

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 1 September 2021

Present:

Councillor Will Harmer (Chairman)
Councillor Robert Mcilveen (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Ian Dunn, Simon Fawthrop, Christine Harris,
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Christopher Marlow,
Melanie Stevens and Harry Stranger

Also Present:

Ben Velmans (Veolia)
John Colgan (TfL)

Councillor Nicholas Bennett MA J.P.

115 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Kieran Terry and Councillor Christine Harris attended as substitute.

116 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

117 MINUTES OF THE ECS PDS MEETING HELD ON 9th JUNE 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on 9th of June 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

118 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER OR CHAIRMAN

Written and oral questions were received from members of the public and from Councillors and these are attached as appendices to the minutes.

119 MATTERS ARISING AND WORK PROGRAMME

It was noted that Riney would be attending the Committee on 17th of November.

Members were informed that a report on electric vehicles would be presented at the November meeting.

1 September 2021

A Member suggested that with respect to road traffic schemes under consideration, it would be helpful for both Members and the public to receive updates on a six monthly basis. This would enable everyone to understand how projects were developing. The Chairman supported this idea.

A Member asked if a review of 'Fix My Street' could come to the Committee. The Chairman said that this would be considered and that someone would get back to the Member with a response to her request.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) Riney would attend the meeting on 17th November.**
- 2) A report regarding electric vehicles would be presented at the November meeting.**
- 3) A update on road traffic schemes under consideration should be presented to the Committee for information on a six monthly basis.**
- 4) Consideration would be applied to the request for a review of 'Fix My Street' and a response provided to the relevant Member.**

120 PRESENTATION FROM TfL--358 ELECTRIC BUS

John Colgan, (Business Development Manager/Buses) from TfL attended to present to the Committee.

The presentation was concerning the trial of the proposed electrification of the 358 bus route from Orpington to Crystal Palace. This was being trialled in an attempt to begin to address issues of air quality and TfL's carbon footprint. Mr Colgan informed the Committee that the journey quality for passengers would be improved, with less noise, less juddering and with onboard charging points for the convenience of passengers. The new buses would have very high safety specifications.

Members were briefed concerning the various technologies that could be utilised to bring about the electrification of the route. TfL had considered that the use of 'opportunity charging' with pantographs seemed to be the best option to progress the project.

It was currently estimated that in achieving an entirely zero emission bus fleet, approximately 80-85% of TfL's bus routes would use garage-charged electric buses, with the remaining 15-20% running off hydrogen and/or using some form of opportunity charging. The use of hydrogen was expensive and required a different infrastructure.

An explanation was provided as to how the 'opportunity charging' option would work. It was noted that this was a single decker route because of the low bridge near Shortlands train station. It was explained that the technology

worked off a pantograph charger which connected to the bus and which derived its electric power from the national grid.

Mr Colgan stated that the new electric buses would be operated by 'Go Ahead' and would have the highest safety specifications of any buses in London. The buses and the accompanying equipment would all be made in Spain as a single integrated package. Members asked if there was not a British company that could be used, but apparently this was not the case. A Member asked if the possibility of the batteries being provided by a British company had been looked at. Mr Colgan responded that all possibilities had been examined and the integrated Spanish solution was the best option.

Members noted the existing operation of a similar system of electrification using pantographs at Harrogate. Members were shown plans for the development of the pantograph and ancillary equipment at Crystal Palace Bus Station. It was noted that this would not interfere in any way with the movement of buses and existing bus services. A permitted development certificate of lawfulness had been granted by the Council.

Plans were also shown for the installation of the relevant equipment in a disused yard at Orpington Bus Station. This land was owned jointly by The Arch Company and Network Rail; work was being undertaken to arrange the required leases. Preparation of the sites would commence during spring/summer 2022.

A Member drew attention to the 43 bus route which was serviced with garage charged electric buses with a range of 160 miles. This being the case, he wondered why the new technology was required. Mr Colgan explained that around 10%-15% of the current bus routes had a daily mileage per bus of over 200 miles and so the new technology was a cost effective way of operating bus routes with a high daily mileage, often in excess of 200 miles.

It was noted that the electric power would come from the National Grid.

A Member asked if the new buses would be ok to navigate some of the steep hills that existed in places like Anerley. Mr Colgan said that the relevant testing would be undertaken and that the buses were currently navigating steep hills in Spain.

A Member asked if the presentation could be uploaded to the Bromley Council website. Mr Colgan requested that this be co-ordinated with the TfL press team.

RESOLVED that the presentation on the TfL trial of the proposed electrification of the 358 bus route be noted.

121 VEOLIA ANNUAL CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Assistant Director for Environment attended and introduced the report.

1 September 2021

Attending on behalf of Veolia was Ben Velmans--Regional Manager.

LBB was now in the second year of the contracts that had been agreed with Veolia in 2019—the total contract period was for an 8 year term.

The contracts were managed via a governance model; KPIs were monitored on a monthly basis. The report covered a number of contract streams, one of which was waste disposal. The waste disposal contract stream had performed satisfactorily during the pandemic in meeting the KPIs and zero waste had been sent to landfill which had exceeded the target. With more people working from home during the pandemic, more business and domestic waste was collected. Staff shortages during the pandemic had caused a dip in performance with respect to waste collections.

During the period covered by the report the recycling target was not achieved, and the reasons for this were covered in the report.

There had been an increase in green garden waste customers.

The street cleaning targets had been achieved throughout the pandemic period. It was further noted that during the period covered by the report, there had been a 17% increase in service requests to 'Fix My Street'.

A Member highlighted some errors in the report which were noted by the Assistant Director. A Member referred to section 5.22 of the report which detailed various inquiries that had been received in relation to all aspects of street cleansing. He was interested to know if there was a particular hotspot where these complaints were originating from. He suggested that going forward that some sort of measure or analysis of these hotspots be incorporated into future reports.

A Member referred to section 5.14 of the report which stated that the moisture content in some loads of paper and card was so high that it could not be recycled. The Member wondered what could be done about this and what the potential cost to the Council could be. He mentioned that the waste recycling bins did not have hard lids which meant that rain water was getting in. He said that it was a shame that paper could not be recycled because of rainfall.

The Assistant Director responded that in future reports, details of complaint hotspots and potential costs incurred by the Council would be incorporated.

Mr Velmans outlined the procedures being adopted by Veolia to reduce their carbon footprint. The biggest factor would be the type of vehicles used. It was explained that at the beginning of the contract, Veolia procured some electric vehicles but primarily standard diesel engine vehicles for the main dust carts. They were the best vehicles that were available at the time of the initial procurement. As had been previously noted with the TfL presentation, some challenges existed with electric vehicles in terms of being able to complete

their cycles, and this was compounded with dustcarts in the sense that much of the electric was used in the back of the vehicles because of its crushing activities. The City of London did possess a fully electric fleet but they used small low usage dustcarts to cover a small area. Bromley was a much larger geographical area. Strategies and campaigns were being developed to drive up recycling and reduce contamination specifically with respect to flats.

The Chairman highlighted that the level of fly tipping had increased by 25% and he wondered what was driving this. He suggested that more should be done with public protection and enforcement to crackdown on fly tipping.

The Assistant Director agreed that collaborative work should be undertaken with public protection and enforcement. Some trial campaigns were underway in the Penge and Mottingham areas to try and establish the root causes of fly tipping. A report would come back to the Committee with recommendations. It was noted that the parks security guards had delegated powers to issue PCNs for fly tipping. The Assistant Director assured that LBB would be focusing on developing campaigns to reduce the amount of fly tipping within the borough.

