

EXECUTIVE

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2022 starting at 7.00 pm

Present:

Councillor Colin Smith (Chairman)
Councillors William Huntington-Thresher, Kate Lymer
(Vice-Chairman), Peter Morgan, Angela Page,
Michael Rutherford and Diane Smith

Also Present:

Councillor Julian Benington, Councillor Nicholas Bennett
MA J.P., Councillor Robert Evans, Councillor Christopher
Marlow and Councillor Melanie Stevens

343 COUNCILLOR MARY COOKE

Before the meeting started, the Leader invited all present to stand for a minute's silence in memory of Cllr Mary Cooke, who had died a few days previously.

344 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

Councillors Graham Arthur, David Jefferys, Keith Onslow and Angela Wilkins joined the meeting online.

345 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

346 QUESTIONS

Five questions from members of the public had been received for oral reply at the meeting, and eighteen for written reply. In addition, there was one question from a member of the Council for oral reply and two for written reply. The questions and answers are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

347 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24 NOVEMBER 2021

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2021 be confirmed.

348 BIGGIN HILL AIRPORT NOISE ACTION PLAN REVIEW
Report HPR2022/001

Five years after the signing of the Deed of Variation on their lease with the Council, Biggin Hill Airport Limited (BHAL) had submitted a Noise Action Plan (NAP) review, as required. The Council had obtained independent reports on the review. BHAL's NAP review and comments on the review were presented in the report together with next steps for further improvements. The report also considered BHAL's overall compliance with the NAP.

The report had been scrutinised by the Executive, Resources and Contracts PDS Committee on 5th January 2022. The Chairman of the Committee, Councillor Christopher Marlow, thanked members of the public and Flightpath Watch for their submissions and stated his view that BHAL had not demonstrated full compliance with the NAP. He recognised that some Councillors had emphasised the importance of the thriving airport to the borough's economy, but he felt that there was an issue of trust, that many people felt that the Airport had not kept to its commitments. He had therefore proposed amendments to the recommendations to require the Airport to provide further information by 30th June 2022. The PDS Committee had supported the amended recommendations, which the Executive accepted.

RESOLVED that

- (1) It is noted that Biggin Hill Airport Ltd (BHAL) has submitted a review of the Noise Action Plan (NAP), as required by the NAP and the Management Information Letter (MIL).**
- (2) The Flightpath Watch report and the work undertaken by the Council in conjunction with and following external legal advice, as requested by Flightpath Watch, is noted.**
- (3) The reports of RSK Acoustics dated 8 September 2021 and the Civil Aviation Authority dated 20 December 2021 be noted.**
- (4) It is noted that the Council has forwarded the above reports to BHAL and they have acknowledged receipt of the same.**
- (5) It is noted that the review of the NAP submitted by BHAL does not fully demonstrate compliance, owing to a failure to provide evidence in connection with various actions as set out in the Civil Aviation Authority report (CAA report) dated 20 December 2021, with particular reference to Appendix C of the CAA report. Reference is also made to clause 4.33 of the NAP, which requires BHAL 'to assess performance with respect to the previously forecast noise envelope... by reference to the number of people and dwellings affected'.**
- (6) Officers be authorised to inform BHAL of the conclusion reached under recommendation 2.5, and to request an updated review of the NAP that addresses areas of the review that have been highlighted as**

requiring evidence, to be submitted to the Council no later than 30 June 2022, in order to allow for a report to be brought to the Executive as set out in (13) below.

(7) It is noted that no Executive Decision will be considered regarding the tenure of the airport until the updated review as set out in recommendation 2.5 is received by the Council, and deemed by the Executive to fully demonstrate compliance, or explain non-compliance with appropriate reparative measures and timescales for implementation.

(8) Officers be instructed to assist BHAL with the preparation of the updated review described in recommendation 2.6 upon request.

(9) Officers be authorised to prepare a report detailing potential improvements to the NAP using best industry practice, as recommended by the CAA, having regard to feedback from residents and as proportionate to the size of the airport.

(10) It is noted that the work referred to in paragraph (9) above is to include but not be limited to the following:

- (a) The suggestions made within the attached reports, including the updating of noise modelling software, as recommended in paragraph 56 of the CAA report;
- (b) Consideration of noise levels as monitored by noise contours with regard to governmental guidelines, as suggested in para 2.8 of the RSK Acoustics report;
- (c) Limiting hours when circuits can be flown as suggested in para 9.3 of the RSK Acoustics report .

(11) Officers be authorised to request BHAL provide additional and ongoing evidence of adherence to the existing Noise Action Plan, particularly through the forum of the Airport Consultative Committee.

(12) Officers be authorised to request that BHAL provide information and produce a timetable for the implementation of the outstanding “reasonable endeavours” provisions of the NAP.

