

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 21 March 2022

### **Present:**

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

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Michael Tickner and Councillor Stephen Wells

#### **158 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Marlow.

#### **159 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **160 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19th JANUARY 2022**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 19th of January 2022 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

#### **161 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO THE CHAIRMAN**

There was one written question received from a member of the public to the Chairman. The response to this written question was disseminated to Members and to the questioner shortly after the meeting.

The responses to the written questions are appended to the minutes.

#### **162 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

On the night, four oral questions from members of the public were heard and responded to by the Portfolio Holder. Sixty written questions had been received and the answers to these questions would be disseminated to Members and the public shortly after the meeting.

The responses to the written and oral questions to the Portfolio Holder are appended to the minutes.

**163 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM COUNCILLORS**

One oral question and been received from Cllr Kieran Terry.

The response to the oral question from Cllr Terry is appended to the minutes.

**164 MATTERS ARISING AND WORK PROGRAMME**

**CSD21141**

A Member enquired when the item relating to Goddington Park would be presented to the Committee. The Director for Environment and Public Protection stated that it was not clear which committee this report would go back to. He would have a discussion with the Strategic Property Team first to clarify this.

A Member raised the issue of moving traffic contraventions and asked if it was the case that the cameras were now recording an increased number of people who were committing offences. The Director confirmed that this was indeed now the case, although the figures were not in line with projections. The Director clarified that the reconfiguration of the cameras had not yet been completed. The Member asked if there was better compliance and the Director responded and said he would look into this as he was not aware if this level of data existed currently.

**RESOLVED that:**

**1) The Director for Environment and Public Protection would liaise with the Strategic Property Team to find out when the Goddington Park report would be presented and to which committee.**

**2) The Director for Environment and Public Protection would investigate the level of compliance with respect to moving traffic contraventions.**

**165 CHAIRMAN'S ANNUAL REPORT**

A Member referred to the South Eden Park Road Safety Scheme and said that in line with policy, a signalised crossing was required there. He also made reference to the 'PV2' figure noted in the report and asked what this meant in comparison with other crossing locations.

It was explained that the PV2 reference meant that if a crossing was going to be installed at this location, then a signalised traffic light crossing would be best. It was noted however, that these type of crossings were expensive to

install and to maintain and so priority would be applied to casualty locations. South Eden Park Road was not classed as a priority casualty location.

Members expressed their thanks to the Chairman (Cllr William Harmer) for his Chairmanship and strong leadership.

**RESOLVED that the Chairman's Annual Report be noted.**

## **166 ECS PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW**

A Member expressed the view that the Council's targets in terms of waste disposal and collection were quite stretching, which meant that the Council didn't always meet those targets; and he wondered what could be done to change this. The Head of Performance Management & Business Support, informed the Committee that in terms of waste arising/collection--the tonnes were decreasing to pre COVID levels over the last Quarter, however the performance thresholds would remain the same next year in line with the Portfolio Plan.

A Member wondered if the Committee could help in terms of any policy decisions concerning potential new ways of working (which may enable the Council to get back on track in terms of hitting its waste targets). A Member highlighted an experience that he recently had when he was driving around trying to dispose of cardboard. He experienced problems doing this, as multiple paper recycling bins were full. He suggested that an electronic chip be placed in the large recycling containers, which could then send a signal when they were full.

The Head of Neighbourhood Management responded and said that the Council did have comprehensive collection schedules, but this sort of thing could be looked into and he asked the Member that had experienced the recycling issues to email him the details so that he could investigate further. He explained that the matter of using electronic chips had been trialed in 2005/2006 for street litter bins, but there had been problems with the technology. It was also the case that the possibility of using electronic chips was not part of the current Veolia contract. He pointed out that the Council could make a charge for large cardboard collections under the provisions of the Controlled Waste Regulations.

A Member suggested that a prize could be awarded to any young person that could come up with a plan to improve the waste collection service at the Council's recycling banks and that this would be good for community engagement.

A Member commented that members of the public should be reminded to break up their cardboard for ease of collection and this could be highlighted in the Council's magazine 'Environment Matters'.

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

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

**a PLANNED HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE**

**ES20169**

The Assistant Director for Highways gave a brief introduction to the report and stated that in 2016 there had been a capital investment programme. The revenue budget had then been frozen for five years, but it was now coming back online from April 2022. It was therefore now the case that £2.5m was available for highways maintenance work which would be split between roads and pavements. Detailed surveys had been undertaken to prioritise where this work should take place and more data concerning this could be provided to Members if required. The report before the Committee requested the authorization to initially use £1.7m/£1.8m of the budget for the initial programme of works which had been subject to member consultation.

A Member noted that 17% of the highways currently required maintenance and a discussion took place as to whether or not the highways network was deteriorating, improving, or staying the same. The Assistant Director for Highways stated that ideally he would prefer the 17% figure to reduce to somewhere in the region of 10% which would provide a safer network, but more funding would be required to achieve this. It was probably the case that the overall condition of the carriageway had remained about the same.

A Member asked if footways were always replaced in a like for like manner. The Assistant Director responded that it was always the Council's policy to do this and if Members were aware of any instances where this was not the case, please could they let him know so that he could investigate further. In such cases there could be an issue with root damage or utilities works.

A discussion took place as to whether or not the maintenance works would be reactive or planned and the Assistant Director said that there was a careful combination mix of planned and reactive works, but it was better if as much work as possible could be planned maintenance.

A Member asked if she could be provided with a detailed map which explained (with respect to her ward) which roads and sections of roads would be the responsibility of Bromley Council and which would be the responsibility of other councils. The Assistant Director for highways confirmed that this data could be provided.

It was confirmed that in terms of road maintenance, Bromley was now using warm asphalt in all cases and indeed Bromley was the first London borough to adopt this practise wholesale.

**RESOLVED that:**

**1) The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services agreed that the schemes listed in Appendix 'A' and Appendix 'B' be included in a programme of planned highway maintenance for 2022/23, to be undertaken by the Council's existing highway term maintenance contractor.**

**2) The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services agreed that the decision to include additional schemes in the Planned Highway Maintenance Programme be delegated to the Director of Environment & Public Protection, based on the results of further condition assessments.**

**b CAPITAL MONITORING REPORT-QUARTER THREE**

**FSD22029**

Members noted the Capital Monitoring report and that the details outlined in the report had previously been agreed by the Executive.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder notes and acknowledges the current position in respect of Capital Schemes, as agreed by the Executive on 9<sup>th</sup> February 2022.**

**c BUDGET MONITORING 2021/22**

**FSD2 2025**

A Member asked what the reason was for the underspend with respect to Street Environment. The Director for Environment and Public Protection said that he would investigate and find out. It was still the case that the Council was removing graffiti.

**RESOLVED that the Environment & Community Services Portfolio Holder endorses the latest revenue budget monitoring for the Environment and Community Services Portfolio.**

**d ALBEMARLE ROAD WESTGATE ROAD JUNCTION  
RECONFIGURATION**

**ES20170**

It was noted that this report was being provided as it had been promised at the previous ECS PDS meeting that a follow up report would be provided to assess suitable options for the junction reconfiguration at Albemarle Road and Westgate Road. It had been agreed that one of the options that would be considered would be the installation of a new mini roundabout. Officers had considered the various options and had recommended that 'Option 1' be

*21 March 2022*

implemented, which was the installation of a 'Priority Junction'. This would mean that priority would be given to Albemarle Road, while the traffic from Westgate Road would have to give way.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking explained some of the reasons for the officers' recommendation, saying that the installation of the mini-roundabout could cause problems—it was quite likely that traffic from Albemarle Road approaching the mini-roundabout would not slow down and give way as it should—because of the historical layout. Also, with the limited space available, it was difficult to give adequate visibility to traffic approaching the mini roundabout, especially out of Westgate Road Bridge; this could lead to an increase in accidents. It had also been noted by officers that many pedestrians had been using this point to go along Westgate Road or to proceed to Beckenham, (along Albemarle Road) and also this was on a cycle route. The Assistant Director explained that mini roundabouts were not good for cyclists or pedestrians. He expressed the view that the 'priority give way' junction would be better for cyclists and pedestrians at this location.