The Chairman asked if the current shortage of HGV drivers was a risk factor for Veolia. Mr Velmans responded in the affirmative, stating that there was a risk and that in the UK the shortage of HGV drivers was estimated at between 60,000 to 100,000. Veolia in mitigation, had competitive pay rates and attractive bonuses. They had a nationwide scheme that offered a £1500 incentive for new drivers.

The Chairman asked how LBB compared with other boroughs in terms of key metrics. Mr Velmans responded that street cleaning in Bromley was excellent. However, he wanted to see some improvement in terms of waste collections; it was difficult sometimes to compare boroughs because of different geography.

A Member asked if Veolia would work with Idverde to promote recycling. The Assistant Director answered in the affirmative and confirmed that there was synergy and cooperation with service partners in these areas.

It was noted that an award ceremony had been held for street cleaners. The awards were based on referrals from the general public. Awards from the Mayor were well received.

RESOLVED that the update report and presentation from Veolia be noted.

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

a OUTTURN 2020/21

1 September 2021

Members noted that this report had already gone to the Executive and the recommendations had been agreed.

A Member stated that he wanted to understand what was happening to the 'run rate'. He felt that this would give Members a clearer idea concerning what was on track. In fact, he felt that information concerning the run rate should be added to all financial reports across the Council.

A Member referred to the purchase of a Sonic Tomograph. The report stated that the Council had paid £30k for this item. He wondered why this was the case as he had looked one up on Google and the cost was only £2k. He requested an explanation of this and the Director of Environment and Community Services said that he would look into the issue and provide a response.

RESOLVED that the Director for Environment would look into the cost of the Sonic Tomograph and report back to Members.

b BUDGET MONITORING 2021/22

The issue concerning underspends in the Traffic and Road Safety Service because vacancies had not been filled was raised. This was cross referenced to the capital programme report which mentioned over £600k slippage in the Capital Programme and design work. It was asked if the fact that vacancies had not been filled had caused a delay to certain projects in the Capital Programme.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking responded that LIP (Local Implementation Plan) related work had been affected by uncertainty because of a lack of funding from TfL. This was a legacy from May 2020 when TfL experienced a funding crisis. So any delays in the Capital Programme were not caused by vacancies, but rather by a lack of funding from TfL. It was also the case that because of the pandemic, funding that was available had to be allocated to Covid related projects.

A Member referenced page 105 of the agenda where there seemed to be an indication that the 'run rate' was increasing in certain areas like waste services. He commented that it would be useful to know why this was the case.

The Head of Finance (ECS) responded and explained that Covid impacts were now within the monitoring process, but it may be more helpful going forward to make a clearer distinction between what was 'business as usual' and what had been impacted by Covid.

RESOLVED that the Budget Monitoring report be noted.

123 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING--Q1--2021--2022

This report noted changes that had been agreed by the Executive on 15th July 2021.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

124 FUTURE MAINTENANCE OF THE WINTER SERVICE FLEET

The question was raised as to how the contractual costs compared with other boroughs. The Assistant Director for Highways responded that the initial valuation for the contract was looked at in detail two years ago. The reason for bringing this report to the Committee was simply to extend the contractual services for the remaining period of the contract. Costs were difficult to compare with other boroughs as other councils operated differently to LBB. It was noted that with respect to the vehicle fleets, any specialist work would be undertaken directly by the manufacturers--but routine maintenance was undertaken by local companies. It was further noted that the vehicle maintenance costs were fixed.

RESOLVED that the report on the future maintenance of the winter service fleet be noted.

a FUTURE OF FOOTWAY RECYCLING COLLECTION SERVICE

A Member expressed the view this was a case of 'use it or lose it' and consequently the service had now been lost.

Whilst the Chairman expressed some sympathy with this view, he felt that not enough work was being done by the Planning Department to put more onus on developers to provide adequate recycling facilities. The Chairman was concerned that unless the Council could achieve a different outcome, then the Council's recycling rates would decline.

The Portfolio Holder said that the Council was getting advice from 'WRAP' (Waste and Resources Action Programme) to clarify what could be achieved in line with current planning law. LBB needed to make it clear what the Council expected from developers. The Portfolio Holder had requested that officers make it clear to developers that adequate waste and recycling points were required.

The Assistant Director for Environment mentioned that a paper was being looked at in Parliament next year concerning these matters and so it was likely that subsequently, a report would be presented to the ECS PDS Committee.

The Director for Environment and Community Services stated that he had spoken with the Chief Planner concerning this issue. His aim was to get a round table of officers together so that the Planning Team would be fully aware of the concerns in this area.

1 September 2021

A Member commented that residents in flats were paying council tax and so were paying for a service. She felt there had been a lack of communication to explain to homeowners what they could do. She felt it had not been made clear enough about where they could put their recycling and waste. She expressed the view that it looked like the project had been badly managed. She felt that more needed to be done to work out what had gone wrong so that the pilot would not turn out to be a complete waste of money. It was important to find out what the barrier or barriers were to the successful implementation of the pilot scheme and she suspected it lay in the area of poor communication.

A Member responded that officers did go door to door to publicise the pilot and that possibly what may be required was a sort of communal type of bin system; however in his view the current scheme was dead and something else had to be looked at.

The Assistant Director for Environment said that the Council had tried its best to engage.

A Member reiterated her view that the Council needed to get more from the pilot scheme.

The Chairman concluded the discussion by saying that it was great and we can't always be successful.

RESOLVED that:

1) The Portfolio Holder agreed to cease the footway recycling collection service pilot and that the cessation of the pilot be communicated; also that the locations of the nearest recycling sites be communicated to all households in the pilot areas.

2) The Portfolio Holder agreed that alternative options for recycling provision be considered for Chatsworth Parade.

125 STREET LIGHTING LED CONVERSION PROGRAMME

Members noted the report on the Street Lighting LED Conversion Programme.

RESOLVED that the proposed programme for lantern conversions and column replacements be approved.

126 SOUTH EDEN PARK ROAD (BECKENHAM) SAFETY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking introduced the report. He explained that officers had been asked to look into road safety in this area, particularly with respect to schools. Officers had consulted with Ward

Councillors. No decision was required at this stage. Officers had been asked by Members to look into road safety issues with respect to South Eden Park Road and adjacent areas—mainly with regard to local schools. The schools concerned were Langley Park, Unicorn, St David's and Oak Lodge.

Officers had undertaken site visits to consult with local residents. On the list of casualty cluster sites in the borough, one of the sites that officers had recently been looking into was on the junction of South Eden Park Road and Links Way. There was no specific casualty problem identified with respect to any particular school. The Assistant Director explained that there was no funding available from TfL for this type of work to be undertaken until at least the 11th December. This, however, did not mean that the Council could not continue to investigate and prepare plans and costings in the interim.

Councillor Nicholas Bennett attended and addressed the Committee. He said that his concerns were with respect to Beckenham Road and South Eden Park Road. His main concern was focussed on cars speeding on Beckenham Road. He explained that this was a route taken by the 194 bus—it was a very straight and wide road and drivers were often tempted to speed along it. His concerns were for the local residents and for people trying to cross the road as they were put in danger because of speeding traffic. There was only one crossing point on the road which was a traffic island by St David's School.