(13) It is noted that a further report will be presented to the Executive in autumn 2022 detailing progress against the recommendations identified in the report.

349 PLATINUM JUBILEE CELEBRATIONS
Report HPR2021/062a

HM The Queen’s national Platinum Jubilee celebrations were planned to take place on 2nd to 5th June 2022. The London Borough of Bromley would be marking this through a local programme of events as well as by taking part in the national celebrations. The report set out all activity strands and asked the Executive for budget approval.

The report had been scrutinised by the Executive, Resources and Contracts PDS Committee on 5th January 2022, and the Committee had added a number of recommendations to the two set out in the report to consider expanding the range of activities promoted by the Council. These included a souvenir brochure, a range of “Best Decorated” awards, a small gift for all school children, a grant programme for local businesses and community groups and waiving of the normal fees for holding events in local parks. It was acknowledged that waiving these fees could have a budget implication and this would need to be considered in more detail.

The Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing reported that a temporary Events Manager had now been appointed, that he would be holding weekly meetings with officers to monitor progress and that he was open to any other suggestions.

RESOLVED: That

- (1) The contents of the report and the borough’s Platinum Jubilee programme of activities be noted.**
- (2) Drawdown and spend of up to £105,500 be approved from the Investment to Community Fund earmarked reserve to deliver the Platinum Jubilee programme.**
- (3) Consideration be given to producing a souvenir brochure, giving the history of Her Majesty’s reign, involvement in events in Bromley, and jubilee events arranged by residents across the Borough, with advertising to ensure that the publication is cost neutral.**
- (4) The Executive endorses that a Best Decorated Shop, Best Decorated House and Best Decorated School Award be made by the Mayor to encourage residents to decorate their premises.**
- (5) A small gift be considered for Bromley School Children to commemorate Her Majesty’s Platinum Jubilee.**
- (6) Funding be allocated for a grant programme for local business and community groups to apply to fund decorations, events and other initiatives to commemorate the Jubilee on high streets and parades around the Borough.**
- (7) The waiving of fees be considered for the use of small local parks for volunteer groups wishing to hold local celebrations.**
- (8) Any further suggestions be considered that can be accomplished within the very pressing timeframe.**

**350 DRAFT BUDGET 2022/23 AND UPDATE ON THE COUNCIL'S
FINANCIAL STRATEGY 22/23 TO 25/26**

Report FSD2022/001

The report sought approval of the initial draft 2022/23 Budget including the full year effect of changes agreed as part of the 2021/22 Council Tax report and savings approved during the year with the resultant impact on the Council's medium term "budget gap."

A key part of the financial strategy was to highlight the budget issues that would need to be addressed by the Council over the coming financial years, by forecasting the level of available resources from all sources and budget pressures relating to revenue spending. Details of the capital programme would be reported separately to the next meeting of the Executive.

PDS Committees' views would also be sought and reported back to the next meeting of the Executive, prior to the Executive making recommendations to Council on the 2022/23 Council Tax and Adult Social Care precept levels.

The report provided details of the Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2022/23 which had been published on 16th December 2021 and represented a one-year settlement only. The awaited Fair Funding Review and changes relating to the devolution of business rates, which could have a significant impact on future funding, had been delayed until at least 2023/24.

There were still outstanding issues and areas of uncertainty remaining. Any further updates would be included in the 2022/23 Council Tax report to the next meeting of the Executive.

The Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management reported that the proposed staff pay award for 2022/23 would be 2.25%. There would also be an increased merit payment pot of £300k to recognise the hard work of staff.

The report had been scrutinised by the Executive, Resources and contracts PDS Committee on 5th January 2022 and the Committee had supported the recommendations.

RESOLVED that

(1) The initial draft 2022/23 Budget be agreed as detailed in Appendix 7 to the report including continuation of the iBCF hospital discharge funding reserve and setting aside New Homes Bonus funding for housing investment.

(2) The initial draft 2022/23 Budget for each portfolio be referred to the appropriate PDS Committees for consideration.

(3) The financial projections for 2023/24 to 2025/26 be noted.

(4) It is noted that there are still areas of financial uncertainty which will impact on the final 2022/23 Budget.

(5) The setting of the schools' budget, mainly met through Dedicated Schools Grant, be delegated to the Children, Education and Families Portfolio Holder, allowing for consultation with the Schools Forum (section 11 in the report.)

(6) It is noted that the outcome of consultation with the PDS Committees will be reported to the next meeting of the Executive.

(7) The proposed contribution be agreed of £246,470 in 2022/23 to the London Boroughs Grants Committee (section 10 in the report.)

(8) The outcome of the Provisional Local Government Financial Settlement 2022/23 be noted, as detailed in the report.

(9) The budget gap remaining of an estimated £19.5m per annum by 2025/26 and that any decisions made for the 2022/23 Budget will have an impact on the future year projections, be noted.