The Assistant Director said that officers had previously recommended the installation of a mini roundabout at the junction of Scott's Lane and Bromley Road—but in this case there was more space to do so and also there was an ongoing accident and injury situation that needed to be resolved.

Attending the meeting were Ward Councillors Stephen Wells and Michael Tickner who supported 'Option 2', which was for the installation of a mini-roundabout.

Councillor Tickner explained that Albemarle Rd was a long straight road which drivers often used to avoid the A222. The road had been made one way when cycle lanes had been implemented and now it had been proposed to remove the cycle lanes and for two way traffic to be reintroduced. He stated that local residents were concerned about the speed of traffic along Albemarle Rd. He expressed the view that if the road was reinstated as it was, then traffic would continue to speed along the whole length of the road. In his view, the installation of a mini roundabout would be a good opportunity to slow down the speed and pace of traffic along the road.

Councillor Tickner said that local residents had seen much money spent on the installation of cycle lanes and now they would see additional money being spent on the removal of the cycle lanes. He felt it would be good for local residents to see something concrete that was an improvement to the junction. He felt that just to put things back as they were, would make the Council seem foolish. He felt that the installation of the mini-roundabout was a good opportunity to implement a change at the junction for the better.

Councillor Tickner noted that the money required for the improvement would come from TfL. He noted that the cost for the mini roundabout would be 20% more, but felt that this cost would be justified as it would provide a positive and visible improvement at the junction. Councillor Tickner therefore moved

that the recommendation of the report be amended and that 'Option 2' be recommended instead of 'Option 1'. Option 2 was for the implementation of the mini-roundabout.

Councillor Wells agreed that an improvement to the junction was required and felt that in terms of 'arms' on roundabouts, the one in question on the night was more 3.5 arms than 4. The costings were about 20% of the overall project cost—this was a worthwhile exercise and should be progressed, he seconded Councillor Tickner's proposal that the officers' recommendation be overturned and a mini roundabout be installed. This would be a safe and progressive approach in his view.

A Member asked what the public wanted. Had the public asked for a roundabout at this junction? The Assistant Director responded and said that it was not clear what the public wanted. Councillor Wells said that previously, residents had indicated that they wanted to see an improvement to the junction and in particular, an improvement in safety at the junction. Later, conversations seemed to indicate that they were positive about mini roundabouts in general and were positive about a mini roundabout being installed at this location.

The Chairman asked Councillor Wells for greater clarification as to what the public actually wanted—did they want a safer junction or slower speeds---Cllr Wells responded that they would like to see both.

A Member commented that this was a difficult matter as he appreciated the local knowledge of the ward councillors, but at the same time respected the expertise of the officers in the Traffic Team. He said that in his ward the mini roundabouts that tended to cause problems were the 4 way mini roundabouts. Because of this he was concerned that the introduction of the 4 way mini roundabout may have a detrimental impact on safety. He asked if sufficient TFL funding was available to cover the extra 20% funding. The answer to this was affirmative. He also enquired as to the effectiveness of a nearby traffic enforcement camera.

The Assistant Director assured that the mini roundabout could probably be achieved within budget and that this would also include funding for an additional pedestrian refuge which would be required. He said that officers were not saying that a mini roundabout could not be put in, rather it was the case that a mini roundabout would normally be suggested when there was an issue to resolve in terms of casualties which was not currently the case. If a mini roundabout was implemented, then probably the Council would seek to install two pedestrian refuges on two arms of the roundabout to assist pedestrians. A discussion took place as to whether or not a raised dome would be used, but there was no decision taken regarding this at the meeting. There was a possibility that an anti-skid surface could be used but this would need costing.

*21 March 2022*

A Member asked if the speed camera on Albemarle Road was operational. The Assistant Director responded that the information that he had received from TfL was that the camera was faulty. It was not known when TfL was going to undertake the repair to the camera. Cllr Wells stated that this camera had been waiting repair for three years.

**RESOLVED that:**

**1) Option 2 be implemented which was the installation of the mini-roundabout at the junction, with an additional pedestrian refuge introduced on the south side of the Albemarle Road junction.**

**2) The pedestrian refuge on Westgate Road would be re-instated and the footway would be extended on Westgate Road (North).**

**168 PRE DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS GOING TO THE EXECUTIVE FOR DECISION**

**a CROYDON ROAD RECREATION GROUND BANDSTAND RESTORATION**

**ES20165**

The report was presented to the Committee to outline the restoration proposals for the Bowie Bandstand within Croydon Road Recreation Ground, Beckenham, and to recommend that the scheme be added to the Council's Capital Programme to enable works to proceed.

The Council had been working with architects regarding the restoration of the bandstand to restore the facility for community use and to have regard to the bandstand's heritage. It was anticipated that the project would be completed in April 2023. The Chairman said that this was a good news story.

The report had been submitted to the ECS PDS Committee for pre-decision scrutiny before being presented to the Executive for a final decision on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

**RESOLVED that:**

**1) The ECS PDS Committee approved the proposals for the Bandstand at a cost of £236k including a contingency budget of £27k, and that the Committee approve the request to the Executive to add the project to the Capital Programme.**

**2) The Committee note that a five year maintenance plan had identified a liability of £18k which included redecoration works to uphold the restored condition of the bandstand, this would be funded as set out in paragraph 3.13 of the report.**

**3) Subject to agreement from the Executive, the Director of Environment and Public Protection be given delegated authority to award contracts for the Bandstand Restoration following the tendering process.**

**4) Subject to Executive agreement as to recommendation 2.1.1, the Assistant Director of Carbon Management and Greenspace be given delegated authority to approve spend from the contingency fund.**

**169 POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS**

**170 LBB RESIDENTIAL EV CHARGING PILOT**

**ES20166**

The report outlined plans for the EV Charging Pilot which would last for one year and which would include 45 charging points and 14 gullies installed across 12 wards. During this period, several different charging solutions would be tested. The results of the pilot would assist in determining how the roll out of electric vehicle charging points would take place going forward. A discussion took place concerning the selection criteria for the pilot scheme. A Member asked if the Chislehurst Ward could be included in the pilot going forward and the Carbon Programme Manager said he would investigate if this was possible.

A discussion took place as to why (as detailed in Fig 1 of the report) in some cases the 'secondary utilisation' was greater than the number of chargepoints and if the Council would be affected by staffing constraints. Members noted that two of the options under consideration would be part supplier funded (25%) and part funded by ORCS (On Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme—75%). Other operators would be 100% supplier funded; it had not been determined yet which option would be pursued. The Committee discussed how the installation of gullies and charging points could affect access to scarce parking spaces.

The Chairman asked how many off street charging points existed in the borough—he was informed that this data had been requested prior to the meeting but had not been made available yet.

Members discussed legal matters relating to the user agreement and what the consequences would be for noncompliance. It was noted that interested parties would be asked to sign and comply with a user agreement, but this would be an informal agreement in the sense that it would not be legally binding.

The Chairman enquired about time scales moving forward. Members were informed that the installation of the pilot electric charging points was anticipated to commence in Autumn 2022. Results would then be analysed from winter 2023 onwards and it was intended that a follow up report on the

*21 March 2022*

results of the pilot would come back to the Committee in the Spring of 2024. The Chairman commented that this was quite a long time to wait and it may be the case in the future that LBB should move forward (even without the full data) with the project if the demand from the public was high. This could help residents with the cost of living if fuel costs were high. Of course, before moving forward the matter would be brought back to Committee first for scrutiny.

A Member highlighted that there could be cases where members of the public applied for the installation of an EV charging point simply to get a designated parking bay and he wondered if they should be charged for that parking bay. The Committee was briefed that the EV charging points would not be individual bays and this would be made clear on the user agreement.

A Member and the Chairman expressed the view that the installation and de-commissioning costs were high. The issue of security was raised in that there could be attempts to steal cabling. In this regard the customer would need to bear the risk.