Councillor Bennett made the following suggestions:

- A 20 mph warning activated sign to be installed by St David's School. This would operate only during school hours
- Changes should be made to the current crossing at St David's Road. It should be changed to either a light controlled crossing or a zebra crossing. His preference was for a zebra crossing that would give priority to pedestrians.
- The widening of the pavement from 18 Beckenham Road to the junction. This was only 110mm wide and was basically just enough width to get a pram through.
- There was a concern about vehicles jumping the traffic lights at the junction of Red Lodge Road and Station Road. A camera should be installed to capture the details of any vehicle jumping the traffic lights.

Councillor Christine Harris drew attention to what she regarded as a very dangerous stretch of road that ran from Creswell Drive to 82 South Eden Park Road. She expressed the view that this was a very hazardous stretch of road for pedestrians as it was only the width of a buggy. Councillor Harris had witnessed occasions when young people had stepped out into the road without looking behind them in order to let others pass by. The issues were compounded by the fact that this particular pavement was likely to be used by

1 September 2021

children from 6 local schools and on the other side of the road no pavement existed to provide an alternative walkway.

A question was raised with respect to School Streets and it was noted that the review results of the trial of temporary school streets would be an item on the agenda for the November PDS meeting. This would include feedback from the trial of the School Street in Hayes.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder permit Council officers to undertake feasibility studies and to progress the scheme to an informal consultation and detailed design.

127 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS GOING TO THE EXECUTIVE

128 COMMUNITY CYCLE TRACK, HOBLINGWELL WOOD RECREATION GROUND

Members regarded this report as a good news story and approved the recommendations in the report. It was noted that the decision with respect to the increased costs in the capital programme provision would be made by the Executive at its meeting on September 22nd.

RESOLVED that:

1) The proposed repurposing of £35k from the Neighbourhood Management revenue budget for 2021/22 in respect of the variable work elements be agreed.

2) There should be an increase of £31k in the contribution from the Friends Fund and a contribution of £35k from the Environmental Initiative Fund.

3) There should be an acceptance of the HSBC grant, subject to standard terms and conditions and that this should be applied to the project.

129 POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS

a ECS PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

The Chairman expressed his thanks to the Senior Business Performance Officer for producing a performance overview document that was much easier to read than previous versions.

Members noted the red risk areas which related to the recycling of waste and to highway maintenance.

With respect to highway maintenance the Senior Business Performance Officer commented that performance had been impacted by bad weather and by the delay in the recruitment of a new Contract Manager. The Director of Environment and Community Services stated that he had been meeting with Riney in an attempt to resolve outstanding issues and that Riney were aware of these issues.

It was noted that Riney would be attending the November meeting of the ECS PDS Committee. A Member requested that the KPIs be brought back to the November meeting.

A Member asked if any analysis had been undertaken regarding non-recyclable black bags. It was confirmed that this analysis had not been explored. A Member stated that the public should be reminded that they could request extra recycling boxes and more green garden waste containers.

The Portfolio Holder commented that the increased volume of waste was concerning. Another Member pointed out that as well as the effects of the pandemic, increased waste volumes could also be impacted because the population rate was increasing.

RESOLVED that the ECS Performance Overview update be noted.

130 LBB'S NET ZERO CARBON ACTION PLAN--REPORTING YEAR TWO

A Member raised the issue of how the Council's emissions were calculated. He expressed the view that 'green' suppliers and contractors' emissions had not been taken into consideration and because of that the way in which LBB had been instructed to calculate the emissions by the GLA was wrong. He felt that the fact that LBB used suppliers that used renewable energy sources had been overlooked.

The Carbon Programme Manager stated that this was a matter that was bigger than the GLA, and that in fact it was a matter of international debate. He said that LBB was waiting to hear from London Councils to see if they approved LBB's Net Zero Carbon Action Plan. He was hoping that they would vote in favour.

A Member commented that if the Council was using renewable energy suppliers—then that should be taken into consideration in the way that emissions and targets were calculated. The way that the GLA was making the calculations should not be accepted and that common sense was required.

The Chairman agreed that this matter was a problem for the sector.

Members noted that London Councils and the GLA were working on a standard methodology that could be used by all councils in London.

1 September 2021

The Chairman was pleased to note that paper usage in the Council had dropped from 44 tons to 10 tons per annum.

RESOLVED that the progress made concerning the Council's Net Zero Carbon Action Plan be noted.

131 ECS RISK REGISTER

A discussion took place as to how risk ratings were derived and why some risks looked more severe than others but may have a lower risk rating. It was accepted that risk ratings were not always easy to assess. It was noted that there were certain risks that the Council had some control of, but there were other risks that the Council had little or no control over. It was noted that the degree of risk was a view taken at a particular point in time and that the process of rating risks was not a precise science.

RESOLVED that the update on the Risk Register be noted.

132 TRANSFORMING BROMLEY 2019--2023: FIRST TWO YEARS

Members noted the Transforming Bromley report.

A Member referenced page 209 of the agenda pack—and section 3.34 of the report. This highlighted the need to 'review the three main environmental contracts'. The Member asked for further detail regarding which contracts were being mentioned. The Director responded that he would seek clarification on this and report back.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and that the Director for Environment and Community Services report back concerning the three contracts that were highlighted in section 3.34 of the report.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

Environment and Community Services PDS Committee

September 1st 2021

Written Questions from Members of the Public

1) Question from David Boswell:

I have heard rumours from three separate sources that as a result of lorries when turning at the partly constructed mini-roundabouts, at the Warren Road junction with the Orpington Bypass, newly laid kerbs have been displaced by the lorries which has resulted in the redesign and reconstruction of the roundabout. Please could it be confirmed if the rumours are correct or not?

Reply:

The kerbs were damaged during the construction works as some larger HGVs over-ran kerbs that were not at that time fully affixed in place. The contractor later re-fixed the kerbs at no additional cost to the Council. No redesign was required.

2) Question from Dr Brendan Donegan:

What plans does the Portfolio Holder have to follow-up on the school travel survey the Council conducted last year, for example by (a) sharing results with schools, residents and/or local concerned-voluntary-groups, and (b) running a follow-up survey.

Reply:

Active travel to schools is always monitored through annual surveys with many of our schools across the Borough participating. We do this in the form of hands up surveys. It is a simple process for the busy schools and is one regular survey rather than several ad hoc surveys; this avoids survey fatigue and confusion. The hands up surveys were completed at the end of the Summer Term 2021. This data helps to form the Stars TfL Accreditation and once TfL have verified our recommendations, we will share the results of accredited schools and their level (gold, silver, or bronze) on the Bromley Council website. Unfortunately, last summer the data was not gathered anywhere in London as schools were closed to most pupils, but the Department for Transport asked us to conduct a special School Travel Survey to help to coordinate a smooth return to school following the Covid school lockdowns.

3) Question from Brendan Donegan:

The UK Government's "Manual for Streets" publication contains a wealth of advice for local authorities, emphasising the need for coordinating decision-making to create inclusive streets, and defining streets as highways that serve "important public realm functions beyond the movement of traffic." Can the Portfolio Holder explain if/how Bromley Council takes this document into consideration in projects such as redevelopment of High Streets in Bromley, Beckenham or Orpington?

Reply:

The Council in a project led from the then Renewal and Recreation Team, conducted a project to consider the right approach for our High Streets, engaging consultants and conducting site visits to evaluate approaches for different areas and types of High Street. The conclusion was that the Shared Space concept was the appropriate model for Orpington, Bromley North Village and Beckenham High Streets. This approach whilst maintaining access by vehicles has ensured that those High Streets are not dominated by the car, with equal priority for pedestrians in particular and cyclists. We have also encouraged TfL to undertake a similar approach for West Wickham High Street which is on a TfL road.