(10) It is noted that any final decision by the Executive on recommended Council Tax and Adult Social Care Precept levels to Council will normally be undertaken at the next meeting of the Executive.

**351 COVID-19 ADDITIONAL RELIEF FUND (CARF) AND
ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS GRANTS (ARG) THIRD TOP-UP**
Report HPR2022/002

On December 15 2021, the London Borough of Bromley was notified by the Government that it would receive funding of £5,315,301 for businesses from the COVID-19 Additional Relief Fund (CARF), along with initial guidance on the operation of the fund. The discretionary scheme needed to be designed and set up in early 2022, subject to further guidance and clarification on the scheme from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, including when the funding must be spent by.

The Government had also announced that the third top-up of ARG funding of £102 million would be allocated to Local Authorities in England from 30 December 2021. The funding would be allocated based on a per-business calculation and had to be spent by 31 March 2022. The allocation for Bromley was £640K.

Due to the tight timescales to spend both funds once allocation and guidance was received, the report requested approval for the delegation of decision making to a Chief Officer in consultation with the Portfolio Holder. Members expressed concern that the report had to be considered without the normal scrutiny process by a PDS Committee, but accepted that it should be considered as a matter of urgency due to the very tight timescales.

RESOLVED that

(1) Delegated authority be granted to the Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing to determine the design of the CARF discretionary scheme for businesses.

(2) Delegated authority be granted to the Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing to determine CARF criteria and application process as required, in line with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) guidance, when further detail is received.

(3) Delegated authority be granted to the Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Renewal Recreation and Housing to distribute and move funding between any approach designed to best respond to demand and to ensure the full £5,315,301 relief for CARF is applied.

(4) Delegated authority be granted to the Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing to distribute allocation for ARG top-up three by increasing amounts available to any of the previous funding programmes agreed by the Executive for ARG, moving funding between any of the existing programmes to ensure the full amount is spent by 31 March 2022.

(5) Delegated authority be granted to the Director of Housing, Planning and Regeneration in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing to make any decisions required owing to unforeseen changes in Government guidance or policy relating to either fund.

352 CONSIDERATION OF ANY OTHER ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE EXECUTIVE, RESOURCES AND CONTRACTS POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

There were no additional items referred from Executive, Resources and Contracts PDS Committee.

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

RESOLVED that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the item of business referred to below as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings

Executive
12 January 2022

that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

**The following summary
refers to matters involving exempt information**

**354 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 24
NOVEMBER 2021**

**RESOLVED that the exempt minutes of the meeting held on 24th
November 2021 be confirmed.**

The Meeting ended at 8.10 pm

Chairman

EXECUTIVE

12 January 2022

(A) Questions for Oral Reply from Members of the Public

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

Why have residents been treated unfairly by the Council, by not being asked to contribute to the CAA review, or updating the councils CAA Terms of Reference, so that the FPW NAP review document could have been given to the CAA for review, alongside the BHA NAP review document?

Reply:

The report we have before us today includes a number of inputs: it includes Biggin Hill Airport's NAP review, it includes the CAA review, and it includes the Flightpath Watch review. Residents have been treated fairly by the Council, and we are very conscious of the impact the airport has on them.

As is ever the case, the Council employs the specialists it needs to give a range of advice as required in any given situation. In this instance the CAA was asked to examine the NAP review as an independent aviation specialist. Agreement was made on the scope of their work before the Council was aware Flightpath Watch had prepared its own report, so the Flightpath Watch could not be included.

As the Flightpath Watch document makes very clear, many of their complaints were better answered by legal counsel. To this end, the Council sought external legal advice on the contents of the Flightpath Watch review.

Supplementary Question:

Mr Trinick asked whether he could have a recording or a transcript of the June 2016 Executive meeting.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that details of the meeting were in the minutes, but he would look at whether this was possible.

2. From Ms Tahrir Swift to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

This is not a question about Affordable Rent. This is a specific question, that requires a specific answer. What is the percentage number of households currently on the Housing Waiting List able to afford to live in the proposed Areli development in the Walnuts?

Reply:

We would not hold this information – which is dependent on both price in the future and the income and savings of people on the Register. We have no idea of these details. We do however have a financial limit on eligibility for inclusion on the housing register - i.e. for those who essentially would not have sufficient funds to purchase or rent privately. The limits are a combined annual income of £60K or more before tax and savings or capital of £30K or more.

Supplementary Question:

Ms Swift asked where in the six blocks being proposed the affordable/social housing would be located, and whether this would be on land owned by the Council.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder stated that it could be anywhere in the development, but this detail would become clear as part of the planning application.

3. From Sherilee Mace-Pearce to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

How does the London Borough of Bromley balance its duty to its constituents while it is a landlord to BHA - surely there should be an independent impartial party to review?