**RESOLVED that:**

- 1) The Residential EV Charging Pilot Scheme should proceed.**
- 2) The Portfolio Holder would delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Legal Services to sign all ancillary documentation required for the progression of the pilot scheme.**

**171 ECS DRAFT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2022/23**

**ES20163**

The Committee noted that the air quality figures for 2020 were impressive. The question was raised as to whether or not this improvement was because of the Covid pandemic. The Director for Environment and Public Protection commented that the reduction in emissions was probably at least in part related to the COVID pandemic in that during this period pollution levels had decreased primarily because of the reduced volume of traffic. The Portfolio Holder commented that although this was probably the case, it was equally true that there had been a long term trend showing an improvement in Bromley's Air Quality.

Members noted that Asthma UK had commented that Bromley had the best air quality of all London boroughs.

A discussion took place concerning the number and positioning of air quality monitors within the borough and the Portfolio Holder stated that the air quality modelling that was currently taking place within the borough was good at predicting air quality across the whole of the borough; resultingly the Council did not need to invest in extra monitoring points.

The Director stated that an Air Quality Action Plan update report had been factored into the work programme and it was a possibility that this would come back to the Committee in September 2022.

The Chairman raised the matter of litter picking. Many residents were keen to do this to clean up their streets but were put off by the fact that in order to obtain purple sacks from the Council they needed to go through a registration process first. The Chairman expressed the view that this seemed to be an added level of bureaucracy which deterred members of the public and he asked for the registration process to be removed and this was agreed by the Committee.

**RESOLVED that the Draft ECS Portfolio Plan be noted and that the registration process for purple sacks be ended.**

## **172        FIXMYSTREET PRO REPORTING SYSTEM REVIEW**

### **ES20168**

The introduction to the report was provided by the Technical Support and Market Manager. He informed the Committee that Bromley Council had been a key development partner with 'Society Works' in developing and implementing the online waste services and self-service green garden waste portal used within FixMyStreet. Bromley had been shortlisted as a finalist at the 2022 Local Government Chronicle awards for the public sector/private partnership category with its service provider 'Society Works' in terms of customer experience with respect to waste services..

The Chairman expressed the view that this was a good service overall, had been a huge success and was basically invaluable.

The Technical Support and Market Manager said that going forward it may be possible to extend the scope and functionality of FMS (Fix My Street) to integrate with other core services such as waste services, litter bins and recycling bins. A Member requested that the service be extended if possible to include issues in car parks.

A discussion took place concerning the matters highlighted in section 3.26 of the report where the Council was seeking to enhance the FixMyStreet software so that it could also deal with cross boundary matters and issues that were the responsibility of Housing Associations. There could also be a link to the Environment Agency.

The Chairman said that it would be good if one of the 'invisible layers' that was factored into the software going forward was information relating to individual ward boundaries so that Members could be better informed as to issues occurring in their specific wards across the board. He offered to provide the mapping files for ward boundaries to support this. The Technical

*21 March 2022*

Support and Market Manager responded by saying that this type of functionality existed already and that it would be good to provide training on this functionality to all Councillors post-election.

**RESOLVED that**

- 1) The report, the direction of travel and the FMS Roadmap be noted.**
- 2) A FMS update be brought back to the Committee in March 2023**

**173 FLY TIPPING ACTION PLAN UPDATE**

**ES20156**

The Committee heard that the cost to the Council of removing fly tips had been agreed at the contract tender stage and so the price was fixed regardless of the number of fly tip removals undertaken. It was the intention of the Envirocrime Section to use data and intelligence to focus activities in fly-tipping hotspots. This was detailed in the Fly-Tipping Action Plan. Historically, departmental underspends had been used to fund fly-tipping projects and initiatives and any further projects would be funded from the allocated earmarked reserves. Officers were analysing data from 2016 to look at trends that would help with investigations.

The Head of Neighbourhood Management stated that the Council was good at clearing fly-tips but had not been so good at investigating. With the appointment of a new (and very experienced) Street Enforcement Manager, this was expected to improve. In LBB, the main type of fly-tipping were fly tips on the highway, 'household other' and small van loads. The Assistant Director of Environment advised the difficulty with proceeding to prosecution was due to insufficient evidence and in some cases a lack of information from witnesses. Reference was made to the 'Your Waste is your Responsibility' campaign that had been organised recently by Veolia in conjunction with an officer working group which had following monitoring been successful in reducing fly tipping incidents; there were plans to build on this going forward.

The Chairman expressed concern regarding the growth in 'man and van' services for waste collection. He was concerned that many of these were unregistered to save on costs. The Head of Neighbourhood Management stated that he wanted to see an increase in the number of waste carrier stops (working in conjunction with the police and LBB Public Protection). There was a need to seek out offenders and create a 'rim of steel' around Bromley. The Chairman suggested the occasional use of tracking devices.

A Member raised the issue of businesses using recycling banks for the disposal of business waste. The Head of Neighbourhood Management responded and said that a 'Section 34' officer would be appointed to visit

businesses and enforce compliance with the proper disposal of commercial waste.

A Member referenced Item 5 on the appendix to the report. This was in respect to the installation of high security drop bollards at the end of Star Lane. He asked when this would be achieved. The Head of Neighbourhood Management responded that the installation should be actioned in the next few months—implementation had been complicated by the fact that there was a Cellnex mobile phone mast in the middle of Star Lane and access was required to this for maintenance purposes.

A Member asked if details of the top 10 sites for fly tipping in Member's Ward areas could be circulated to Members. The Assistant Director of Environment advised this would be made available by the Technical Support and Market Manager using intelligence from FixMyStreet.

**RESOLVED that the Fly-Tipping Action Plan Update be noted.**

**174 ECS CONTRACTS REGISTER**

**ES20159**

Members noted the updates on the report regarding the Videalert and Confirm contracts. Members noted that the Fix My Street contract had been extended.

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

**175 ECS RISK REGISTER**

**ES20161**

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

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

**177 CONTRACTS REGISTER-PART 2**

The Committee noted the Part 2 (confidential) update with respect to the Contracts Register.

**RESOLVED that the Part 2 Contracts Register update be noted.**

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

ECS PDS—21<sup>st</sup> March 2022.

## Oral Questions from the Public

### 1) Question from Alisa Igoe:

On 14 February residents on New Street Hill, BR1 and all side roads were unable to access/leave their streets by vehicle or on foot due to the railway bridge which crosses the road being damaged by a high vehicle. Network Rail quickly temporarily repaired it. Will the access road be closed at any time in the future to enable Network Rail to undertake permanent repairs?

### Response to Question 1:

We understand that Network Rail are planning to close New Street Hill on the 8<sup>th</sup> June to carry out a full bridge inspection, between 10pm-6am. Network Rail will then be able to identify whether any permanent repairs are necessary, with our Network Management team co-ordinating any future road closures.

### Supplementary Question from Alisa Igoe:

None

### 2) Question from Alisa Igoe:

Reference: Development Control Committee 9 March - Item 7 - 21/03622/FULL1

4.2 Transport for London.

Improvements to the existing pedestrian crossing refuge islands on Burnt Ash Lane should be secured through S278 agreement and consideration should be given to the provision of zebra or light controlled crossings.

The developer has agreed to widen the refuges via a S278 agreement. The road junction with New Street Hill is very difficult for pedestrians to cross, especially due to southbound high speed vehicles. If condition of development does not cover the installation of zebra or light controlled crossings as suggested by TfL, will Bromley Council install them?

### Response to Question 2:

The works will be secured by a section 278 agreement for improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities to be undertaken within 2 years of completion of the development.

### Supplementary Question:

I was at the Development Control Committee meeting when this matter was discussed. This development is due to be completed in 2031. Do you think it is

reasonable for us to have to wait until possibly 2033 to get a pedestrian crossing installed where there are currently three refuges. Could this not be expedited?

Response to Supplementary Question:

This matter sits within the planning process and this was a condition on the planning application. The developers agreed to do that. We can engage with them to see if they would wish to do this earlier if some of the development was habitable before the final completion date.

3) Question from Jasper Bell:

Your update on the *South Eden Park Road Danger Reduction Scheme* states that there is no funding available at present for any of the interventions listed however your Executive Council Tax Report (dated 9.10) highlights reserves in the millions. Why is the Council unable to deploy some of these reserves for the improvements identified on South Eden Park Road?