The UK Government's 'Manual for Streets' (MfS) is a guidance for designing streets. As explained in the document itself, the guidance focuses on lightly trafficked residential streets, but the principles may be applicable to other types of street, for example high streets and lightly trafficked lanes in rural areas. It is the responsibility of users of MfS to ensure its application to the design of streets not specifically covered if appropriate.

The Council takes the guidance from this document into consideration, but there is no statutory requirement for a strict adherence to it. The decision for the final design of schemes in the borough is dependent on several factors ranging from the needs of our residents, funding available, stakeholder consultation, political approval, council policy, road safety audit etc.

4) Question from Dr Carrie Heitmeyer:

Hawksbrook Lane, a cul de sac, houses Langley Park Boys, Langley Park Girls and Langley Park Primary Schools. As TfL funds are currently held by the Council for the purpose, why has a School Street not been installed here, where 2,500+ children walk to school every day and where there are hardly any residential homes?

Reply:

A temporary School Street option on Hawksbrook Lane was investigated as an emergency measure and whilst the schools were very keen to adopt a temporary School Street in this location, investigations with local stakeholders highlighted the potential number of vehicle movements which still could occur, plus the potential impact on businesses trying to recover from the Covid-19 lockdown.

Managing a school street with more than a minimum number of permits and vehicle movements would be more complex for the staff managing the barrier, taking it outside the scope of the emergency project and potentially leading to a false sense of security for pedestrians. Following consideration of the information provided by local stakeholders, together with input from Local Councillors, a School Street was not progressed in Hawksbrook Lane. The implemented solution, (social distancing barriers) did not preclude more confident pedestrians from using the road space for social distancing, but when they did, they knew to look out for vehicles; for those less confident the expanded footway space provided additional protected space for social distancing. It is considered that the implemented scheme enabled greater social

distancing in the locality without undesirable impacts on local stakeholders. We will continue to support the schools with promoting road safety and active travel to and from school where we are able to.

5) Question from Dr Carrie Heitmeyer:

In your previous responses, you sometimes mention Bromley's success with STARS - TfL's accreditation scheme for London schools and nurseries. Burnt Ash Primary has a Gold STARS rating. What does this rating mean, in real, tangible terms - for example, does it mean the school can access additional funding or support from Bromley Council?

Reply:

GOLD: This is the highest level. To achieve this level a school must demonstrate a high level of participation and involvement. Most importantly, the school illustrates an impressive level of innovation towards the travel plan and its objectives. Here, the travel plan is ingrained within the school's ethos. An outstanding school is an exceptional school. The school must demonstrate a 6% modal shift away from the car. We encourage all schools to engage with and take part in the School Travel Plans programme as it helps us and them to streamline all of the communications and concerns relating to the school more effectively.

The Council uses the engagement of the school in the School Travel Plan process and its successes in achieving active and healthy school travel to prioritise support from the School Travel team and where necessary other interventions as by implication they will be better used.

6) Question from Terence W Ide:

Dear Sir, on 9 June you advised a pedestrian crossing is not required outside the Pink Elephant Nursery, Chislehurst Sports Ground, Elmstead Lane. This despite a proposed increase, from 40 to 64, of very young children attending. As a local independent school also make regular use of these sports fields, would it not be prudent to commission an urgent traffic study of school pedestrian danger on this very busy road?

Reply:

This refers to planning application 20/00310 RECON which has not yet been determined. The information provided by the applicant was that of the 51 families that are currently registered, 17 drive and 34 walk or use public transport. Applying the same split to an additional 24 children would give 8 children being dropped off by car and 16 walking / using public transport. There are other people using the car park, but it was not thought these numbers would justify looking at installing a formal crossing in this location.

A Road Safety Audit has been requested.

7) Question from Terence W Ide:

It is welcome news that local eco activists are raising funds to open a green eco community hub in our central shopping mall. They have raised a substantial amount

of money but still have some way to go. Has the Council been able to contribute financially to this initiative and, if so, by how much?

Reply:

The Council is very encouraged to see community initiatives that foster environmental stewardship and ecological awareness, with the proposed “Eco-Hub” being a clear example of this. The Council intends to add value to this space through supporting the provision of a “Library of Things” – an initiative to lease household items to the community, thereby preventing less “things” bought by individuals. Not only will this reduce the borough’s waste to landfill rates, but will also drive down the borough’s embodied carbon emissions as less things are manufactured in the first instance. The cost of the initiative is £30,000 and will share space with the Eco-Hub.

8) Question from Jen McArthur:

Bromley Council's Carbon Management Plan only covers the organisation's own emissions, which are equivalent to 2.5% of the borough's total emissions from transport, domestic and industrial activities. Will Bromley Council commit to declaring a climate emergency and develop a credible plan to reach net zero by 2050, covering the other 97.5% of emissions too?

Reply:

I will not repeat what is already in the public domain. The Council is committed to reaching what is already a highly demanding target and we are committing £multi-millions to make this possible, with good progress being made. It is noteworthy that whilst recent investment announcements, such as in LED street lighting, have demonstrated our deepened attention in this area, our successful work has actually been underway for some years.

By setting a date of 2029 for net zero for Council Controlled emissions, we are demonstrating our leadership in this area and setting an example. However, it is for property owners, businesses and residents to take responsibility for their property and lifestyle and progressively make changes to achieve net-zero. Property is an area with one of the highest levels of emissions across the borough--property in the main owned by others.

We have been working with residents over a considerable period of time to outline how they can reduce their emissions, including promoting energy efficiency, but also by considering travel choices, such as walking and cycling. It is wrong for any one organisation or individual resident or group of residents to assume it is their sole responsibility to take this important agenda further, as this needs to be a partnership of the many and the Council is committed to playing its part and supporting residents to do the same.

We will be adding further advice and guidance/sign posting for residents etc. to help them make decisions to reduce their carbon footprint.

9) Question from Richard Gibbons:

Please confirm:

1. Current number of LBB litter bins by ward and type (a) small (lamp)post mounted open top, (b) stand-alone open top, (c) stand-alone covered top, and (d) other (please specify); and

2. Frequency of emptying by (a) Veolia, (b) idverde, (c) other (please specify).

Reply:

1) - Parks and Greenspaces: A total of 900 bins. See Appendix 1 below.

1) - Streets – A total of 1,189 bins. See Appendix 1 below. NB: There is a corruption in the data extracted for Cray Valley West.

2) Parks and Greenspaces: Idverde cleansing teams attend to bins in accordance with the Parks Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse whereby parks are zoned based on intensity of use. Each zone has a cleansing frequency e.g., zone 1 are visited daily and zone 2 weekly. In practice though, and especially with the increased waste and footfall to parks, Idverde aim to attend to all bins daily, including rural sites.

2) Streets: Frequency of litter bin emptying will vary as above in accordance with the DEFRA Code of Practice. Bins will be emptied both through the pre-determined frequencies of street cleansing attendances and through our mobile caged crews who supplement those emptying frequencies, e.g., bins within a town centre environment will be emptied multiple times per day.