Reply:

The Council has been committed to both protecting residents and facilitating a successful business since it bought the airport. It continues to do so. In producing the report on the Biggin Hill Airport NAP review, the Council has employed independent experts to provide that impartial advice which supports its decision-making processes.

Supplementary Question:

Ms Mace-Pearson asked whether the report was available.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that it was in the papers for the meeting, published on the Council website.

4. From Sherilee Mace-Pearce to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

What academic reports have been reviewed and taken into account in respect of health issues (psychological health, sleep disturbance, cardiovascular and effect on children's cognition and learning?) Noise pollution is only part of the pollution issue which should be addressed in the report - why has GHG not been taken into account when it is key to the impact on our lives and those of future generations?

Reply:

This review covers a defined set of commitments agreed with Biggin Hill Airport as the Noise Action Plan, with the Council's expert advisors also considering the national context of aviation related Noise Action Plan reviews. Topics outside these noise-related conditions, while important areas to be explored, are not for consideration as part of this particular report.

Supplementary Question:

Ms Mace-Pearce asked what academic reports had been considered on the impact of noise on children's health?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the report was limited in scope to noise pollution, and repeated that it was available on the Council website.

5. From Giuliana Voisey to the Portfolio Holder for resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

The recommendation you are considering tonight is to give BHAL six more months to comply with the mitigating conditions attached to the granting of the new hours. Considering that officers have been unable or unwilling to enforce those conditions over five years, will you confirm that it will finally become "appropriate" to suspend the new hours at the end of these additional six months if non-compliance persists?"

Reply:

The Council has sought legal advice regarding suspension of hours, which is included within the report. Should it be required, the Council will not hesitate to seek the advice of legal Counsel in the future and act upon it.

Supplementary Question:

Ms Voisey asked whether the Council would honour its commitments on issues like the 50,000 movements and the approach to Runway 3.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that a lot of work was being done on the Noise Action Plan and aircraft movements. He was concerned about the issue of the approach to Runway 3 and there had been communication with the airport on this.

(B) Question for Oral Reply from a Member of the Council

1. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett MA JP to the Portfolio holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

Why was it not possible to take the tender for the renewal of the contract for the Woman's Refuge through the normal democratic scrutiny process?

Reply:

The request to re-tender the contract was presented to and scrutinised by the Renewal, Recreation and Housing Committee on the 16th of June 2021. It was not possible to renew the contract as all renewal options had been exhausted. Changes were also required to ensure that the changes brought about by the Domestic Abuse Bill 2021 were duly encompassed.

The Committee resolved that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve proceeding to a competitive tender, via an open tender process which duly took place and a successful bidder was recommended. As outlined in the Part 1 and 2 reports being heard not only did this tender meet the required specifications but it was also financially competitive, coming in slightly below the tender budget.

It was unfortunate but due to the timing of the scheduled committee meetings and procurement standstill requirements an urgent decision was needed in order to ensure that the service continued to be operational and no vulnerable family was left without accommodation or support.

Supplementary Question:

Councillor Bennett stated that he did not disagree with the decision, but he did think it was unfortunate that Members had not had the usual opportunity to scrutinise.

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder agreed with Cllr Bennett.

(C) Questions for Written Reply from Members of the Public

1. From Richard Maury to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

1NAP Review presumes that the 50,000 cap on annual aircraft movements, an important safeguard for residents independent of the NAP itself, has now reverted to 125,000, despite the apparent understanding amongst Councillors in 2015 that the lower cap would continue permanently as a trigger to suspend the extended hours. Will LBB clarify the lease to confirm this permanence?

Reply:

The NAP introduced a 50,000 movement cap, while the MIL laid out how this applied to the first five years of the NAP's operation. The minutes of the June 2016 Executive Committee meeting reflect that this timing was discussed in the public arena. The Council has taken external legal advice on this point during its review of the NAP. Counsel's opinion was also that the 50,000 movement limit was not a permanent alteration to the lease, with the 125,000 movement limit continuing to be in place. Factually, movements remain under 50,000 a year.

It is important to remember that any movement cap does not alter the noise contours agreed to within the Noise Action Plan as a way of controlling the noise disruption felt by Bromley residents. These remain unchanged.

2. From Richard Maury to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

Will LBB give full, urgent consideration to commissioning work on introducing, to the NAP, Single Event noise metrics such as N70 as in Recommendation No. 1 in the July 2020 Report by ICCAN, as the NAP is not yet sufficiently effective in abating noise:

https://iccan.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020_07_16_ICCAN_review_of_aviation_noise_metrics_and_measurement.pdf

Reply:

It is important to note that the Executive first needs to agree the Council's response to the Airport's NAP review. Anything that mitigates noise from aircraft would be a positive step and could potentially be examined with the airport to assess viability. It is worth remembering that the NAP has already introduced a limit for single noise events in the early morning period, helping to control the noise between 06:30 and 07:00.