Response to Question 3

The operational budget for improvements to the highway for pedestrians, cyclists and for casualty reduction comes from grants made available from TfL each year. This funding has ceased since December, as TfL and the DfT negotiate funding arrangements for TfL. I hope this is a temporary funding gap.

Regardless of funding, each highway improvement scheme must be prioritised according to need, with the priority being given to making changes at locations where there have been larger numbers of injury collisions and with a particular focus on serious injuries.

The Council takes a one Council view of its priorities and Council's level of reserves reflects the significant financial uncertainty facing the Council and the need to address the medium term budget gap, with the majority of amounts being retained for specific earmarked purposes, and to provide a more sustainable longer term financial position. Reserves also generate an income which avoids raising the funds through Council Tax, which is particularly important with the current pressures on residents. One particular pressure on the Council at the moment and looking uncertain going forward is our housing waiting list and the current ear marked reserve for this purpose may need increasing.

Supplementary Question:

If there is a situation where there is not a viable crossing, no pavement and where pedestrians are at the mercy of drivers can you make an exception please, even if it may be the case that there is no historic data showing collisions?

Response to the Supplementary Question:

There are locations (including at the roundabout on South Eden Park Rd which have been identified as accident locations; these are locations that have been identified as a possible spot for road safety interventions. So I would be hard pushed to say that

other sites would move above settings that have been identified as priority accident locations.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Simon Fawthrop:

I would like to ask a question regarding the various earmarked reserves. Is it fair to say that within those earmarked reserves is unaccounted for inflation which could be a big concern in the coming financial year.

Response to the Supplementary Question:

I can't say precisely whether or not inflation is accounted for. As you are aware, the Council looks for contractors to try and absorb inflation where possible but equally things like building costs having been moving ahead significantly faster than inflation. Inflation was the aspect that I was particularly highlighting relating to why residents would prefer not to see Council Tax go up and prefer that our reserves generate income.

6) Question from Jasper Bell:

Your update on the South Eden Park Road Danger Reduction Scheme states that funding will be sought from TFL for the interventions listed as Bromley cannot provide the funds. Is it TFL policy to fund measures of this nature, and could you confirm how pedestrian crossings installed across the borough near schools were funded across 2020 and 2021?

Response to Question 6:

Funding for crossings and other improvements around schools, some temporary, was specifically made available to London local authorities through TfL's London Streetspace Programme, to support choice of travel during the Covid pandemic. As you may be aware, Bromley took advantage of this funding to install a number of pedestrian crossings near schools, in suitable locations.

Please confirm when a comprehensive "borough wide" LBB Green Recovery Plan will be published by the Council and how they will support residents to get involved with local green jobs and halving emissions by 2030 (ideally a wide range of community groups, stakeholders and residents are consulted e.g. citizens assembly).



## ECS PDS—Written Questions from the public.

21<sup>st</sup> March 2022

### **1) Question from Clive Lees:**

Could the Chair identify the legislation (law, section, para) which controls the placement of distribution bins (e.g. for free newspapers) on the pavement.

#### Response to Question 1:

The placement of any infrastructure on the highway including bins is restricted by section 137 of the Highways Act 1980, which ensures that there is no wilful obstructions to pedestrians on footways and highways across the borough.

Further powers are contained within section 143 HA. This section provides the "Power to remove structures from the Highway", and a notice would be issued with a 1-month time frame for compliance.

Also section 149 HA "Removal of things so deposited on highways as to be a nuisance etc". This section is normally used when the placement of an item constitutes a danger and allows removal forthwith.

The Environmental Protection Act, Section 89 also places a duty on local authorities in respect of all other publicly maintainable highways in their area, to ensure that the highway or road is, so far as is practicable, kept clean. (this Act does not however have any specific requirements in relation to the placement of bins).

### **2) Question from Pauline Smith:**

The council has a 4 year tree planting plan. What are the projected figures for the amount of CO2 removal for the newly planted trees over the next 5, 10 and 20 years if they all survive. What percentage of the total emissions of the borough do these figures represent?

#### Response to Question 2:

It is very difficult at this stage to accurately calculate the carbon sequestration figures from tree planting due to variables such as the selected species, the age they are planted, the environment they are placed and the inconsistency of the literature on species sequestration rates. However, we estimate cumulative emissions captured by the newly planted trees, together with the percentage compared to borough-wide cumulative emissions (in brackets). This of course is in addition to the substantially larger carbon sequestration of our significantly more mature street trees and woodlands and the foresight of our predecessors on the Council and the Council's concentration on the green environment over many decades. Mature trees sequester substantially more carbon than young trees.

10 years: 383 tCO2 (0.004%)

20 years: 1,174 tCO2 (0.006%)

30 years: 2,317 tCO2 (0.008%)

The Council's emissions only account for a very small proportion of the borough's emissions and we would expect that residents will also be planting trees as we all play our part. Tree planting is just one part of the Council's strategy for net-zero since where possible it is better to avoid the emissions in the first place.

Note that these figures are based on the borough's total emissions remaining constant over time, which will not be the case – in reality, they will hopefully reduce which would result in the carbon captured by the new trees forming a higher percentage compared to total borough emissions.

### **3) Question from Pauline Smith:**

In the Net Zero Action Plan you state that you will “continue to guide residents, businesses and communities” to reduce their emissions. In what specific ways have you enacted this commitment and what measurable success have you had in emissions reduction? Please provide evidence.

#### **Response to Question 3:**

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available). A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress) was presented at the ECS PDS committee meeting in January 2022 and can be accessed via the Council's website.

The Carbon Management Team will also 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.

One example of a measurable success is the increased use of the public EV charge points we have installed. We know that many homes and new developments have also installed private EV points.

### **4) Question from Andrew McAleer:**

What steps have the council taken to identify the opportunities, barriers and solutions to driving a transition to a circular economy in Bromley?

#### **Response to Question 4:**

Transitioning to a sustainable economy is key to delivering Bromley's Green Recovery Programme. As such, the Carbon Management Team are in the process of setting up a working group comprised of officers from across the Council to consider and implement actions to reduce consumption emissions. Through a workshop led by ReLondon earlier this year, Senior Managers have begun an initial exercise considering opportunities, their barriers and actions the Council can take to move sustainable economy principles forward.

Bromley Council has worked to create a new sustainable procurement policy that incorporates sustainable economy principles. With an aim to ensure that contracts for products and services consider and embrace sustainable economy opportunities, this policy is already being embedded within the Council's procurement processes.

### **5) Question from Brayley Small:**

In the NZAP (p45) the council says it will be mapping out a strategy to reduce borough-wide emissions before 2050. What progress has been made on this strategy and in view of the latest IPCC report will the council consider bringing this target date forward?

Response to Question 5:

The Council acknowledges the seriousness and impact of climate change, and the need for everyone to play an important part in reducing their emissions, including residents, businesses, and community groups.

Reducing emissions will be a nationwide endeavour as we will not change the future environmental projections if we just transfer the emissions from one area to another. National, regional and local Government plus every resident will have to make changes to achieve the ambitions of COP26. The Government is best placed to design and organise national initiatives to tackle the issues, a myriad of local schemes would be likely to have higher costs and cause confusion. The Council sees one of its roles as providing information and signposting to residents to help residents make their own choices and determine their priorities for action to reduce their carbon emissions. Local initiatives will be appropriate in certain cases.

In our role as community leaders we have recently announced that the Council aims to become net-zero in 5 years in 2027. We have and will continue to highlight to residents the actions and investments the Council is making to achieve that ambition to demonstrate worked examples for residents to consider. We have already facilitated the provision of a number of fast and rapid EV points on the boroughs roads and tonight's agenda includes the updated EV strategy as transport currently has the highest emissions in borough.

The Council is participating in the Local Authority Delivery scheme which aims to address energy efficiency of low income households. Approximately £920,000 has been allocated to improve the energy efficiency of approximately 130 homes, the delegated contractors are currently signing up Bromley households and residents.. The Council also provides a domestic energy efficiency advice service, funded by the GLA, to reach vulnerable residents across the borough in providing free advice and small energy saving measures to save money on energy bills and therefore reduce emissions.

