2) The Portfolio Holder agreed that a bid for funding of £1.5m should be submitted to TfL for the schemes listed in Appendix 'B' to form a future principal roads maintenance programme and, if successful, the Executive is requested to amend the Capital Programme accordingly.**

**97 PRE SCRUTINY OF REPORTS GOING TO THE EXECUTIVE**

**a PROCUREMENT OF MOVING TRAFFIC CONTRAVENTION CAMERAS**

**ES 20078**

Members were asked to undertake pre decision scrutiny of the report regarding the procurement of moving traffic contravention cameras. The final decision concerning the recommendations of the report would be taken by the Executive. There were 13 cameras to procure, and it was hoped to begin enforcement later in 2021.

The recommendation was that the cameras would be procured via APCOA (the existing contractor). APCOA would sub-contract the procurement to TES Limited.

A Member asked for assurances that the quality of the images would enable prosecutions to take place, and also asked if LBB would be able to add to the number of cameras being used going forward. The Head of Shared Parking Services stated that additional cameras could be added to the network in the future if required. Evidence of image quality would be provided by the contractor before LBB entered into a contractual arrangement.

The Vice Chairman asked if consideration had been applied to undertaking a joint procurement initiative with Bexley, with the possibility of making efficiencies/savings. The Head of Shared Parking Services replied that no direct conversation to that end had taken place. However, if in the future the camera network was going to be extended, then this was something that could be considered.

The Chairman asked about the vendor (TES), reminding the Committee that they were a small business with approximately 8-10 staff. He inquired us to what protection LBB would have if TES went bust. This was because the Council had experienced previous issues when a company had gone bust and the Council had been unable to access the affected systems. He would not wish the situation to arise whereby TES went bust and then LBB was left with non-functioning cameras. The Head of Shared Parking Services responded that TES was a company that was known to the Council as they had provided services with respect to mobile CCTV cars in Bexley. She expressed confidence in their ability to fulfill their contractual obligations. However, she agreed with the Chairman that it would be prudent to include assurances in the Council's agreement with APCOA which would make it clear that APCOA

*11 March 2021*

would take responsibility for any risk associated with using TES as a sub-contractor.

A Member pointed out that in his view it should be the Council's policy to support small and medium sized enterprises, and as TES was known to the Council then they should be given the opportunity to undertake the work.

**RESOLVED that it be recommended to the Executive that they accept the recommendations of the report.**

**b BROMLEY BIODIVERSITY PLAN 2021-2026**

**DRR000000**

Members were presented with a report outlining the Bromley Biodiversity Plan (BBP) for consideration and pre-decision scrutiny before the plan went to the Executive for ratification.

Members noted that the report recommended that the new Bromley Biodiversity Plan (BBP) should be adopted by the Council. The BBP aimed to prevent the decline of species and habitats and to promote their conservation through active management of land, and the promotion of biodiversity gains through the planning system. The BBP provided guidance to developers, planners and land managers on how biodiversity should be protected and enhanced in the borough.

Dr Judith John attended the meeting to answer any questions with respect to the Plan. The purpose of the report was outlined by Ben Johnson. The onus on the Council to produce the report was in response to the requirements of the National Environmental Rural Communities Act. This placed a duty on Councils to protect Bio-Diversity. The Chairman commented that recently there had been much focus nationally on bio-diversity.

The Committee noted the importance of gardens in this regard, especially when taken cumulatively, and that it may be prudent to reflect this in the Local Plan when it was reviewed.

Members were impressed with the detail and quality of the report and agreed with the recommendations.

**RESOLVED that the Bromley Biodiversity plan be noted, and that the Committee recommends the adoption of the Plan by the Executive.**

**98 POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS**

**a SHORTLANDS FRIENDLY VILLAGE LIVEABLE UPDATE**

**ES20081**

Members were presented with a report that was primarily for information purposes. The report was drafted to provide the Committee with an update with respect to the design developments for the Shortlands Friendly Liveable Neighbourhood Village.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking explained that the project had been delayed because of Covid19, but nevertheless design modelling was continuing. More work was required to be done before anything more concrete could be brought to the Committee for scrutiny.

The Chairman was very keen for the scheme to be pursued, and for modelling to continue and for a local public consultation to be implemented. He commented that there was no data in the report with respect to funding for improving 'street scene' and for enhancing the general look and feel of the area to encourage local businesses. The Chairman stated that the project was very challenging as the Council was restricted by obstacles that were not movable.

A Member stated that it was important that the scheme facilitate cycling from Bromley, to Beckenham and then to Greenwich. A discussion took place concerning the note in the report of differing views amongst the Ward Member Project Board. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking explained that this was largely because the answers to the correct solution were not clear and that was why more modelling was required. Once the results of further modelling were known, then the results would be reported back to the Committee.

A Member said that he had attended previous public meetings concerning this development, but they had been unproductive as there had not been enough detail available to comment upon. He was not keen on more traffic lights. He was in favour of streamlining and the use of mini-roundabouts as required.