[Appendix 1 – Parks litter bins.](#)

Row Labels	Dog Litter Bin	Litter Bin	Grand Total
Bickley	2	7	9
Biggin Hill	6	19	25
Bromley Common & Keston	18	45	63
Bromley Town	15	46	61
Chelsfield & Pratts Bottom	14	23	37
Chislehurst	9	19	28
Clock House	4	12	16
Copers Cope	3	5	8
Cray Valley East	20	44	64
Cray Valley West	15	20	35
Crystal Palace	29	69	98
Darwin	6	19	25
Farnborough & Crofton	12	17	29
Hayes & Coney Hall	24	48	72
Kelsey and Eden Park	24	71	95
Mottingham & Chislehurst North	10	19	29

Orpington	16	30	46
Penge and Cator	13	39	52
Petts Wood & Knoll	13	16	29
Plaistow & Sundridge	8	29	37
Shortlands	2	12	14
West Wickham	10	18	28
Grand Total	273	627	900

Appendix 2 – Street litter bins.

Ward	Count of type	Total
Bickley Ward		26
Admiral	1	
Gemini	2	
Hooded Trimline	4	
Jubilee	1	
Streamline Jubilee	3	
Trimline	15	
Biggin Hill Ward		46
Admiral	1	
Evolution	17	
Hooded Trimline	1	
Jubilee	3	
Streamline Jubilee	2	
Trimline	22	
Bromley Common and Keston Ward		70
Admiral	22	
Big Belly Bin	1	
Evolution	8	
Gemini	2	
Hooded Trimline	7	
Jubilee	4	
Streamline Jubilee	2	
Trimline	24	
Bromley Town Ward		121
Admiral	5	
Evolution	1	
Jubilee	12	
Streamline Jubilee	5	
Trimline	32	
Wybone	58	
Wybone Recycling	8	
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Ward		49
Admiral	5	

Evolution	3	
Gemini		
Hooded Trimline	2	
Jubilee	4	
Streamline Jubilee	2	
Trimline	32	
Wybone Recycling	1	
Chislehurst Ward		79
Admiral	11	
Big Belly Bin	2	
Evolution	3	
Gemini	5	
Hooded Trimline	7	
Jubilee	14	
Streamline Jubilee	22	
Trimline	15	
Clock House Ward		41
Admiral	8	
Big Belly Bin	1	
Evolution	2	
Jubilee	12	
Streamline Jubilee	4	
Trimline	11	
Wybone	3	
Evolution		
Streamline Jubilee		
Copers Cope Ward		80
Admiral	6	
Evolution	9	
Gemini	2	
Hooded Trimline	7	
Jubilee	4	
Streamline Jubilee	1	
Trimline	20	
Wybone	27	
Wybone Recycling	4	
Cray Valley East Ward		38
Admiral	6	
Big Belly Bin	1	
Evolution	6	
Gemini	1	
Hooded Trimline	6	

Jubilee	1	
Trimline	15	
Wybone	1	
Wybone Recycling	1	
Cray Valley West Ward		4
Admiral		
Evolution	4	
Hooded Trimline		
Jubilee		
Streamline Jubilee		
Trimline		
Crystal Palace Ward		45
Admiral	15	
Evolution	4	
Gemini	3	
Hooded Trimline	4	
Jubilee	9	
Streamline Jubilee	6	
Trimline	4	
Darwin Ward		14
Admiral	6	
Gemini	1	
Hooded Trimline	1	
Streamline Jubilee	1	
Trimline	5	
Farnborough and Crofton Ward		47
Admiral	18	
Big Belly Bin	1	
Evolution	3	
Hooded Trimline	2	
Jubilee	4	
Streamline Jubilee	3	
Trimline	16	
Hayes and Coney Hall Ward		80
Admiral	8	
Evolution	13	
Gemini	4	
Hooded Trimline	5	
Jubilee	12	
Streamline Jubilee	3	
Trimline	35	
Kelsey and Eden Park Ward		81

Admiral	12	
Evolution	7	
Gemini	2	
Hooded Trimline	3	
Jubilee	37	
Streamline Jubilee	9	
Trimline	11	
Mottingham and Chislehurst North Ward		27
Evolution	2	
Gemini	4	
Jubilee	12	
Streamline Jubilee	1	
Trimline	8	
Orpington Ward		88
Admiral	4	
Big Belly Bin	1	
Evolution	3	
Hooded Trimline	14	
Jubilee	3	
Streamline Jubilee	4	
Trimline	25	
Wybone	30	
Wybone Recycling	4	
Penge and Cator Ward		83
Admiral	13	
Big Belly Bin	1	
Evolution	28	
Gemini	3	
Hooded Trimline	1	
Jubilee	11	
Streamline Jubilee	8	
Trimline	15	
Wybone	3	
Petts Wood and Knoll Ward		39
Evolution	27	
Gemini	2	
Jubilee	2	
Streamline Jubilee	2	
Trimline	3	
Wybone	3	
Plaistow and Sundridge Ward		31
Admiral	6	

Evolution	3	
Hooded Trimline	6	
Jubilee	2	
Streamline Jubilee	2	
Trimline	11	
Wybone	1	
Shortlands Ward		30
Admiral	6	
Evolution	2	
Gemini	1	
Hooded Trimline	1	
Streamline Jubilee	1	
Trimline	17	
Sydenham Ward	1	
Admiral	1	
West Wickham Ward		72
Admiral	6	
Evolution	30	
Gemini	3	
Hooded Trimline	5	
Jubilee	2	
Streamline Jubilee	2	
Trimline	24	
Total	1191	1191

10) Question from Richard Gibbons

How is the Council mitigating against impacts of the car-led recovery from the Covid-19 restrictions to reduce short journeys by car to schools, shops, stations and local amenities within the borough?

Reply:

In addition to introducing new cycling and walking infrastructure last year in various locations across the Borough, the Council has an extensive active travel programme and as the restrictions have lifted the team have been heavily engaged in schools and within the adult community with projects such as:

- child cycle training
- adult cycle training
- escorted ride from home to school or work
- Dr Bike
- Bike Marking

- Bike Maintenance Courses
- Smart Movers (Active Travel Scheme)
- Scootsure (Infant Scooting awareness training)
- Junior Travel Ambassador Scheme
- Businesses are being approached and offered help and support to encourage help and support with walking and cycling

11) Question from James Brown:

According to crashmap.co.uk, there have been 5 KSIs (Killed or Seriously Injured) on West Wickham High Street, and many less serious injuries, in the last few years. What action is the Portfolio Holder taking in response?

Reply:

West Wickham High Street is part of the Red Route which is managed by TfL and not the borough. Bromley therefore cannot introduce changes on West Wickham High Street. Bromley does however raise the issue of safety on TfL managed streets at liaison meetings with TfL. In line with our interventions in other High Streets we have encouraged TfL to consider changes in West Wickham High Street that would change the feel of the High Street to more naturally change behaviours in the area.

12) Question from James Brown:

What plans does the Portfolio Holder have to ensure the £1.35m Bromley Council is spending on street trees (a) is spent strategically, to support creation of 'walking superhighways' across the borough with trees providing shade, and (b) represents value for money, by ensuring these vital (and expensive) assets survive?

Reply:

A) The council will present a comprehensive plan in November 2021 (in advance of the first trees being planted) which will include how the establishment of the remainder of the trees will be targeted to support the stated aims of the project. Street trees will provide shade for pedestrians. Where walking routes cross our green spaces other management plans will allow for planting of trees as appropriate for the area.

B) As per answer 'a' a comprehensive report will be delivered in November setting out how this will be delivered. Fundamentally, procurement procedures will be followed to ensure value for money and a new contract will be let specific to this element of service delivery with financially incentivised high establishment rates. Enhanced planting and maintenance procedures have been created and enhanced public engagement is being undertaken to promote and support public ownership of elements of the aftercare.