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available). A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress) was presented at the ECS PDS committee meeting in January 2022 and can be accessed via the Council's website.

**6) Question from Brayley Small:**

In the NZAP (p45) the council says it will be placing, "...emphasis on partnerships and collaboration between all stakeholders in Bromley and beyond..." with the goal of achieving net zero borough-wide emissions before 2050. What plans do the council have to actively involve citizens with emphasis on young people, women, and BAME communities in that collaboration process?

Response to Question 6:

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.

### **7) Question from Christopher Scully:**

Please could you let me know what sort of on-going road maintenance costs are involved for the following roads: Foxgrove Road, Crab Hill, Ravensbourne Avenue, Farnaby Road, Bromley Avenue.

#### Response to Question 7:

Regular condition surveys are undertaken of all roads in the borough with any necessary repairs being funded from the Council's reactive and planned maintenance budgets, which would include Foxgrove Road, Crab Hill, Ravensbourne Avenue, Farnaby Road, Bromley Avenue. Details of proposed planned maintenance are considered as part of this agenda.

### **8) Question from Christopher Scully:**

Please could you consider the idea of a special cycle lane on the section of road going up Crab Hill from the junction with Ravensbourne Avenue? The problem here is that this is an extremely steep section of road. Therefore, when cycling up it, cyclists inevitably cycle very slowly, and it feels very unsafe to have impatient vehicle drivers tailgating you and itching to take over even allowing very an unsafe margin to the right of the cyclist. Some drivers drive safely with consideration. But many do not.

#### Response to Question 8:

I am aware that this section of Crab Hill is on a well-used cycle route, so your feedback is useful and I will ask the Traffic team to look for some simple changes that might help at this location on the uphill section.

### **9) Question from Roger King:**

How successful has the council been in implementing the Government's food waste hierarchy in the borough?

#### Response to Question 9:

Reducing waste and recycling as much as possible are two of the key objectives within the Council's Environment and Community Services Portfolio Plan. The Council has been running the 'Food for Thought' campaign for several years now to encourage residents both to minimise avoidable food waste and to recycle or compost unavoidable food waste like vegetable peelings.

It is difficult to provide a measure of success for food waste reduction as we are unable to easily ascertain how much food waste is placed in general refuse and home compost bins. However, the table below indicates that the Council has been successful in increasing food waste recycling; with the tonnes of food waste collected for recycling increasing over the last three years.

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Food Waste Recycled (tonnes)	11503.65	9831.67	9272.47

### **10) Question from Roger King:**

In the Alternative Technologies section of Bromley's NZAP it says the council is conducting feasibility studies on the suitability of renewable opportunities within the borough. Please

provide more details of the likely opportunities. Will this include community ownership of installations such as mini-turbines and solar panels on village halls?

Response to Question 10:

The Carbon Management Team (CMT) continues to assess a range of renewable initiatives across the borough. They have accessed the Mayor's London Community Energy Fund, which provides several types of funding for decarbonisation feasibility studies for community endeavours. Energy appraisals have been undertaken at several schools, churches and leisure centres, with some promising results requiring further investigation. There will be another round of funding released in due course and residents are encouraged to approach the CMT with ideas and for assistance in their application. Permitted technologies much demonstrate carbon and energy savings, and all installations will require adherence to the local planning criteria.

**11) Question from Theresa Leon:**

The [latest IPCC report](#) indicates we urgently need to create spaces where people choose to visit, supporting local businesses plus reducing need to travel further afield for leisure and shopping, which increases congestion, air pollution and emissions. [Shortlands Friendly Village scheme](#) could do this. Surely Bromley Council has the money?

Response to Question 11:

The Shortlands Friendly Village scheme is a great opportunity for Bromley to make the changes that you are referring to, with plans to make improvement to the public space to enhance the area, supporting walking, cycling and the local economy.

However, due to the pandemic and related income shortage that TfL faces, funding for the Shortlands Friendly Village Scheme is currently suspended. I hope that the funding will resume once TfL is on more of a sound footing.

**12) Question from Theresa Leon:**

Responding to previous questions on climate change, the Portfolio Holder asserted that Bromley believes in "actions not words." Other London councils have targets for borough-wide net-zero emissions: Greenwich chose 2030, Westminster chose 2040. Will Bromley commit to drafting a plan to reach net-zero emissions for all activities across the borough?

Response to Question 12:

The Council acknowledges the seriousness and impact of climate change, and the need for everyone to play an important part in reducing their emissions, including residents, businesses, and community groups.

Reducing emissions will be a nationwide endeavour as we will not change the future environmental projections if we just transfer the emissions from one area to another. National, regional and local Government plus every resident will have to make changes to achieve the ambitions of COP26. The Government is best placed to design and organise national initiatives to tackle the issues, a myriad of local schemes would be likely to have higher costs and cause confusion. The Council sees one of its roles as providing information and signposting to residents to help residents make their own choices and determine their priorities for action to reduce their carbon emissions. Local initiatives will be appropriate in certain cases.

In our role as community leaders we have recently announced that the Council aims to become net-zero in 5 years in 2027. We have and will continue to highlight to residents the actions and investments the Council is making to achieve that ambition to demonstrate worked examples for residents to consider. We have already facilitated the provision of a number of fast and rapid EV points on the boroughs roads and tonight's agenda includes the updated EV strategy as transport currently has the highest emissions in borough.

The Council is participating in the Local Authority Delivery scheme which aims to address energy efficiency of low income households. Approximately £920,000 has been allocated to improve the energy efficiency of approximately 130 homes, the delegated contractors are currently signing up Bromley households and residents.. The Council also provides a domestic energy efficiency advice service, funded by the GLA, to reach vulnerable residents across the borough in providing free advice and small energy saving measures to save money on energy bills and therefore reduce emissions.

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available). A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress) was presented at the ECS PDS committee meeting in January 2022 and can be accessed via the Council's website.

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.

In addition, the Carbon Management Team are represented at several London Councils Climate Change Steering/Working Groups to help develop a London-wide plan for achieving net zero emissions by 2030 through cross-borough working - the output will help inform and support the Council to address emissions at a borough-wide level.

### **13) Question from James Brown:**

According to <https://carboncopy.eco/local-climate-action/bromley>, Bromley Council has not yet published its climate action plan. If this is correct, when does the council plan to publish it?

#### **Response to Question 13:**

The website referred to contains several inaccuracies. For clear and up to date information, residents are encouraged to read the Council's sustainability reports on its website, which will detail over 10 years of our Carbon Management Plan and borough wide emissions reporting. We have also published our Organisational Net Zero Action Plan alongside a Year 2 progress report, which again can be found on the Council's website. The website referred to also notes that our action plan is borough-wide and that the council has declared a climate emergency, in both cases this is incorrect. Furthermore, in recognising Bromley's ambition to rapidly decarbonise as an organisation, members have recently moved the target date forward from 2029 to 2027

### **14) Question from Sue Sulis:**

Flooding in the crays during 2021.

Can the Council identify the following?-

1. the roads and locations where flooding occurred?

2. the number and types of buildings which experienced Internal flooding?
3. the number of residents affected.
4. how many of these required temporary relocations, where, and for how long?
5. what types of assistance have residents and businesses been offered?

Response to Question 14:

1. Station Road SMC, Leasons Hill Primary School, Kynaston Road Orp, Edmund Road Orp, Hockenden Lane, Blacksmiths Lane SMC, High Street SMC, Chelsfield Lane, Clarendon Grove, Elmcroft Road Orp, Somerden Road, Cockmannings Road, Hodson Crescent, Rookery Gardens, Sholden Gardens.
2. The number of residential buildings internally flooded is unknown. One school was reported to LBB as internally flooded.
3. Unknown
4. Overall unknown. Following the flooding in Hodson Cres / Sholden Gardens some housing association residents there were temporarily rehoused but LBB does not have details as local housing associations generally took responsibility for their displaced tenants. Other residents may have resorted to their insurers LBB does not hold any details in this regard.
5. Advice such as to sign up for flood warning alerts and consider Property Level Flood Protection measures.