**RESOLVED that the update report be noted.**

#### **b ECS PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW UPDATE**

Members were briefed with the performance overview update for 'ECS4' which was in respect of the recycling of household waste. This was rated as 'amber'. This was below target due to the impacts of the Covid Pandemic. 'ECS6' was similar to this and was also amber, figures similarly being affected by the pandemic.

Changes to residents' lifestyles during the Covid-19 pandemic and the resulting restrictions meant that more people were at home during the daytime. This had resulted in an increase in the amount of residual waste produced per household. It was likely that home clearances and improvement activities also increased during this time which also impacted on the figures.

*11 March 2021*

Members heard that with respect to the arboricultural contract, the required target levels had not been hit. This was due to the seasonal volatility of the work and the need to deal with a backlog. Performance had now improved.

The Chairman said that the borough had experienced disruptive waste collections with the snow and ice that occurred during February. Services had been suspended for several days. He wondered if with hindsight, this was the correct course of action, and if the decisions made had been communicated effectively, and what could the Council do better next time.

Members were informed that the snow and ice caused chaos and serious health and safety issues. The safety of the work force was of first importance and so services were suspended for three days. A discussion took place as to how matters were communicated during this period. The Portfolio Holder pointed out that going forward, the Council would benefit from an enhanced website which would improve the way the Council communicated with residents. It was also the case that LBB now benefited from an advanced weather forecasting system which was very reliable and perhaps more trust could be placed in their accuracy, rather than waiting for early morning inspections before determining whether collections could occur safely, thus allowing residents to be alerted the day before.

Part of the discussion relating to communication, concerned whether or not a message concerning collections should have been put on the front page of the Council website, where it would be easy to see. The Communications Executive stated that the waste news website address was well known, and lots of people had looked at this. He said that in terms of the lessons learnt, the Council would be looking to improve the website, and was also looking into text messaging residents directly.

A Member inquired if refuse teams could have been redirected to the North of the borough which seemed to get less adverse weather conditions. It was noted that an issue making this difficult was that this would have necessitated a comprehensive communications exercise to explain what was happening, so that residents could get their bins out for collection on time.

A Member suggested that emails be sent directly to residents explaining what the default position was, sending out a holding email if necessary. In her ward, as there was little communication, plastics were left out for collection for a week which were blown everywhere by the wind.

A Member suggested the possibility of adding a note to Council Tax reminders to request more email addresses, so that the Council could get greater coverage for their communications. The Communications Executive said that the Council currently held 70,000 email addresses of residents but it would obviously be good to get more.

The Chairman wondered if Residents Associations could be used to get messages out to the public if required.

A Member referred back to 'ECS 4' and the issue of high precipitation making paper too wet for recycling. He wondered if any plans were in place to try and resolve this issue. The Strategic Manager for Waste Services explained alternatives to the current collection methodology was something that had been looked into, but so far all options for alternative collections seemed to be too costly. In the meantime, the Waste Transfer Station was having some repairs actioned, and holes were being repaired in the roof to stop water getting in and wetting the paper.

The Committee was briefed that trials were underway with an alternative paper re-processing centre and a refuse derived fuel facility, in an attempt to find cost effective ways of drying paper that could then be recycled.

The Committee noted that with respect to the paper market, there had been a general downward trend in pricing due to supply exceeding demand with respect to paper. During the Covid-19 pandemic, the price had seen an uplift due to an increase in demand for card packaging. This was likely to be temporary, with the overall trajectory being that paper prices would continue to decline.

**RESOLVED that the ECS Performance Overview update be noted.**

## **99 ECS DRAFT PORTFOLIO PLAN**

### **ES20070**

A discussion took place about the development of electronic vehicle charging points in the borough. It was noted that some charging points had been installed by TfL and others by Blue Point/ChargePoint London. The Portfolio Holder explained that this was a developing strategy, and the Council had to be careful to make the correct investment in technology, one that would be an investment for the future and also upgradeable.

Mention was made of the facilities for the Cray Wanderers football team and the fact that they were in desperate need of funding, as their current conditions were very bad, and they were looking to have 26 junior football teams up and running the next season.

The Chairman commented on ambitions for the Portfolio Plan and referred to the contract targets with respect to public satisfaction for cleanliness. His observation was that the report seemed to indicate less ambitious targets going forward, despite the fact that the previous targets had been hit. He wondered why this was the case. The Senior Business Support Officer explained that the Council was definitely not seeking a reduced performance from the contractor. There was some confusion in that the targets mentioned in the report that the Chairman was looking at, were contractual targets as per the contract--whereas the previous targets that Members had been looking at were targets that were for internal reporting purposes rather than contractual.

**RESOLVED that the Draft Portfolio Plan be noted.**

**100 RISK REGISTER**

**ES20067**

Members noted that the Covid Pandemic had now been removed from the Risk Register.