3. **From Rachel King to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services**

Referring to the Make Bromley even Better Strategy, what specific actions have the Council taken (or are planning to take) to encourage residents to use renewable and sustainable energy and how are you measuring the success of this initiative? What targets have been set?

Reply:

The Carbon Management Team will be presenting a report at the ECS PDS meeting in June 2022, specifically about signposting residents, businesses and community groups to various grants, services and other initiatives aimed at energy savings and reducing CO₂ emissions.

A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress), will be coming to the January ECS PDS meeting.

The incorporation of energy efficient systems and insulation is a preferable approach in moving to a low carbon future with the installation of renewal sources of energy following behind. Both energy efficient systems and renewable energy are better installed during construction than via retrofits. Bromley's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) details payments that a developer will have to make if their development does not achieve the required levels of carbon dioxide reduction targets.

4. **From Rachel King to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services**

"Children growing up exposed to PM2.5 are more likely to have reduced lung function and develop asthma....exposure to PM2.5 attributes to 29,000 premature deaths in the UK every year." How will the Council address poor air quality in Bromley, which threatens ambitions 1-5 of its corporate strategy?

Reply:

Bromley has some of the cleanest air in London. Improving local air quality and reducing air pollution is everyone's business. The London Borough of Bromley has several strategic documents that relate to issues that affect air quality. The main document is the Borough's Air Quality Action Plan 2020-25. This details action points which cover how the London Borough of Bromley will address air pollution. The document is available by following this link.

https://www.bromley.gov.uk/downloads/file/6391/air_quality_action_plan_aqap_2020-25

Other documents that also impact on air quality include the Bromley Local Plan -

The Bromley Local Plan | The Bromley Local Plan | London Borough of Bromley

And strategic policies on Sustainability and Climate Change, amongst others -

Sustainability reports | Sustainability reports | London Borough of Bromley

5. From Roger King to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Referring to the 'Make Bromley even Better Strategy', in what specific ways have the Council provided (or are planning to provide) support and advice for the installation of equipment for renewable sources, such as solar and wind?

Reply:

The Carbon Management Team will be presenting a report at the ECS PDS meeting in June 2022, specifically about signposting residents, businesses and community groups to various grants, services and other initiatives aimed at energy savings and reducing CO₂ emissions.

A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress), will be coming to the January ECS PDS meeting.

The incorporation of energy efficient systems and insulation is a preferable approach in moving to a low carbon future with the installation of renewal sources of energy following behind. Both energy efficient systems and renewable energy are better installed during construction that via retrofits. Bromley's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) details payments that a developer will have to make if their development does not achieve the required levels of carbon dioxide reduction targets.

6. From Roger King to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Bromley is London's largest borough, yet it only has one operational air monitor situated on Harwood Avenue. Bexley, Greenwich, Lewisham, Southwark, Lambeth, and Croydon councils each have multiple, operational air monitoring sites. Does Bromley have plans to increase the monitoring of its air quality?

Reply:

Bromley is a member of the London Air Quality Network. All monitoring stations operated by all London Boroughs are part of this city-wide network and provide monitoring data which both underpins and checks the GLA's London air quality model. The London

network and model are global leaders in city wide air quality management. The London air quality modelling system provides a very reliable overview of air quality within Bromley without the need for a boroughwide network of monitors. It should also be noted that the quality of the air in Bromley is, overall, significantly better than in some of our neighbouring boroughs. Since air moves with the wind, the air monitoring points locally, including those in neighbouring authorities will be able to detect if an event occurs that has a noticeable impact on air quality either good or bad.

The air quality monitoring station at Harwood Avenue contains three analysers measuring Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx) and airborne Particulates (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}). NOx is also monitored, using the more affordable technology of diffusion tubes, at a further 32 additional locations across the Borough. More recently Node monitors were installed at the PRUH and Poverest Allotments. These monitor NOx and PM_{2.5} as part of the Breathe London Network.

Monitoring stations are expensive to install, service, maintain, calibrate, and operate. Bromley Council takes a strategic, prudent and proportionate approach to air quality monitoring. That said, there is an action point within Bromley's current Air Quality Action Plan to continue to seek further opportunities to fund more air quality monitoring as they arise.

7. From Peter Noorlander to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Bromley is London's largest borough, yet it only has one operational air monitor. From 01/12/2020 to 01/12/2021, that air monitor measured an annual mean of 9ug/m³ of PM_{2.5} particulates. The World Health Organisation's air quality guideline annual average for PM_{2.5} is 5ug/m³. What will be done about this?

Reply:

Please see answers to Roger and Rachel King's questions in relation to monitoring within the London Borough of Bromley.