13) Question from Gary Kent:

Given long standing community concerns about narrow pavements, speeding, and unsafe crossings should this project now be classified as urgent and the time for feasibility study halved from 6 to 3 months?

Reply:

The urgent heading on report front covers relates to the procedures applicable for scrutiny of the decision and the ability for a number of Councillors to ask for a decision to be reviewed. It is not a measure of the priority of the topic in question or even the speed of delivery of the project as a whole (if for example a decision was urgent to meet a deadline to bid for funds).

We would not usually half the period earmarked for the feasibility study of any project, as this would mean cutting corners and not undertaking the due diligence of the background work required. We also rely on 3rd party surveys and audits that require set times of operation, which is difficult to control. The only exception to this is if there is an emergency and a requirement for immediate intervention.

This feasibility scheme is not one of the cluster site locations in the borough. The team is currently prioritising locations where there have been 5 or more collisions in the latest 3 years period. This is not the case for South Eden Park Road area; the issues mentioned in the report relate to safety perception, encouraging walking and reducing congestion.

14) Question from David Marshall:

Open spaces are sanctuaries for many and have been especially important to communities during the Covid-19 pandemic. When can we expect the final Open Spaces Strategy document and what is the reason for the further delay beyond September, the hoped-for publication date at the previous meeting of this committee?

Reply:

It is acknowledged that the boroughs parks and open spaces became an important sanctuary for many during the pandemic. As part of the revision process of the strategy, officers sought to ensure that both the views of the consultation respondents and the impact of the pandemic had been fully considered and understood when redrafting the strategy, especially where there have been negative perceptions of certain aspects. The Council's intention was to ensure that the revision process delivered a high-quality and ambitious strategy that reflected the priorities, needs and aspirations of all sectors of the community. Given the feedback it is important we get this strategy right rather than meet a particular timescale.

Having said that, following a process of stakeholder engagement regarding the content of the redraft, it is intended that the strategy will be reported to the November PDS Committee.

15) Question from Jasper Bell:

The report states that the decision relating to approval for the feasibility scheme is 'non-urgent' and that the analysis alone will take 6 months despite the criticality of the issues and ongoing risk to residents. Could you provide a rough timeline around when the analysis will commence, when recommendations will be made, how decisions will be prioritised and the likely timeline for implementation?

Reply:

The urgent heading on report front covers relates to the procedures applicable for scrutiny of the decision and the ability for a number of Councillors to ask for a decision to be reviewed. It is not a measure of the priority of the topic in question or even the speed of delivery of the project as a whole (if for example a decision was urgent to meet a deadline to bid for funds).

This feasibility scheme is not one of the cluster site locations in the borough. The team is currently prioritising locations where there have been 5 or more collisions in the latest 3 years period. This is not the case for South Eden Park Road area; the issues mentioned in the report relate to safety perception, encouraging walking and reducing congestion.

The Council's priority is to propose measures to improve safety where collisions occur, rather than perceived danger.

- Timeline of when analysis will commence – Initial surveys are scheduled to start in September.
- When recommendations will be made - This will be when necessary approvals and safety audits are in place. We cannot specify a date because we are still in the early stages of the scheme.
- How decisions are prioritised - This will be based on several factors and the type of measures proposed. A few factors to consider are data collected, Council's policy, cost of the scheme vs benefits, impact on residents, road safety audit etc.
- Implementation timeline - This is unknown at this time because we are still in the early stages of the scheme.

16) Question from Jasper Bell:

The scope of the feasibility analysis and possible remedial works required relating to the scheme are considerable. How will the council involve and consult with local residents as the findings are made and remedial works need to be prioritised?

Reply:

The Council will use the normal consultation method as with all traffic schemes that could potentially impact the public. Residents will be consulted at the preliminary design stage and invited to comment. The feedback will be considered, and designs amended if necessary, then a detailed design will be completed and passed on to contractors.

As explained above this is not a priority location based on the criteria set out in our road safety strategy, the Bromley Local implementation Plan (LIP). Bromley's LIP has been approved by the Mayor. Individual aspects will be prioritised, relatively, based on their cost effectiveness in achieving the desired aims.

17) Question from Sarah Smith:

As a campaigning parent I noted that the South Eden Park Road Safety Improvement Scheme has been classified as 'non urgent', thus perhaps pre-empting the findings of the proposed six-month analysis. However, given that the pleas for safe crossings have been consistently raised by parents for more than a decade, can the Council please acknowledge that for us the situation is in fact urgent, and act accordingly?

Reply:

The urgent heading on report front covers relates to the procedures applicable for scrutiny of the decision and the ability for a number of Councillors to ask for a decision to be reviewed. It is not a measure of the priority of the topic in question or even the speed of delivery of the project as a whole (if for example a decision was urgent to meet a deadline to bid for funds).

This feasibility scheme is not one of the cluster site locations in the borough. The team is currently prioritising locations where there have been 5 or more collisions in the latest 3 years period. This is not the case for South Eden Park Road area; the issues mentioned in the report relate to safety perception, encouraging walking and reducing congestion.

18) Question from Sam Webber:

In light of the 35 day road highway maintenance tasks falling behind schedule, has Palace Grove been affected by this problem as the quality of road surface is poor with significant potholes reappearing despite temporary repairs. When was the last inspection, is any remedial work outstanding and when is the next inspection scheduled?

Reply:

There are two Palace Groves in the borough, one in Anerley and one in Bromley. As the following question from the same person relates to roads in Bromley, I will respond in regard to the Palace Grove in Bromley. The last scheduled walked inspection of Place Grove Bromley was carried out 16/07/21. There is 1 outstanding job with the contractor in Palace Grove, for a 1m2 patch of the footway though, not the carriageway. The next scheduled walked inspection of Place Grove Bromley will be carried out around 16/07/2022.

19) Question from Sam Webber:

In light of the 35 day road highway maintenance tasks falling behind schedule, have Coniston Road, Yewdale Close or Ullswater Close been affected by this problem as

the quality of road surface is poor, which causes problems for all pedestrians but especially those with mobility issues, as well as causing problems for road users. When was the last inspection, is any remedial work outstanding and when is the next inspection scheduled?

Reply:

The last scheduled annual walked inspection of Coniston Road was carried out 20/04/21. There are 2 outstanding jobs with the contractor in Coniston Road raised at separate later ad-hoc inspections, both in the footway, both of which are still within ordered timescales, so not overdue. The next scheduled walked inspection of Place Grove Bromley will be carried out around 20/04/22.

The last scheduled annual walked inspection of Yewdale Close was carried out 08/01/21. There are no outstanding jobs with the contractor in Yewdale Close. The next scheduled walked inspection of Yewdale Close will be carried out around 08/01/22.

The last scheduled annual walked inspection of Ullswater Close was carried out 08/01/21. There are no outstanding jobs with the contractor in Ullswater Close. The next scheduled walked inspection of Ullswater Close will be carried out around 08/01/22.

20) Question from Dave Marshall:

The report to the committee has many references to staff shortages to explain underspends and missed targets. How many staff vacancies are there currently in Bromley, where are they being advertised and what is the expected timescale for filling these positions?

NOTE: To Portfolio Holder and Chairman what section of the agenda this is in relation to.

This is in reference to:

On page 95 & 96 of the agenda document:

Paragraphs 7,8, 9 and 14 have reference staff vacancies

Likewise page 106-108:

Paragraphs 4, 5 and 10 have reference staff vacancies

On page 164 of the agenda document in the table:

"Performance has been affected by poor weather conditions and the delayed recruitment of a new Contracts Manager".