**RESOLVED that the Risk Register report be noted.**

**101 CONTRACTS REGISTER**

**ES20068**

The Chairman noted that there was one item on the Risk Register that was flagged as 'Red', but that this looked manageable.

**RESOLVED that the Contracts Register report be noted.**

**102 ORPINGTON: CROFTON ROAD TRANSPORT CORRIDOR**

**ES 20082**

Members were presented with a report concerning the Crofton Road Transport Corridor Improvement Scheme in Orpington.

The report had been presented because a Member had given notice to the Proper Officer that he wished to raise questions regarding the scheme at the meeting.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking stated that this was a scheme to develop cycle routes along Crofton Road. The scheme had turned out to be a controversial one, with many questions being raised with respect to value for money and the scheme's efficacy. In developing the scheme, the public, along with Ward Councillors had been consulted. He said that the answers to the questions raised by the Guest Member were outlined in the report.

The Chairman commented that he had attended on site and noted that this was a work in progress.

The Guest Member stated that his purpose in bringing the matter to the attention of the Committee was so that the work would stop, and that the Committee sanction or commission an immediate road safety audit of the scheme, particularly in the area between Newstead Ave and Orpington Station.

He referred to the previous use of three lane highways, and the fact that these had been scrapped because of dangers in relation to 'head on conflict'. In his view, the cycle scheme being proposed for Crofton Road had 'head on conflict designed in to the scheme'. The Guest Member referred to an accident that had taken place on the 19th of February at 10:00am, which involved a head on collision. To support this, he read out a statement given by a bus driver that had witnessed the accident.

He stated that post lockdown there could be a danger with standstill traffic in Crofton Road which would have a major impact on bus routes. Again, the Guest Member reiterated his request to the Committee to undertake a proper and thorough road safety audit. The Chairman asked the Guest Member who he thought should undertake the safety audit--should it be the Committee or should it be the professionals. The Guest Member responded that he was asking the Committee to commission the safety audit.

The Guest Member stated that he was in contact with a constituent who was a chartered civil engineer and a road safety auditor who had pointed out what he considered to be flaws in the design of the scheme, again particularly in the area between Newstead Avenue and York Rise. He outlined several suggestions that had been made by the constituent who was a retired chartered civil engineer and these were as follows:

1. The relocation of the BT pole
2. The relocation of the bus stop and cage
3. The revision of the kerb-line of the north of the road between York Rise and the taxi rank, to increase the width of the carriageway by 2 metres
4. Narrow the footway on the southern side of the road

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking responded that the scheme had been audited by an independent safety auditor at the concept and design stage, and that at the completion of the scheme, a stage 3 road safety audit would be undertaken.

The Portfolio Holder said that in due course an update report would be provided and that the Council would continue to monitor the situation. In the meantime, the Council planned to improve the scheme by repainting the line markings and improving the road surface. It was hoped that if the line markings were made clearer this would help to make the scheme safer.

The Chairman asked if there was an immediate and urgent risk that required attention. The Assistant Director of Traffic and Parking responded that this was why the road markings had now in fact already been repainted, with further improvements to come.

The Guest Member who raised the questions initially, asked if a meeting could be arranged with the constituent who was a chartered engineer and with the contractor, as the contractor was already on site.

*11 March 2021*

He asked if the Portfolio Holder and the Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking would like to attend the meeting. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking responded that he would be happy to attend the meeting, and he would probably also bring with him someone from the design team and the build team. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that he also was willing to attend such a meeting.

**RESOLVED that:**

**1) The Committee and the Portfolio Holder noted the report, the questions raised by Cllr Owen and the responses provided.**

**2) A meeting would be held on site comprising the following:**

- **Councillor Owen**
- **Ward Councillors**
- **A constituent who was a retired chartered civil engineer**
- **The LBB contractor**
- **The Portfolio Holder**
- **The Assistant Director of Traffic and Parking together with representatives from the design and build team**

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

# Minute Annex

## ECS PDS for 11<sup>th</sup> March 2021

### List of questions from the public for oral response :

#### 1) Question from Julian Freestone:

'Significant damage to footpaths & fauna is being done in Elmstead Woods through the regular unauthorised use of motorbikes & quad bikes in the woods. There is also a significant amount of noise pollution caused by them at times of high public use (weekends). Can you please tell me how the Council intends to tackle this problem?'

#### Answer to Question 1:

A) The Council and Police are working together to develop an action plan of joint site patrols involving the Councils Parks Security contractor / Ward Security and the police

B) Council officers, The police and the Council's Parks contractors will undertake site visits to identify and assess official key pedestrian and vehicle access points into the park to determine what action / physical improvements are required prevent the illegal access by these motorbikes while still maintaining access for pedestrians, those in wheel chairs and people with buggies.