In October 2021 the WHO updated its recommended guidelines for air pollutants. For PM_{2.5} it tightened the recommended annual average guideline to 5µgm⁻³, while retaining 10µgm⁻³ as an interim guideline which the Mayor of London has committed to meet by 2030 (the legal annual average limit is 25µgm⁻³).

New data issued on 16th December 2021 for PM_{2.5} concentration maps showed that there was a 19 percent reduction in PM_{2.5} across the whole of London since 2016 with many parts of outer London meeting the WHO interim guideline of 10µgm⁻³ for the first time.

Commitments to reduce air pollution within the London Borough of Bromley are detailed in the Borough's Air Quality Action Plan 2020-2025, including measures relating to PM2.5.

8. From Peter Noorlander to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Under the heading Carbon Emissions in the draft budget, the Council states that addressing Borough-wide emissions would require significant investment from central Government. How much funding will be required, what steps have the Council taken to secure those funds, and what success have they had?

Reply:

Work to identify the exact amount required to achieve borough wide net zero emissions is still ongoing, but the investment required is estimated to be several billion pounds per borough.

Achieving the national target for net-zero emissions, is going to require a national co-ordinated effort. It will be of no benefit to shift emissions from one part of the country to another. Industries such as energy and food production typically have emissions distant from the point of consumption, with integrated supplies and networks (e.g. the gas network) and therefore action needs to be co-ordinated either regionally or nationally. Bromley Council intends to work with the different layers of Government to play our part in achieving the National ambition set out by our Prime Minister Boris Johnson.

Despite the large scale investment required, work has already begun, for example with the recent successful application for £920,000 under the Local Authority Delivery scheme (LAD2). The programme will enable the retrofit of an estimated 130 domestic properties. The funding criteria will ensure works tackle poorly insulated homes – ensuring residents save money on their energy bills whilst also mitigating the most amount of carbon emissions. Some 50 homes have already been identified for site visits and further evaluation.

A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress), will be coming to the January ECS PDS meeting.

9. Jamie Devine to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Bromley's corporate strategy will fail to achieve its five ambitions if it does not amend its net zero plan: an unstable climate is incompatible with a stable community. Will Bromley urgently review its plan to account for the greenhouse gas emissions embedded in the products and services it purchases?

Reply:

The Council acknowledges the significance of its indirect Scope 3 emissions arising from the procurement of its services and products. These emissions are directly owned by our suppliers, however we recognise that the council can play a valuable role in helping to reduce them by working closely with its contractors. Every time the large contractors are scrutinised by the Environmental Services PDS, the senior leaders of the company are asked by Councillors about their net zero plans, and they have all responded positively. For example, you may have seen our press release when, our Highway contractor moved to the lower Carbon method for road maintenance using warm mix asphalt.

Bromley leading the way with more sustainable road network | London Borough of Bromley

All of the environmental contracts are currently being reviewed and a position regarding our contractors' carbon commitments will be reported back via the ECS PDS committee in January 2022.

In addition, a pan-London carbon accounting methodology is being developed for use by all London Boroughs. Consideration is being given to the accounting of Scope 3 emissions including procured services and consumption-based emissions.

10. From Jamie Devine to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement

The emergence of covid-19 and storm Arwen starkly illustrate the importance of community resilience and the necessity to plan for the worst. Has Bromley considered the impacts posed by climate change on systems - food, water, sanitation, energy, transportation, economic etc - and does it have a resilience strategy?

Reply:

In terms of resilience, the Council chair the Bromley Borough Resilience Forum which is a statutory forum for local multi-agency emergency preparedness, response and recovery planning within the borough as defined within the Civil Contingencies Act 2004. The Forum's vision statement is 'a resilient and prepared Bromley'. Its overall purpose is to facilitate co-operation and information sharing at the local operational level and to working in partnership to further develop the resilience agenda.

One such output is the Community Risk register. The Bromley Borough Resilience Forum coordinates the completion of this risk assessment and agrees the assessments contained within this document using local knowledge and experience which is informed by National and London risk advice and guidance. The document details identified risks that could affect the borough and are grouped into various categories, including severe weather and flooding, human health, transport and infrastructure.

As part of our Transforming Bromley Agenda, one of our key priority themes is Maintaining organisational Resilience; to be able to identify and address potential changes, challenges and threats that may have an impact upon the Council to effectively discharge its organisational responsibilities. To assist in further developing Resilience across the Borough, the Council have adopted the Resilience Standards for London. Our activities are compared against these standards and are used as part of a broader assurance framework for the council, with the aim of continually improving performance across its emergency planning and resilience activities.

The council continues to work with a number of third sector organisations and community groups in respect of improving resilience. This work was further strengthened during COVID with over 4000 residents coming forward to volunteer to assist the Council and our partners in terms of food provision, befriending and assistance for families shielding.