Reply:

In the Environment Division there are two vacancies. The first is the Street Enforcement Manager, the job advertisement has finished and the expected start date for the candidate is 20th September. The second vacancy is the Street

Enforcement Officer role and this has been advertised on the Council website and local media. The expected start date is provisionally Oct 2021.

The Traffic and Parking Division has two vacancies which are being held vacant as the TfL funding stream has been so uncertain since May 2020.

21) Question from Alison Arratoon:

A major concern on Hawksbrook Lane is the parking along the lane which exacerbates congestion during school run times. This was discussed at length during the recent site visit but isn't mentioned in the project outline. Can you confirm it is within the scope of the proposed review?

Reply:

Parking can cause congestion but can also help avoid speed issues. With regard to Hawksbrook Lane, yes, this will be reviewed along with other congestion related matters on the road.

22) Question from Ms Eileen Welsh:

The report states that funding is available for the proposed improvement works from TfL for the Local Implementation Plan but that this funding might not be guaranteed after December 2021. Given that staff and funds are available now for these improvements and that the lives of children and vulnerable residents are at risk and have been for a long time in this area, why doesn't the council fast track this feasibility study and install the much-needed crossings and speed calming measures as soon as possible.

Reply:

The current funding from TfL for Local Implementation Plan measures is very limited even before December 2021. As a result we particularly need to prioritise the locations in the borough for interventions based on need.

There is currently no conclusion on a new pedestrian crossing or speed calming measures in the area, these issues are to be reviewed as part of the needs assessment and feasibility study.

The costs of introducing the new measures are yet to be estimated as the traffic team still have to carry out feasibility studies and detailed designs before the scheme's costs are finalised.

It is difficult to determine the LIP allocation for this area right now as the team is yet to conclude the exact proposals needed here and their cost and relative priority ranking.

22) Question from Julie Ireland:

In a written response to a public question on 12th July the portfolio holder promised traffic flow measures at the junction between Waldo Road and Homesdale Road would be reviewed with a traffic engineer. Please advise when it is expected this review will take place as traffic queuing to enter the recycling centre continues to create traffic chaos.

Reply:

The traffic engineer site visit to review traffic flow measures at the junction between Waldo Road and Homesdale Road will take place in September 2021.

The number of cars visiting the Waldo Road site between April and July 2021 was 42% lower than the number of cars visiting the Waldo Road site during the same period in 2019. 2020 has been excluded because the site was closed in April and part of May that year.

1) 23) Question from Julie Ireland:

The smell from Waldo Road recycling centre has been particularly noticeable to residents in the last few months. What measures are being taken to reduce the smell, do the council have any monitoring of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and how many complaints from residents have been logged this year?

Reply:

The smell from Waldo Road recycling centre has been particularly noticeable to residents in the last few months. What measures are being taken to reduce the smell, do the council have any monitoring of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and how many complaints from residents have been logged this year?

Environment and Community Services PDS Committee:

1st September 2021

Written Questions from Councillors:

1) Question from Cllr Ian Dunn:

When will the bridge in Kelsey Park which has been closed for some time be repaired.

Reply:

This reinstatement of this bridge has been an active topic between the members for Kelsey Park Cllrs Diane Smith, Harris, Dean, plus the Chairman of the Friends of the Park and I as Portfolio Holder. Referring to your earlier question on the Environmental Initiatives reserve, Ward Members have made a request for the bridge reinstatement to be supported by this reserve.

The bridge was closed as structural elements of the bridge had been found to be corroded and worn.

No date has been determined for re-opening as officers are determining the most economically viable solution for the future use and repair of the bridge.

2) Question from Cllr Ian Dunn:

Please provide the number of expressions of interest in electric vehicle charging points in the past 12 months broken down by either Ward or Postal Sector (e.g. BR3/4)

Reply:

There have been 32 formal requests for EV charging points in the past 12 months as of the end of July 2021.

9 in BR1, 6 in BR3, 4 in SE20 and BR5, 3 in SE19 and BR6, 2 in BR7 and 1 in SE9.

Officers recognise that the rate of request is increasing markedly.

This page is left intentionally blank

Environment and Community Services PDS Committee

September 1st 2021

PUBLIC QUESTIONS FOR ORAL RESPONSE

1) Question from Alisa Igoe:

Aside from TfL's installed electric vehicle charging points at a few Bromley garages, the Council website notes a total of 36 electric vehicle charging points in the borough, at car parks/on-street locations. This is currently reduced to 30, as 4 are currently closed and 2 for taxis only. Full EVs have zero exhaust emissions. Will you be urgently installing more?"

Reply:

The Council has facilitated the installation of number of EV charge points across the borough over recent years, some on street and some in Council car parks. More recently we have seen charge point introduced by garages and Supermarkets. They have been largely located at destinations so people can charge their car away from home whilst shopping or visiting local establishments. We have seen their usage increase but they are far from fully used. We have been using that experience to ensure that we had an appropriate charging scheme in place plus we didn't install equipment that would become obsolescent and fall to the Council to remove before their costs had been paid covered. We have found that the technology behind the original charge points has been superseded with the electrical charge rates now too slow for customers.

With that experience gained, the Council is currently in the process of finalising its plans for a comprehensive strategy that will inform the long terms plans for installing electric vehicle charging points, this includes the application for Government funding that is essential to the Council's plans.

As part of working through what is a complex issue we are in advanced discussions with electric vehicle charge point providers with the intention of expanding the current network.

Residents are able to make a formal request for an EV charging point via the council website. Priority will be given to those without off street parking facilities. We have only seen a very small number of requests with most occurring recently.

Any technical faults with charge points should be directed to the supplier in the first instance.

Supplementary Question from Alisa Igoe:

TfL have recently opened a new rapid charging electrical hub in Woolwich which is the second of its kind across the capital. Would you collaborate with TfL to install a rapid charging hub?

Reply:

Two years ago, the Council offered 25 locations to TfL for rapid charging points. One had already been installed on the A222 in Coney Hall. I am not sure if they installed one in West Wickham or did so subsequently. TfL were particularly keen to support the relevant charging points for black cabs. We were in discussion with TfL concerning possible locations—some of the locations were not used because the black cabs did not want the charging points located in the taxi ranks. We were disappointed that TfL did not progress with more of the locations that we offered to them.

Supplementary Question in response from Cllr Simon Fawthrop:

Was the Portfolio Holder aware that many Apps were available that could provide the location of charging points? Will the Portfolio Holder bring forward a paper on this as I feel it is a very important issue and I feel that we should address this in more detail.

Response from the Portfolio Holder:

As you should have noted in my previous answer, we are intending to bring a paper on this to the November PDS. Sometimes Apps are specific to a particular charging technology so it's not necessarily straightforward, but hopefully over time there will be more commonality between Apps and charging technologies.

2) Question from Alisa Igoe:

The Open Space Strategy Consultation operated from 12 November to 7 January 2021. At the 14 January meeting a Member asked if the results would be available at the 11 March meeting. You advised it would come to the 9 June meeting. 9 June he asked why the results had been moved to the 1 September meeting. Today's Work Programme shows it listed for the 17 November meeting. Will it definitely appear in November and why is it taking so long to publish the results?