C) The site visit will also look to identify illegal motorbike access points with a view to blocking them with appropriate infrastructure. We strive to maintain the paths and fauna in Elmstead Woods in a good condition as far as reasonably possible. the budget however will be stretched to repair additional damage so it may take some time to achieve those repairs. If we are successful in catching any of the culprits we will seek to impose fines which we can then use to help with repairs

#### Supplementary Question to Question 1:

You mentioned that this matter falls under the remit of two committees as it also relates to matters of public safety. Am I right in thinking that this will be a joint effort as well as involving the police, given that the activity is illegal.

#### Answer to Supplementary Question 1

The Environment Committee cover the policy aspects of the Parks Security Service and Councillor Lymer (Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement) has more to do with the parks security service. So yes, we will be dealing with this jointly. Councillor Lymer has regular contact with the police. As you pointed out, we require joint action to be effective. Ward security use body worn cameras and patrol with dogs. This give them a good ability to act in the situation regarding the quad bikes and motor bikes.

#### 2) Question from Daniel Mirea:

I have serious concerns about the damage done to the whole ecosystem in Elmstead Woods brought by an increasing number of motorbikes motocross users in this area. It is not just the noise but also the damage done by aggressive off-road driving through Elmstead Woods on a regular basis. In spite of numerous complaints, the council does not seem to take action. Can you please minute these concerns and update on any future action plans?

### Answer to Question 2:

- A) The Council and Police are working together to develop an action plan of joint site patrols involving the Councils Parks Security contractor / Ward Security and the police
- B) Council officers , The police and the Council's Parks contractors will undertake site visits to identify and assess official key pedestrian and vehicle access points into the park to determine what action / physical improvements are required prevent the illegal access by these motorbikes while still maintaining access for pedestrians, those in wheel chairs and people with buggies.
- C) The site visit will also look to identify illegal motorbike access points with a view to blocking them with appropriate infrastructure.

We strive to maintain the paths and fauna in Elmstead Woods in a good condition as far as reasonably possible. the budget however will be stretched to repair additional damage so it may take some time to achieve those repairs. If we are successful in catching any of the culprits we will seek to impose fines which we can then use to help with repairs.

### 3a) Question from Richard Gibbons:

Would Portfolio Holder (a) provide definitive list of land and building assets idVerde is currently contracted to manage and maintain within Open Space Portfolio; (b) list of land and building assets subject to development and/or disposal in 2015/16, 2016/17, 2017/18, 2018/19, 2019/20, 2020/21?

### Answer to Question 3a:

A) A list can be provided of definitive land assets that idverde manage and maintain. We would require more information regarding the format of the information requested.

Idverde are not currently contracted to manage or maintain buildings and property assets.

B) Since 2015 the Council has not disposed of any land or building assets within the Open Space Portfolio – as managed by Idverde. The only exception to this is that the Council have granted a lease for a term exceeding 7 years to FC Elmstead so that they could build their new pavilion at Chislehurst Recreation Ground and the Open Space notification process was followed.

### 3b) Question from Richard Gibbons:

Has the Portfolio Holder undertaken SWOT analysis for Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) to (a) enhance/extend bus routes currently serving borough; (b) support regeneration/development of Orpington Town Centre, Cray Business Corridor, Biggin Hill SOLDC; (c) improve services to/from rural villages, nearby housing developments such as Fort Halstead, and Sevenoaks?

### Answer to question 3b:

The Council understands the importance of the bus as part of the Borough's public transport network and how it could be further developed, incrementally, based on changes in demand and travel behaviour. The Council holds regular Public Transport Liaison meetings, some of which are held in public. These meetings are held to raise service issues and general coordination between users, providers and funders of public transport (the local TDA is invited) TfL is the body in London funded to deliver bus services, the Council, does make requests of TfL in this regard. As and when TfL undertakes studies to develop the network and investigate new and innovative bus services, the Council, as a stakeholder will provide advice and commentary. In July 2018 we wrote to TfL to suggest, in response to a TfL approach, that when they trialled a DRT service that they **consider** the rural part of our borough. You will also have seen the Council's Press Releases on supervised autonomous vehicle tests in 2018 and 2019, which could be a method for delivery of DRT. TfL primarily delivers bus services to Greater London residents and tax payers to reach their destination rather than Kent residents to reach destinations in London. It is my expectation that future developments, such as Fort Halstead as part of their environmental commitments in the planning process should be considering supporting public transport and/or active travel options for residents. The outline planning application for Fort Halstead appears to include the provision of a community bus service probably to Orpington Station. Bus services are only part of the public transport offer, which includes rail.

Our LIP did make a number of requests for new connectivity, particularly orbital routes and links to the Elizabeth line, in addition looking for a timetable for zero emission buses. In addition public transport has been a consideration of the SOLDC and when we become aware of connectivity gaps we will engage with TfL to address them. Future work though remains dependent on TfL finances.

### Supplementary Question relating to 3b

The last meeting that I can find on the LBB website for the Public Transport Liaison Group was in September 2015. Has the Group met since then, and when will it be meeting next? Have TfL's DRT trials in Sutton and Ealing been discussed at London Councils' TEC meetings? If so, when was this? Otherwise, please can this be raised at future meetings?