The resilience of the community is an area the Council is continually seeking to improve. The above measures outline how we are developing resilience for our residence. This is further supported through the promotion of advice and guidance on our emergency planning and business continuity web pages. Please see attached links.

https://www.bromley.gov.uk/info/200039/emergencies/1355/emergency_planning

https://www.bromley.gov.uk/info/200039/emergencies/671/business_continuity

11. From Tim Webb to the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Community Services

What is going to happen to the existing facilities offered by the Saxon Centre if the proposed Walnuts Redevelopment goes ahead. This Centre offers invaluable services to those vulnerable members of our Society who are physically frail and may also have Dementia and in addition offers their Relatives or Carers a valuable and well-earned respite.

Reply:

I have been advised that the plans for the Walnut redevelopment include the reprovision of the Saxon Day Centre. The plans for the site allow for the current provision to be maintained until the new centre is completed. Age Concern, who run the Saxon Day Centre, have worked with Council officers and the developer on the design of what will be a brand new and modern-day activities resource.

12. From Gill Webb to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation & Housing

What alternative facilities will be on offer for Parents/Carers whose children use The Buzz zone at the Walnuts Leisure Centre if it is closed for 2 years?

Reply:

If the Areli development goes ahead there will be significant disruption to users of the Walnuts Leisure Centre. However there are many other public, as well as private, leisure centres and sports clubs across the borough that will continue to provide leisure services and children's activities. We realise this will be less convenient for local residents, however it is an impact of providing a new leisure facility.

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

What report or information has the Council received from Countryside Properties in connection with the development of the Churchill Quarter following the public consultation carried out during 2021?

Reply:

To date the Council has not received any report or information from Countryside Properties following the public consultation carried out during 2021. Officers are working with Countryside Properties closely and it is envisaged that they will submit planning in the near future accordingly.

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

What is the status of the proposed compulsory purchase orders for the homes in Ethelbert Close?

Reply:

Until Countryside Properties submit Planning and such an application is determined, the Council cannot progress a formal CPO for those properties whom do not wish to consider disposing of their interests at this stage. However, in the mean-time the Council is committed to purchasing properties, subject to negotiation, ahead of any such CPO scheme.

15. From Jon Webb to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

What will happen to all the swimming lessons that take place at the Walnuts Leisure Centre if Orpington doesn't have a leisure centre for 2+ years?

Reply:

The borough is home to many other public, as well as private, leisure centres which will continue to offer swimming lessons. We expect these sites to respond to demand as much as practicable and increase provision where possible.

16. From Mary Ion to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Under the heading Carbon Emissions in the draft budget the Council suggests that addressing borough-wide emissions is just a future possibility. In October 2021 the OBR '...concluded that acting early could halve the net fiscal cost of getting to net zero by 2050'. What justification is there for delaying?

<https://obr.uk/box/climate-related-measures-in-the-budget-and-spending-review/>

Reply:

The Council has already introduced a Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document to establish Carbon Offset Contributions with payments in lieu of on-site provision.

The Council has set its own target for net zero for Council operations by 2029, which is one of the most ambitious in London. This is intended to set an example to residents and as appropriate showcase methods to reduce carbon emissions. The Council's committees are also highlighting this issue to our contractors and challenging them on their emissions.

Achieving the national target for net-zero emissions, is going to require a national co-ordinated effort. It will be of no benefit to shift emissions from one part of the country to another. Industries such as energy and food production typically have emissions distant from the point of consumption, with integrated networks (e.g. the gas network). We intend to work with the different layers of Government to play our part in achieving the National ambition set out by our Prime Minister Boris Johnson.

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available).

The Carbon Management Team will be presenting a report at the ECS PDS meeting in June 2022, specifically about signposting residents, businesses and community groups to various grants, services and other initiatives aimed at energy savings and reducing CO₂ emissions borough wide.

A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress), will be coming to the January ECS PDS meeting.

17. From Mary Ion to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services

Draft Budget: You state that addressing borough-wide carbon emissions presents a major financial risk. A UCL study published last September shows that by 2100, global GDP could be 37% lower than it would be without the impacts of warming. Will the Council commit to investing heavily now to mitigate against the impacts of climate change already baked-in?

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2021/sep/economic-cost-climate-change-could-be-six-times-higher-previously-thought>

Reply:

The Carbon Management Team will be presenting a report at the ECS PDS meeting in June 2022, specifically about signposting residents, businesses and community groups to various grants, services and other initiatives aimed at energy savings and reducing CO₂ emissions borough wide.

The Council established its Carbon Management Programme back in 2008 with many actions and investments starting from then to reduce Carbon emissions. The Council announced a significant investment (an invest to save) back in 2013 when it committed to replace 14,000 street light lanterns with efficient LED lanterns. Further investments followed and the Council is currently delivering the final phase of the LED lantern conversion programme. Street lighting did represent a significant portion of the Council's energy consumption and was responsible for a high proportion of LBB's direct carbon emissions.