Reply:

The consultation elicited considered and well-intentioned responses, which showed great diversity both of a positive and negative nature. As part of the revision process of the strategy, officers sought to ensure that both the views of the consultation respondents and the impact of the pandemic had been fully considered and understood when redrafting the strategy, especially where there have been negative perceptions of certain aspects. The Council's intention was to ensure that the revision process delivered a high-quality and ambitious strategy that reflects the priorities, needs and aspirations of all sectors of the community. Given the feedback it is important we get this strategy right rather than meet a particular timescale.

Having said that, following a process of stakeholder engagement regarding the content of the redraft, it is intended that the strategy will be reported to the November PDS Committee.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Ian Dunn:

Given that the Strategy has had 800 potential changes to it, will the Strategy be coming back to the Committee for approval or for final revisions?

Reply:

Its coming back to the PDS Committee, the PDS Committee can make whatever recommendations they feel appropriate.

3) Question from Tony McPartlan:

I note from the Council's net zero carbon action plan, that 'Council fleet' does not include vehicles used by Council contractors. Is this not in effect 'cheating' our way a little to claiming that we will be net zero when vehicles providing Council services are predominantly contractor owned?

Reply:

The Council's net zero target applies to all those emissions that it directly controls, namely all scope 1 and 2 emissions, plus some scope 3 emissions from business travel, water and paper usage, electricity (transmission and distribution) and office waste.

However, we recognise that emissions from our procured services are significant, even though they fall under the direct control and responsibility of our suppliers. Hence why we not only strive to select contractors with good environmental credentials but also work closely with our suppliers of major contracts (e.g. our waste contractors) to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions arising from the services delivered to Bromley. The Environmental Services contractors have all been challenged when they have appeared before this PDS committee on their net zero targets, their target net zero dates typically are similar or ahead of the Council's.

With regard to Environmental Services contractors' vehicles, their current replacement dates are all consistent with a programmed replacement prior to the Council's 2029 date, and we are expecting that viable Zero Emission Vehicles will be available at that time. The demands placed on waste services vehicles are some of the most challenging and few options are currently available and we require them to be reliable.

Supplementary Question:

Is there any scope to add fleet electrification as a pre-requisite to new contracts?

Reply:

The answer is quite clearly 'Yes'. Whenever a 'Gateway Zero' contract comes to a PDS Committee for approval there is the ability for Members (if it's not already in there) to add this as a condition of the contract at that point.

4) Question from Tony McPartlan

According to the 2020/21 Outrun, £326,000 of Government Covid-19 grants were allocated to cover portfolio staffing costs. Have these Covid grants, designed to help local residents and businesses, been used to simply balance the portfolios books.

Reply:

Staff working on the Shielding, Volunteering and Assistance line worked to set up a food distribution hub, recruited 4600 volunteers and operated an incoming assistance line. All staff on this programme were diverted from their Business as Usual roles with no external paid staff involved. The grants for this programme were spent on food, equipment and enhanced DBS checks for volunteers, but because of the sound management of this programme, running costs were minimal. In addition, community funding was received from other sources – for example a generous donation from Direct Line – which was distributed to the Voluntary and Community Sector. A significant portion of the Council's grant was also provided to the voluntary sector food organisations to directly help residents. Any remaining grant was used to contribute towards some revenue staffing costs for the seconded employees.

It is important to state that through this programme, there were no residents that approached the Council that went without support where needed. Customer satisfaction was high and thousands of people were helped through direct pro-active contact from the Council and shopping and befriending volunteers.

On the Contact Tracing programme, many Council staff worked long hours and weekends to support vulnerable patients. Some paid-for external support was used to help on that programme to ensure that the relevant clinical expertise was available and this was funded through the Contain Outbreak Management Fund.

Supplementary Question:

Some businesses are no longer here because of the pandemic. Does this not seem a shame to you when potentially there was grant funding there to help them?

Reply:

I'm not quite sure what you are implying in your question. There were many grant schemes that the Council managed effectively. The Council did its best to ensure that those businesses that were eligible for grant funding received the relevant financial support. There were some limitations set down by the grant providing organisations which stipulated how the grants could be disseminated to businesses; this was directly or indirectly linked to central government guidelines. This matter really is a matter for the Resources Portfolio from where you can likely get more detail on these issues. The Council has distributed a large number of grants for significant sums of money and has supported many businesses to get through this difficult time.

Environment and Community Services PDS Committee

1st September 2021

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS FOR ORAL RESPONSE

1) Question from Cllr Ian Dunn

Can the Portfolio Holder explain the work the Council is doing to facilitate the installation of on street electric vehicle charging in the parts of the borough without off street parking, and provide details of the expected timescale.

Reply:

Can I refer you first to my answer to Mr McPartlan. The Council is currently in the process of finalising its plans for a comprehensive strategy that will inform the long term plans for installing electric vehicle charging points, this includes the application for Government funding that is essential to the Council's plans.

A strategy document is expected to be discussed at the next PDS meeting, with the initial funding application bid to potentially have been made shortly before.

Plans are being made with suppliers and Procurement in anticipation of successful progress in terms of the strategy and funding.

2) Question from Cllr Ian Dunn

The Table of Earmarked Reserves in the Provisional Final Accounts which came to Full Council in July, showed an Earmarked Reserve entitled "Environmental Initiatives". Its balance at 31st March 2020 was £500k, with £47k spent during financial year 2020/21. What was this £47k spent on? What will the balance of £453k be spent on over what time period?

Reply:

The £47k spend to date was to support the Councils Anti Idling Campaign as set out in the report to this committee on the 28th August 2019

I as Portfolio Holder approve expenditure against this budget heading as and when schemes arise. The funding rolls over year on year. There have been a number of requests this year one of which is on the agenda tonight.

3) Question from Cllr Simon Fawthrop:

What signage is available for schools and other bodies wishing to discourage cars idling in their vicinity?

Reply:

We currently have an A5 informational leaflet, 2 different poster designs and large banners available to schools regarding our Anti-Idling campaign. We are currently in the process of having our poster designs made into signage that can be attached to lamp columns. The provision of signs will have to be consistent with the Council's budget and street clutter policies.

The anti-idling programme is focussed on schools and is progressing through schools in priority order with approximately 25% of primary schools either current or past participants.

4) Question from Cllr Simon Fawthrop

What alternatives are available for hard of hearing and deaf people to the mobile pay and display service?

Reply:

There are multiple ways to pay for your parking session that will assist any customer who may be hard of hearing or deaf:

- Download and pay using Ringo Application.
- Text Ringo directly with the location code and the length of the parking session.
- Or pay using the pay and display machine (when available)

5) Question from Councillor Kieran Terry:

What progress has been made in delivering publicly available electric vehicle charging facilities in Chislehurst?

Reply:

Can I first refer you to my answers given to Mr McPartlan and Cllr Dunn. The Council did propose locations in the Chislehurst area for the TfL rapid charger programme, but ultimately TfL only took forward a limited number of the locations we proposed.

The Council is currently in the process of finalising its plans for a comprehensive strategy that will inform the long term plans for installing electric vehicle charging points, this includes the application for Government funding that is essential to the Council's plans.

A strategy document is expected to be discussed at the next PDS meeting, with the initial funding application bid to potentially have been made shortly before.

Preliminary drawings have been produced that envisage charge points being installed in Chislehurst car parks, these drawings although at the planning stage, propose 4 charge points in the Hornbrook House car park and 8 in the High Street car park adjacent to Red Hill Primary School.

Plans are being made with suppliers and Procurement in anticipation of successful progress in terms of the strategy and funding.

This is relevant to Chislehurst as much as anywhere else. Any formal requests made via the Council website will be considered with the emphasis on providing for residents without off street parking available.