### Answer to Supplementary Question 3b

No further meeting is planned. There was a meeting in early 2020, but this was probably not a public meeting. We will be setting up a meeting as soon as we can meet in person again. I will liaise with the PDS Chairman who formerly chairs these meetings to see when another one might be organised. The DRT meetings cross over into the Supervised Autonomous Vehicle Transport Trials. That was probably last discussed at a London Councils TEC meeting a couple of years ago in September 2019.

I will ask the Chairman of the TEC to see when there is a further update, but this will probably not be of much use until TfL have finances available to take this further. Most of these would have been delivered by other parties and TfL and the boroughs are actually only stakeholders and observers, rather than participants in the trials.

(The Chairman commented that the last meeting of the Public Liaison Committee was in mid-January 2020)

## ECS PDS—11<sup>th</sup> March—Questions for Written Response:

### **1) Question from Maureen McCann:**

My young neighbour wrote about the future of our open spaces in Bromley for his young reporter scheme. Since lockdown, these areas have become even more important for families. However, Elmstead/Marvels Wood looks neglected and ruined by ASB. What is Bromley doing to protect these woods for our future generation?

#### **Answer to Question 1**

A) The Council and Police are working together to develop an action plan of joint site patrols involving the Councils Parks Security contractor / Ward Security and the police

B) Council officers , The police and the Council's Parks contractors will undertake site visits to identify and assess official key pedestrian and vehicle access points into the park to determine what action / physical improvements are required prevent the illegal access by these motorbikes while still maintaining access for pedestrians, those in wheel chairs and people with buggies.

C) The site visit will also look to identify illegal motorbike access points with a view to blocking them with appropriate infrastructure.

D) We strive to maintain the paths and fauna in Elmstead Woods in a good condition as far as reasonably possible. the budget however will be stretched to repair additional damage so it may take some time to achieve those repairs. If we are successful in catching any of the culprits we will seek to impose fines which we can then use to help with repairs.

### **2) Question from Ryan Finn:**

High powered off-road motorbikes are regularly using Elmstead and Marvels Woods as their private dirt track. Reaching high speeds in concise space, they pose a significant danger to the numerous members of the public, many of them with small children and dogs, that enjoy these woods. Please can you tell me how the Council intends to eradicate this problem?"

#### **Answer to Question 2:**

A) The Council and Police are working together to develop an action plan of joint site patrols involving the Councils Parks Security contractor / Ward Security and the police

B) Council officers , The police and the Council's Parks contractors will undertake site visits to identify and assess official key pedestrian and vehicle access points into the park to determine what action / physical improvements are required prevent the illegal access by these motorbikes while still maintaining access for pedestrians, those in wheel chairs and people with buggies.

C) The site visit will also look to identify illegal motorbike access points with a view to blocking them with appropriate infrastructure.

D) We strive to maintain the paths and fauna in Elmstead Woods in a good condition as far as reasonably possible. The budget however will be stretched to repair additional damage so it may take some time to achieve those repairs. If we are successful in catching any of the culprits we will seek to impose fines which we can then use to help with repairs.

**3) Question from Mandy James:**

UK government announced 50% of all urban journeys are to be walked or cycled by 2030. Will LBB acknowledge training on road and cycle safety isn't enough to meet this and advise of the actions LBB will take to build sufficient infrastructure to enable this level of active travel?

**Answer to Question 3:**

The 50% target for active travel for urban journeys is of course an average and the fringes of the urban area, such as Bromley will obviously have a lower proportion than Central London. Much of the borough is suburban and rural. Walking, particularly walking to public transport has provided the majority of active travel journeys in the borough and is likely to continue to do so. We therefore support both walking and cycling, plus in the case of some school journey push scooters.

Turning to cycling, our cycle training, outside of the current pandemic, has been able to meet the demand, in addition the Council continues to install improved facilities for both cycling and cycle parking. That includes new facilities recently or currently being installed in Orpington, Beckenham and Crystal Palace and we have also facilitated over 600 cycle parking spaces at destinations in recent years. New developments in addition have a requirement in the planning process to provide cycle parking and those numbers would be in addition to the above.

In terms of future facilities the aspiration is to provide residents with a genuine choice of travel modes as to how they travel within our borough. Understanding the demand is key to ensure that future spend is justified and part of that may require us to understand the extent of a new normal.

**4) Question from Mandy James:**

Road congestion is an ongoing problem within the Waldo and Tylney Road area of Bromley. With so many idling cars in close proximity to four schools, will LBB please confirm what action is being taken to reduce traffic and pollution in this area?

**Answer to Question 4:**

I am sorry you have been inconvenienced in recent weeks by congestion due to the higher volumes of customers visiting Waldo Road re-use and recycling centre. Trips

to council amenity sites have remained an essential activity during lock down, and it appears a high volume of customers have taken the opportunity of staycations to spring clean. We continue to promote our Green Garden Waste Collection subscription service to reduce the number of journeys, and in the last year we have seen approximately a 20% increase in take-up. We also introduced a new online application system for Green Garden Waste sticker purchases, since with the libraries closed the previous method purchase method was unavailable to residents.