The Carbon Management Team works continuously to source funding opportunities that will support the council with borough-wide initiatives. One such example is the recent successful application for £920,000 under the Local Authority Delivery scheme (LAD2). The programme will enable the retrofit of an estimated 130 domestic properties. The funding criteria will ensure works tackle poorly insulated homes – ensuring residents save money on their energy bills whilst also mitigating the most amount of carbon emissions. Some 50 homes have already been identified for site visits and further evaluation.

One element of our approach to tackling borough wide emissions is through the Renewables for London Steering Group which Bromley is a member of. Work has been undertaken to develop a detailed delivery plan which includes accessing funding to support boroughs in this work and to support with resident awareness activities and decentralised energy programmes.

A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress), will be coming to the January ECS PDS meeting.

18. From Lynn Sharman to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

The closure of the Walnuts Leisure Centre and redevelopment, for two years, will effect mental health, physical fitness and community well-being. Why can we not build a new bigger leisure prior to closure of the old one to keep the community happy and healthy?

Reply:

The Walnuts site is considered the best location for a leisure centre. Given the scale of the building works proposed as part of the Areli development it is not practically and financially feasible to build the new leisure centre first prior to the closure of the old site.

(D) Questions for Written Reply from a Councillor

(1) From Cllr Nicholas Bennett MA JP to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

To ask the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management if he will set out in table format what the council tax would be for each council tax band in 2022-23 if it was increased by 1%, 2% and 3%?

(2) From Cllr Nicholas Bennett MA JP to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

To ask the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management if he will set out in table format what the council tax would be for each council tax band in 2022-23 if in addition to an increase of 0%,1%, 2% and 3%, the GLA increased their precept by 5% or 10%?

Reply: (both questions)

See attached sheet.

Given the London Mayors recent consultation on his 2022/23 Budget which represents a potential increase in GLA precept of 8.8%, additional information has been added to the response below to reflect this.

(D) Questions 1 and 2

Given the London Mayors recent consultation on his 2022/23 Budget which represents a potential increase in GLA precept of 8.8%, additional information has been added to the response below to reflect this.

Council Tax Band	LBB Council Tax 21-22 & Projected Increases				GLA Precept 21-22 & Projected Increases			
	Total LBB Council Tax 21-22 (£)	1%	2%	3%	Total GLA Precept 21-22 (£)	5%	8.8%	10%
A	885.24	894.09	902.94	911.80	242.44	254.56	263.77	266.68
B	1,032.78	1,043.11	1,053.44	1,063.76	282.85	296.99	307.74	311.14
C	1,180.32	1,192.12	1,203.93	1,215.73	323.25	339.41	351.70	355.58
D	1,327.86	1,341.14	1,354.42	1,367.70	363.66	381.84	395.66	400.03
E	1,622.94	1,639.17	1,655.40	1,671.63	444.47	466.69	483.58	488.92
F	1,918.02	1,937.20	1,956.38	1,975.56	525.29	551.55	571.52	577.82
G	2,213.10	2,235.23	2,257.36	2,279.49	606.10	636.41	659.44	666.71
H	2,655.72	2,682.28	2,708.83	2,735.39	727.32	763.69	791.32	800.05

Council Tax Band	Total LBB Council Tax plus GLA Precept Projected Increases (£)								
	1% + 5%	2% + 5%	3% + 5%	1% + 8.8%	2% + 8.8%	3% + 8.8%	1% + 10%	2% + 10%	3% + 10%
A	1,148.65	1,157.51	1,166.36	1,157.87	1,166.72	1,175.57	1,160.78	1,169.63	1,178.48
B	1,340.10	1,350.43	1,360.76	1,350.85	1,361.18	1,371.50	1,354.24	1,364.57	1,374.90
C	1,531.54	1,543.34	1,555.14	1,543.82	1,555.62	1,567.43	1,547.70	1,559.50	1,571.30
D	1,722.98	1,736.26	1,749.54	1,736.80	1,750.08	1,763.36	1,741.16	1,754.44	1,767.72
E	2,105.86	2,122.09	2,138.32	2,122.75	2,138.98	2,155.21	2,128.09	2,144.32	2,160.55
F	2,488.75	2,507.93	2,527.12	2,508.72	2,527.90	2,547.08	2,515.02	2,534.20	2,553.38
G	2,871.64	2,893.77	2,915.90	2,894.67	2,916.80	2,938.93	2,901.94	2,924.07	2,946.20
H	3,445.96	3,472.52	3,499.08	3,473.60	3,500.16	3,526.72	3,482.33	3,508.89	3,535.44

This page is left intentionally blank