**15) Question from Sue Sulis:**

Flooding in the crays during 2021:

Has the Council, as a Flood Risk Management Authority:-

- (i) carried out an investigation, with its partner agencies, into the types and causes of the flooding, and
  - (ii) prepared a detailed map and a report to Committee?
- (b) What are the mechanisms to warn residents, businesses, and public service providers of the risks of local flooding?

Response to Question 15:

(i) No, the two major flood events in 2021 were surface water 'Exceedance' rainfall events in which the volume of water produced by the intense storm exceeds the capacity of surface water drainage infrastructure. On 20<sup>th</sup> October 2021 the Environment Agency Orpington rain gauge shows us that 26mm of rain fell in a 90 minute period and that 74 mm fell between 1930hrs and 0100hrs. Under these circumstances surface water will flow overland often as predicted by the Updated Flood Map for Surface Water.

(ii) No

(b) Bromley Council website, Flood Risk Management web page directs customers to Environment Agency Flood Warnings page where they can sign up for alerts and also provides a link to another EA web page that allows residents to view their address on the Updated Flood Map for Surface water ((uFMfSW)

## **16) Question from Carrie Heitmeyer:**

The [latest IPCC report](#) highlights the key role of urban areas that have opportunities to reduce emissions. Evidence shows climate change will have a major impact on Bromley residents' quality of life. Will Bromley Council acknowledge the scale of the crisis and come up with a plan to address it?

### Response to Question 16:

The Council acknowledges the seriousness and impact of climate change, and the need for everyone to play an important part in reducing their emissions, including residents, businesses, and community groups.

Reducing emissions will be a nationwide endeavour as we will not change the future environmental projections if we just transfer the emissions from one area to another. National, regional and local Government plus every resident will have to make changes to achieve the ambitions of COP26. The Government is best placed to design and organise national initiatives to tackle the issues, a myriad of local schemes would be likely to have higher costs and cause confusion. The Council sees one of its roles as providing information and signposting to residents to help residents make their own choices and determine their priorities for action to reduce their carbon emissions. Local initiatives will be appropriate in certain cases.

In our role as community leaders we have recently announced that the Council aims to become net-zero in 5 years in 2027. We have and will continue to highlight to residents the actions and investments the Council is making to achieve that ambition to demonstrate worked examples for residents to consider. We have already facilitated the provision of a number of fast and rapid EV points on the boroughs roads and tonight's agenda includes the updated EV strategy as transport currently has the highest emissions in borough.

The Council is participating in the Local Authority Delivery scheme which aims to address energy efficiency of low income households. Approximately £920,000 has been allocated to improve the energy efficiency of approximately 130 homes, the delegated contractors are currently signing up Bromley households and residents.. The Council also provides a domestic energy efficiency advice service, funded by the GLA, to reach vulnerable residents across the borough in providing free advice and small energy saving measures to save money on energy bills and therefore reduce emissions.

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available). A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress) was presented at the ECS PDS committee meeting in January 2022 and can be accessed via the Council's website.

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.

In addition, the Carbon Management Team are represented at several London Councils Climate Change Steering/Working Groups to help develop a London-wide plan for achieving net zero emissions by 2030 through cross-borough working - the output will help inform and support the Council to address emissions at a borough-wide level.

## **17) Question from Carrie Heitmeyer:**

A MyLondon article published in December 2021 reports that Bromley Council has invested and loaned out £427 million, including investments to banks in the Middle East. Why doesn't the Council invest some of this in action to reduce borough-wide carbon emissions, e.g. through infrastructure improvements to enable walking and cycling?

Response to Question 17:

From its total investment portfolio of approximately £440m, the Council currently has £15m invested in a Middle East bank and a further £50m in the UK division of two Middle East banks. These investments are selected in line with strict criteria and in line with professional advice to maximise the return available to the Council, that is used to fund local services. The Council has implemented a number of walking and cycling schemes over recent years including projects such Crofton Road walking and cycling scheme and a new pedestrian crossing over the last couple of years

**18) Question from Stephen McNairn:**

In September 2021 local newspapers reported a pedestrian (a man in his 80s) was rushed to hospital in a life-threatening condition after being hit by a car outside Tesco Superstore in Elmers End. Is Bromley Council exploring options to improve road safety at this location?

Response to Question 18:

The Council has a successful record in reducing the number and severity of injuries on our roads over many years. This has been achieved by rigorously targeting funding at those locations where the funding will make most difference and trying to improve the standard of driving and cycling through education. The practice of the Council for many years has been to investigate all locations where there have been 5 or more injury collisions over a period of 36 months. The locations are all investigated to look at the severity of the injuries and whether there is a pattern to the collisions. At sites where the collisions are of particular concern and appear to be treatable, the cost of making improvements is estimated and the benefit-cost ratio is calculated. The locations which represent the best value for action, in terms of the potential injuries saved per pound spent, are promoted to the top of the list. Funding is then sought to treat as many locations as possible.

The method above usually leads to an analysis of getting on for 100 sites, with subsequent detailed examination being undertaken on about 30 of those sites. It would not be feasible to investigate the site of every injury collision and if there are fewer than about 5 collisions then it is very hard to establish a pattern / common cause and therefore develop a treatment.

There needs to be a threshold for intervention, as (i) funding for improvements is not infinite and (ii) there is no point trying to make improvements to a location when you cannot establish what the common cause and therefore treatment might be.

The treatment for a casualty site can range from a change to the signs and road markings, through to a complete change to a junction design, with the design being based on what will save most casualties per pound spent. Where speeding is identified, it is for the Police to enforce, as they alone have the powers to do so.

The section of highway outside the Elmer's End Tesco is not, thankfully, a cluster suite, so there is no plan to take action at this site at present.

**19) Question from Stephen McNairn:**

The “15-minute city” is an urban concept in which most daily necessities can be accomplished by either walking or cycling from residents’ homes. This concept has potential to help Bromley residents reduce emissions/pollution by reducing the need to drive. Is Bromley Council considering this concept in the Beckenham Sainsburys Re-development?

Response to Question 19:

The Council does not have any plans to redevelop the Beckenham Sainsbury’s site.

**20) Question from Fiona Small:**

At the London Councils Borough Climate Conference in October 2021 Kingston and Westminster councils put forward the Low Carbon Transport Programme whose ambition is to halve petrol and diesel road journeys between 2020-2030. What is the council’s view of this initiative?

Response to Question 20:

Although not involved in this proposal, Council officers have taken part in early stage Pan London discussions relating to this scheme. The considered view from Bromley officers is that this target could potentially be met by a combination of increased EV usage and active modes, but this needs to be decided upon as they are very different issues. Whether electric vehicles are low carbon depends on whether the energy residents procure is green energy. Regional differences across London would also need to be taken into account, as the scope for increased public transport is obviously much greater in Westminster than it is in Kingston or would be in Bromley. Officers also felt that significant lobbying would be required to acquire the necessary funding and statutory powers likely to be needed to meet such a challenging target. Comprehensive and frequent data collection is also vital. Bromley is also one of the largest London boroughs and with a hilly terrain, so there would be a different emphasis in Bromley.

**21) Question from Fiona Small:**

The NZAP (p45) says the Council will develop a strategy to reduce borough-wide emissions before 2050. In light of the comment by Sir David King, Chair of CCAG, that, “*Achieving net zero by 2050 is no longer enough to ensure a safe future for humanity;*” and the urgency expressed in the latest IPCC report, will the council bring forward the target date?

Response to Question 21:

The Council acknowledges the seriousness and impact of climate change, and the need for everyone to play an important part in reducing their emissions, including residents, businesses, and community groups.

Reducing emissions will be a nationwide endeavour as we will not change the future environmental projections if we just transfer the emissions from one area to another. National, regional and local Government, plus every resident will have to make changes to achieve the ambitions of COP26. The Government is best placed to design and organize national initiatives to tackle the issues, a myriad of local schemes would be likely to have higher costs and cause confusion. The Council sees one of its roles as providing information and signposting to residents to help residents make their own choices and determine their priorities for action to reduce their carbon emissions. Local initiatives will be appropriate in certain cases.