As the weather continues to improve and in anticipation of garden spring cleans, we are starting our weekend operations at our green garden waste satellite sites in Norman Park, Shire Lane, Unicorn Primary and Charles Darwin schools, and these will now begin a week earlier this year on the 27th and 28th March.

We launched our anti-idling education programme outside schools just before the pandemic closed most schools. This is an area we will return to as schools reopen.

**5) Question from Carolyn Heitmeyer:**

Following consultation and with approval from the Greater London Authority, Bromley Council has published its Air Quality Action Plan. This document mentions delivery of 'Shortlands Friendly Village Scheme' as an output. Can the Portfolio Holder provide an update on the delivery of this scheme, and whether it includes Westgate Road traffic lights?

**Answer to Question 5:**

There are two separate reports being presented to this PDS committee this evening, the first of which provides a full update on progress with the Shortlands Friendly Village Scheme and the other will consider whether traffic lights should be installed on Westgate Road bridge.

**6) Question from Carolyn Heitmeyer:**

Can Bromley Council undertake and share a cost-benefit analysis regarding giving residents boxes with hinged lids for paper recycling, i.e. similar to the wheelie bins currently provided for non-recyclable waste in Bromley, or the paper recycling wheelie bins provided to residents in Lambeth?

**Answer to Question 6:**

For clarity, Bromley Council does not provide containers for non-recyclable refuse as the service that we operate is a sack collection. Residents can therefore choose how they want to present their waste and purchase their own container for storage in between collections.

The indicative cost of purchasing and delivering a 180 litre wheeled bin for paper and card to all households is £2.4 million based on 2019/20 tonnage\_data, and 2020/21 costs. Considering the financial aspects of wet paper instead being directed for

energy recovery, there does not appear to be a sufficient benefit to justify this outlay at the current time. We also note these wheelie bins would be plastic.

Bromley is a high performing borough for recycling, achieving a recycling rate of 50.9% in 2019/20, which compares to Lambeth's recycling rate of was 31.7%. The configuration of our recycling and waste services including the container type is one of the reasons Bromley continues to perform at this high level. A regular reader of our environment press releases will see that we continue to introduce new measures with the aim of enhancing our recycling rate.

#### **7) Question from James Rowe**

The need for the UK to adopt much more active travel has recently been restated, and indeed increased, with the statement from Grant Schapps. To that end, will the Council commit to publishing annual success measures that track the necessary increase in levels of school children using active travel?

#### **Answer to Question 7:**

The best measure of success is the number of children in the Borough travelling to school by foot, bike, or scooter. This is a key performance indicator regularly reported to this committee. Unfortunately, as schools were closed for much of the last year, the data we now have is quite out of date. However, The Council's School Travel Advisers continue to liaise with schools to help the schools deliver their travel plan activities and to ensure that Bromley continues to have among the highest number of Gold accredited plans in London. Also, various new infrastructure has been introduced this year in support of active travel to schools.

#### **8) Question from James Rowe:**

The DfT's School Travel Guidance gives local authorities responsibility to promote sustainable travel to schools. Specifically this should include :

1) an audit of sustainable travel infrastructure, and 2) annual publication of its sustainable school travel strategy each August.

When and where are these published?

#### **Answer to Question 8:**

Bromley has recently had more Gold accredited school travel plans than any other London borough. Bromley has, for many years, invested in effective school travel plans, updated as necessary, putting forward a package of measures to improve safety and increase active travel, backed by a partnership involving the school, education, health and transport officers from the local authority, and other stakeholders. These seek to secure benefits for both the school and the children by improving their health through active travel and reducing congestion caused by

school runs, which in turn helps improve local air quality. Each travel plan provides a regular audit of the sustainable travel infrastructure required to support that school.

**9) Question from Amanda McCann:**

My question is why have you allowed the residents whose houses back onto the cow path off of Elmstead Lane to cut down trees and bushes in order to install gates and pathways to their properties. It has completely destroyed what was once a pleasant rural pathway.

**Answer to Question 9:**

The Council has not given consent for residents of Elmstead Lane to cut down trees and bushes to facilitate the installation of gates and pathways to their properties. Thank you for notifying us of this issue which is being investigated.

**10) Question from Rajeev Thacker:**

Action 22 of the Air Quality Action Plan states that the Council aims to "continue with Play Street events." Can you please a) give the names of the streets where the events have taken place and b) the number of and dates of the events that have taken place.

**Answer to Question 10:**

Bromley doesn't have any Play Streets as such but prefers to allow residents to book one-off organised Street Parties. To better reflect this in the AQAP and avoid any misinterpretation "Play Street Events", has been amended to "Street Party Events". This will make no difference to the activities already undertaken, as part of the target 22 concerning "Temporary Car Free Days". This small change to the wording of the target will be reflected in the AQAP's first annual status report, scheduled for release in April 2022. Mindful of the Government's easing of lockdown guidance schedule we are considering the possibilities for 2021.

In 2019 Bromley received 50 applications for Street Parties, followed by 71 applications in 2020. A list of these streets will be sent to Mr Thacker by officers.

**11) Question from Rajeev Thacker:**

The same action point refers to the Council engaging "with residents in discussions about possible changes in the locality that would enhance walking and cycling." Please give details of the process that residents should follow in order that they can engage with the Council to discuss such potential changes.

**Answer to Question 11:**

The Council encourages residents to give their views on cycling and walking schemes through consultation events and communications in respect to larger

proposals, but also responds to hundreds of approaches from residents via the Council's online forms each year. Please use <https://www.bromley.gov.uk/trafficmanagementcontactform>

**12) Question from Robbie Vincent:**

Sophisticated monitors show human made Air Pollution in Bromley exceeds WHO safe limits. On occasion by more than 5 times. Health Charities and other Boroughs issued notification of dangers attached to all types of Wood Burning. Bromley shows 24 related deaths in 2021. Bromley's plan of action please?

**Answer to Question 12:**

Bromley's plan of action is provided in the Air Quality Action Plan and the associated matrix which can be accessed here [https://www.bromley.gov.uk/downloads/download/246/air\\_quality\\_action\\_plan](https://www.bromley.gov.uk/downloads/download/246/air_quality_action_plan)

**13) Question from Laura Vogel:**

Bromley Council has an outstanding record of achievement regarding the STARS program. Does the Portfolio Holder agree there is merit in the Council counting and reporting the number of children in the borough travelling to school by foot, bike, or scooter as a key performance indicator?

**Answer to Question 13:**

This information is already recorded and is a key performance indicator regularly reported to this committee. Unfortunately, as schools were closed for much of the last year, the data we now have is quite out of date. However, The Council's School Travel Advisers continue to liaise with schools to help the schools deliver their travel plan activities and to ensure that Bromley continues to have among the highest number of Gold accredited plans in London. Also, various new infrastructure has been introduced this year in support of active travel to schools.

**14) Question from Laura Vogel:**

Many were pleased to see the addition of the planters on Bromley High Street, could the Portfolio Holder confirm if the funds for the planters came from the Covid Infrastructure Grants and if so, explain how the placing of the High Street planters enhances residents' ability to "active travel" and social distance?

**Answer to Question 14:**

Grant funding for the planters and other social distancing barriers and signage in town centres across the Borough was awarded by the MHCLG under the banner "Reopening High Streets Safely". Planters were also installed to allow space for increased outdoor dining to support food and beverage businesses required to

reduce the number seats inside their premises. Social distancing measures in town centres are therefore primarily to allow high streets to reopen safely, giving customers confidence that they can return high streets without significant risk in respect to Covid 19. Other funding, received via TfL from the DfT, was used to introduce social distancing and active travel facilities around schools and along some transport corridors, with the introduction of new segregated cycle routes and zebra crossings, amongst other measures.

**15) Question from Alisa Igoe:**

Environment and Community Services: Portfolio Plan for 2021/22

Priority 6, page 442

Overarching Portfolio Themes:

*Our Ambitions: Strategic links: The priority aligns to the following Building a Better Bromley ambitions: • For Bromley to have a safe, clean and green environment great for today and the future. “The purpose of the ASR is to shift the focus towards what is being done to improve air quality locally and therefore, provides an update on monitoring undertaken and progress towards the various actions set out in our action plan.”*

**Question:**

The Air Quality Action Plan is shown for September 2021. The Annual Status Report (ASR) is required to be provided by Councils. What changes have now been implemented to improve air quality in Bromley as a result of the completed AQAP consultation and what is planned between now and September 2021?

**Answer to Question 15:**

The finalised Air Quality Action Plan runs from 2020 to 2025. Changes implemented so far will be recorded in the April 2021 annual status report, where data is available for the previous year.

To see what is planned between now and September 2021, please access the Air Quality Action Plan here  
[https://www.bromley.gov.uk/downloads/download/246/air\\_quality\\_action\\_plan](https://www.bromley.gov.uk/downloads/download/246/air_quality_action_plan)

**16) Question from Alisa Igoe:**

It's excellent Bromley acted swiftly to impose a TPO on trees alongside No 1 Broadheath Drive on Elmstead Lane. Would the Council consider tightening its published policy on felling/work on trees that are outside Conservation areas and/or not subject to permanent TPOs, to insist all tree felling must be approved by the Council?

**Answer to Question 16:**

When a threat is identified to a tree which sits outside a conservation area the Council can manage this through the imposition of a TPO. It is not practical given the limited resource available or enforceable under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the Council to create its own requirement for all felling of private trees to be approved by the Council.

Further queries on TPOs may be better directed to the Chairman of the Development Control Committee.