In our role as community leaders, we have recently announced that the Council aims to become net-zero in 5 years in 2027. We have and will continue to highlight to residents the actions and investments the Council is making to achieve that ambition to demonstrate worked examples for residents to consider. We have already facilitated the provision of a number of fast and rapid EV points on the borough's roads and tonight's agenda includes the updated EV strategy as transport currently has the highest emissions in borough.

The Council is participating in the Local Authority Delivery scheme which aims to address energy efficiency of low-income households. Approximately £920,000 has been allocated to improve the energy efficiency of approximately 130 homes; the delegated contractors are currently signing up Bromley households and residents. The Council also provides a domestic energy efficiency advice service, funded by the GLA, to reach vulnerable residents across the borough in providing free advice and small energy saving measures to save money on energy bills and therefore reduce emissions.

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available). A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress) was presented at the ECS PDS committee meeting in January 2022 and can be accessed via the Council's website.

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.

In addition, the Carbon Management Team are represented at several London Councils Climate Change Steering/Working Groups to help develop a London-wide plan for achieving net zero emissions by 2030 through cross-borough working - the output will help inform and support the Council to address emissions at a borough-wide level.

**22) Question from Rachel King:**

Is there a ban on single-use plastics in council offices? If not, what is the council's view on introducing one?

**Response to Question 22:**

The Council already has some measures in place to reduce single use plastic within Council offices and plans to conduct further publicity to encourage staff to not use single-use plastics. Once this has been completed, the Council will consider further actions. The Council is aware that it needs to consider any unintended environmental impacts of alternatives to plastic.

**23) Question from Rachel King:**

Has the council considered introducing a workplace car parking levy or similar initiative to encourage car commuters to consider other modes of transport, and to provide a sustained funding source to implement sustainable transport measures?

**Response to Question 23:**

When the Council's transport strategy document "Bromley's Transport for the Future" was put together in 2019, consideration was given to the introduction of a workplace parking levy, but it was concluded that because of the nature of the Borough, this would not be beneficial in driving change towards sustainable transport but would instead become more like a tax

on local businesses. Businesses in Bromley Town Centre already were assessing the cost of providing commuter parking spaces for staff and seeing the cost reducing the ability of staff to use spaces or charging them for their use. Businesses outside of the Town Centres do not have the same options for public transport. It was not therefore included among the various measures that the Borough is taking forward to help promote more sustainable modes of transport, which can be read here: [Local Implementation Plan \(LIP3\) | London Borough of Bromley](#).

**24) Question from Harry North:**

What actions are the council taking to inform its residents of the seriousness of the climate crisis and the urgency of the mitigation measures required with the aim of inspiring the individual to take action, which the council believes is needed to “... to achieve the climate target” as stated in the answer to written question 47 from the ECS PDS committee meeting dated 17 Nov 21?

Response to Question 24:

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.

**25) Question from Harry North:**

In the NZAP (p41) the council has said that “green deals” have been made available by Government to accelerate de-carbonization. Please clarify what new deals are available and which ones the council has applied for and for what purpose?

Response to Question 25:

There are many available grants and schemes, too many to include in this answer, but the Carbon Management Team maintains a list of current and potential funding opportunities. Some schemes the Council has applied for:

The London Community Energy Grant – for energy efficiency appraisals at schools and community sites (Financed by the GLA)

Local Authority Delivery Scheme 2 – for domestic household retrofit projects for low-income households (Financed by the Government)

The Warmer Homes Advice Service – as part of a consortium of South London boroughs for energy advice services (financed by the GLA)

Sustainable Warmth Fund – domestic household retrofits for low-income households

**26) Question from Jamie Devine:**

How will Bromley’s emissions reach net zero in around 10.5 years without further Council action?

Response to Question 26:

The Council acknowledges the seriousness and impact of climate change, and the need for everyone to play an important part in reducing their emissions, including residents, businesses, and community groups.

Reducing emissions will be a nationwide endeavour as we will not change the future environmental projections if we just transfer the emissions from one area to another. National, regional and local Government plus every resident will have to make changes to achieve the ambitions of COP26. The Government is best placed to design and organise national initiatives to tackle the issues, a myriad of local schemes would be likely to have higher costs and cause confusion. The Council sees one of its roles as providing information and signposting to residents to help residents make their own choices and determine their priorities for action to reduce their carbon emissions. Local initiatives will be appropriate in certain cases.

In our role as community leaders we have recently announced that the Council aims to become net-zero in 5 years in 2027. We have and will continue to highlight to residents the actions and investments the Council is making to achieve that ambition to demonstrate worked examples for residents to consider. We have already facilitated the provision of a number of fast and rapid EV points on the boroughs roads and tonight's agenda includes the updated EV strategy as transport currently has the highest emissions in borough.

The Council is participating in the Local Authority Delivery scheme which aims to address energy efficiency of low income households. Approximately £920,000 has been allocated to improve the energy efficiency of approximately 130 homes, the delegated contractors are currently signing up Bromley households and residents.. The Council also provides a domestic energy efficiency advice service, funded by the GLA, to reach vulnerable residents across the borough in providing free advice and small energy saving measures to save money on energy bills and therefore reduce emissions.

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available). A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress) was presented at the ECS PDS committee meeting in January 2022 and can be accessed via the Council's website.

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.

In addition, the Carbon Management Team are represented at several London Councils Climate Change Steering/Working Groups to help develop a London-wide plan for achieving net zero emissions by 2030 through cross-borough working - the output will help inform and support the Council to address emissions at a borough-wide level.

**27) Question from Jamie Devine:**

Will the Council take proportionate action to assist in limiting global warming to 1.5°C and secure a livable future?

Response to Question 27:

Please refer to the response to Question 26:

**28) Question from Stephanie Williamson:**

Has the Council received (or applied for) any external funding or made available internal funds for climate mitigation measures specifically directed towards low-income households, vulnerable residents and those most at risk from extreme weather?

Response to Question 28:

The Council is participating in the Local Authority Delivery scheme which aims to address exactly these problems. Approximately £920,000 has been allocated to improve the energy efficiency of approximately 130 homes, the delegated contractors are currently signing up Bromley households and residents.. The Council also provides a domestic energy efficiency advice service, funded by the GLA, to reach vulnerable residents across the borough in providing free advice and small energy saving measures to save money on energy bills and keep homes warmer.

**29) Question from Stephanie Williamson:**

For the most recent 12-month period for which information is available, what volumes and brands of glyphosate-based herbicide were used by or on behalf of the Council on land owned by, managed by or under the control of the Council?

Response to Question 29:

Answer to first question: For the period 01.01.2021 - 31.12.21

- Gallup Biograde Amenity: 195.5l
- Lockstar Pre Emergent Total Herbicide: 560g
- Paradise Long Lasting Weed Control: 350g

With respect to our street cleansing operations, for the purpose of weed spraying, our service provider Veolia use the brand Trustee Amenity glyphosate at the below quantities for 2021.

<b>Street cleansing 2021</b>			
Trustee Amenity			
<b>Spray</b>	<b>Highway</b>	<b>Housin g</b>	<b>Recycling sites</b>
1st	535.7	49.1	1.5
<b>2nd</b>	685.8	50.5	2
3rd	602.9	93.5	1.5
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1824.4</b>	<b>193.1</b>	<b>5</b>

**30) Question from Robert Clegg:**

What requirements are there in place to require Veolia operatives collecting recyclable and non- recyclable waste to pick up material that they drop or fail to correctly transfer to the collection vehicle.

How is this monitored, and what sanctions exist to encourage operatives not to leave a mass of litter in the streets after the collection round.

Are time restraints on operatives by Veolia preventing any dropped material being picked up?

If the current contract does not address these issues can it be amended to include this in future?

### Response to Question 30:

The Council requires residents present their recycling and waste in a secure manner to avoid it being distributed by foxes and/or the wind. So it is important to differentiate between items not presented securely and items dropped by the waste operatives.

The Waste Collection contract specification requires that waste operatives ensure that items dropped during collection are picked up.