**17) Question from James Hamilton:**

ECS PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE MONITORING (2020/21)

Household Waste Recycled or Composted:

Agenda Item 10b

ECS4

**Question:**

10b ECS4 states: "There was particularly high precipitation in January 2021, which meant the majority of paper collected for recycling had to be disposed and this had an impact to the recycling rate for January of 9%". What is the estimated total of loss of income and disposal costs of this contaminated wet paper?

**Answer to Question 17:**

The estimated total loss of income and additional cost associated with sending paper for energy recovery instead of recycling in January 2021 was £170k.

The amount of paper and card recycling that was not recycled in January 2021 was significantly higher than we have experienced before. The reason for this was the number of days and amount of precipitation in January 2021 was particularly high. To compare, the total cost of loss in income and sending paper to energy recovery for the entire annual period of 2019/20 was £230k with this matter discussed at Environment PDS Committee previously and information on the Council's website.

**18) Question from James Hamilton:**

Could you please state the total tonnage of paper and card collected for recycling in January and what percentage of that could not be recycled and had to be disposed of?

**Answer to Question 18:**

The total tonnage of paper and card collected for recycling in January 2021 was 1,097 tonnes and 85% was sent to energy recovery. The impact of the paper and card not recycled in January 2021, on our total recycling rate in 2020/21 to date is 1%.

This is highly unusual and in contrast, during the period April to December 2020, 92% of the total paper and card collected for recycling was recycled.

Bromley continues to have one of the highest recycling rates in London, with 50.9% in 2019/20. Whilst we strive to recycle as much as possible, it is not unusual for there to be a proportion of the recycling that we collect to not be recycled due to contamination. In 2019, the average contamination rate in England was 16.6%.

Bromley prides itself on being open and honest with residents about what happens to its recycling, which is why we have let residents know that there is currently an issue with wet paper and have been encouraging residents to work with us to keep it as dry as possible.

**19) Question from Chloe Jane Ross:**

Why does TfL not recommend the mini roundabout at Scotts Lane /Bromley Rd and would the Council proceed contrary to TfL's recommendation?

**Answer to Question 19:**

TfL have not been asked whether they recommend a mini-roundabout or other measure at this collision cluster site. The roads are Bromley's not TfL roads. It is for Bromley and its consultants to design a solution.

**20) Question from Chloe Jane Ross:**

Are there any potential safety concerns in regard to the pedestrian crossing proposed next to the Scotts Lane /Bromley Rd mini-roundabout?

**Answer to Question 20:**

All new schemes such as this are subject to a two-stage road safety audit process prior to being installed to ensure that any design concerns are addressed.

**21) Question from Kerry Nash-Clarke:**

It's great the Shortlands Friendly Village scheme is being considered again, but why are segregated cycle lanes being cut out? A YouGov survey last year found 71% of surveyed parents identified building more segregated cycle lanes as the number one intervention that would help them, and their children, cycle more.

**Answer to Question 21:**

Segregated cycle lanes have already been installed as part of the Shortlands Friendly Village scheme and others may follow. One route originally proposed for a segregated cycle route may not be suitable due to the number of mature street trees that would need to be felled in order to implement the route. We will be monitoring

the usage of the new facilities we have provided to ensure that future spend is most efficiently targeted.

**22) Question from Kerry Nash-Clarke:**

Please can Bromley Council consult residents on options for improving the junction of Station Road and Beckenham Lane, as part of the Shortlands Friendly Village scheme, and please can this consultation provide residents with information on the pros and cons of the different options being considered?

**Answer to Question 22:**

The Council will most certainly consult residents when we have firm proposals for improving the junction of Station Road and Beckenham Lane, as part of the Shortlands Friendly Village scheme. As you will see in the report to this committee regarding the Shortlands Friendly Village scheme, modelling still needs to be undertaken before any proposals can be firmed up.

**23) Question from Valerie Gaisford St Lawrence:**

Elmstead/Marvels Wood continues to be destroyed by off-road motorbikes especially at weekends. It is causing considerable public nuisance to users/residents plus ruining footpaths and plants. Despite the Council and police being fully aware, the issue is on-going.

What measures will Bromley be undertaking to resolve this and preserve the woods?

**Answer to Question 23:**

- A) The Council and Police are working together to develop an action plan of joint site patrols involving the Councils Parks Security contractor / Ward Security and the police
- B) Council officers , The police and the Council's Parks contractors will undertake site visits to identify and assess official key pedestrian and vehicle access points into the park to determine what action / physical improvements are required prevent the illegal access by these motorbikes while still maintaining access for pedestrians, those in wheel chairs and people with buggies.
- C) The site visit will also look to identify illegal motorbike access points with a view to blocking them with appropriate infrastructure.
- D) We strive to maintain the paths and fauna in Elmstead Woods in a good condition as far as reasonably possible. the budget however will be stretched to repair additional damage so it may take some time to achieve those repairs. If we are successful in catching any of the culprits we will seek to impose fines which we can then use to help with repairs.