There are a number of ways in which this requirement is monitored, with both Veolia's Environment Managers and Council Officers visiting crews on a regular but ad hoc basis during the working day to ensure that all collection standards are met.

In addition, residents are encouraged to report issues with their collection including dropped rubbish through the Council's online reporting tool. Reports from residents and Council Officers directly feed into the contract performance management framework.

Where an acceptable level of performance is not met e.g. a high number of reported incidents of operatives dropping litter, there are appropriate sanctions and measures in place to get performance back to an acceptable level.

There are no time restraints placed on operatives that would prevent them from clearing any dropped waste and crews should ensure wherever possible ensure that litter they have caused is picked up.

The street cleaning schedule was also designed so that street cleaning would follow the normal collection day, though not all streets have a weekly street cleaning visit.

### **31) Question from Louise Clark:**

There is evidence that driving at lower speeds reduces air pollution and congestion. What is the Council's view on introducing a 20-mph speed limit in urban areas?

### **Response to Question 31:**

The Energy Saving Trust says that the most efficient speed you can travel in a car in terms of achieving the best fuel economy is 55-65mph. Other studies have suggested that speeds between 40 and 60mph are most economical, depending on the type of vehicle and the load carried. In an urban environment 30mph is often the highest safe and legal speed, but drivers should put safety first and travel at a speed suitable for the road conditions. Advanced driving skills can help drivers to improve the smoothness of their driving by teaching better anticipation of hazards, leading to less acceleration and braking, which as well as being a safer and more comfortable drive, also saves fuel and reduces emissions.

In regard to 20mph limits, the experience the Council has from the various parts of the Borough where area-wide 20mph limits have been installed in the past is that we receive very many complaints about speeding, despite the lower limit. Research commissioned by the DfT showed that following the introduction of signed-only 20mph limits the median speed fell by just under 1mph and found no significant change in collisions and casualties. The study was focussed primarily on safety and not pollution, and in light of the lack of evidence that introducing widespread 20mph limits is the most effective approach, Bromley has no plans to introduce such area-wide 20mph zones. However, in light of evidence that drivers respond better to warnings or regulations where they can see the reason for them, part time advisory 20 limits are being introduced around schools in the Borough, on a case-by-case basis.

**32) Question from Louise Clark:**

Does the council agree that the world is in the midst of a climate emergency? (The Oxford Dictionary defines climate emergency as "a situation in which urgent action is required to reduce or halt climate change and avoid potentially irreversible environmental damage resulting from it.")

Response to Question 32:

The Council acknowledges the seriousness and impact of climate change, and the need for everyone to play an important part in reducing their emissions, including residents, businesses, and community groups. To illustrate the importance of this, the Council has just reduced its own net-zero target to 2027 just 5 years away. We hope that the publicity around this will highlight the importance of emissions to residents so they will also take action.

**33) Question from Elisabeth Thomas:**

How many electric vehicle charging points have been installed in the borough and what targets have been set for increasing the provision?

Response to Question 33:

42 on public land.

The Residential EV Pilot Scheme discussed at this meeting is intended to begin shortly and during its 12 month duration the aim is for 46 on street charge points and 14 resident cable gullies to be installed.

Charge points in other publicly available areas (retail outlets, private car parks, leisure sites and filling station forecourts) are also increasing and are expected to continue to do so.

**34) Question from Elisabeth Thomas:**

In the Net Zero Plan, you refer to the Mayor of London's Energy Efficiency Plan (MEEF) as a source of external funding. Has the Council applied for funding and, if so, how much has been obtained and what projects is it being directed to?

Response to Question 34:

The Council has not yet applied for funding from the MEEF. However, it remains an option for a potential project that is being assessed.

**35) Question from Richard Gibbons:**

LITTER - Every week countless residents spend innumerable hours litter picking in our borough. How much would you estimate this volunteer work force saves the Council and its contractors per year; what initiatives to reduce casual littering has the Council introduced during the current election cycle 2018-22; and why does the Council not acknowledge the scale of the problem?

Response to Question 35:

A significant number of Bromley residents are successfully working to improve their neighborhoods and help build an even better Bromley by registering as Street Friends; and our purple sack scheme allows registered Street Friends to dispose of litter and

leaves that they have collected from public pavements and public footpaths. The council provides the purple sacks, which when full can be left on the pavement where they are collected by our street cleansing service provider, Veolia. The scheme should not be viewed as a saving initiative, as there is a cost in supplying equipment and sacks, but overall, we collect 11 tons of purple sack waste per year, which is approximately 1833 bags per year.

In 2019 a new contract for street environment commenced between the council and Veolia. New fleet, logistics technology and a re-aligned sweeping schedule have made significant improvements in the cleanliness of the borough's streets, and we have seen an overall reduction in litter being reported. The Fix My Street reporting system is available for residents to log street cleanliness issues at any time of the day or night. Street litter patrols have been reintroduced following the pandemic, and our Neighbourhood Management enforcement team regularly undertake investigations and follow ups where evidence is available.

**36) Question from Richard Gibbons:**

LEGACY - How have you improved LB Bromley's Environment and Community Services during your time as Portfolio Holder, and what achievements would you most like to be remembered for?

**Response to Question 36:**

I have been a member of the Environment PDS committee since I joined the Council 16 years ago and I was Chairman of the committee from 2008 until I was appointed Portfolio Holder in 2017. In my time as Chairman of the PDS I put great emphasis on policy development, proposing a number of policies to the then PH to improve the remit of Environmental Services. It was not only during my terms as PH that I have improved the LBB's Environment. To list a few headlines.

- The Carbon Management Plans since 2008 that have significantly reduced the Councils Carbon footprint resulting in the Council setting a 2027 net-zero target and as part of that completing the rollout of LED lighting.
- Recycling: Developing the design and supporting the food waste recycling service, so Bromley has been one of the highest performing boroughs on recycling for many years.
- Proposing Bromley adopt the extremely successful Green Garden Waste Wheelie bin service and design the proposed service.
- Moving to zero waste to landfill.
- Improvements in all modes of transport for residents to support them being able to choose their preferred mode: from reducing congestion pinch points and coordinating traffic lights e.g. the A224; to walking and cycling schemes.
- Continuing the downward trend of KSIs on Bromley's managed roads.
- Scrutinising and then managing our contractors so they deliver excellent and value for money services.
- As we have to deal with the issues that arise on our watch, managing a reducing budget for Environmental Services whilst maintaining extremely high public satisfaction survey results across the department for the services we deliver. Dealing with the day-to-day issues of delivering frontline Environmental Services during 2 years of a pandemic.
- Supporting the network of Friends Groups and Volunteers in our Park and Greenspaces.

### **37) Question from Jane Dutton:**

Last week it was revealed that the percentage of Bromley's NOx emissions from road transport went up by 10% between 2013 and 2019, from 42% to 52%. What action is planned to address this increase in emissions?

#### Response to Question 37:

Table 2 from the link provided shows the 'Percentage of road transport NOx emissions from diesel and petrol cars in 2013, 2016 and 2019'. Whilst this is interesting information it does not necessarily mean that NOx levels in Bromley have increased over this time. The figures are a reference to the proportion of NOx that is a result of road transport emissions. From the information cited, it cannot necessarily be concluded that there has been an increase in road transport emissions. It could be that there has been a decrease in other sources of NOx which have resulted in a proportional rise in the percentage of transport emissions as one of the sources of NOx.

The Council is hoping to continue with its educational programmes that encourage behaviour change to more active modes of travel. This is however somewhat dependent on the continuation of funding streams that have been hindered dramatically by factors stemming from the Covid pandemic.

The Council has facilitated the rollout of fast and rapid EV charge points on borough roads. The Council has also recently established an electric vehicle charging strategy, an update on which will be provided during this meeting. The aim of this strategy is to increase, by way of a pilot scheme, the number of electric vehicle charging facilities in the Borough on roads without off-street parking, helping residents switch to electric vehicles.

The London Borough of Bromley's Annual Status Report for Air Quality for the year 2020 contains information on the measured levels of NO2 in the borough. It generally demonstrates a gradual decline in measured NO2 levels in the borough year on year since 2014 (see Table D). The trend of gradual reduction in pollution levels is mirrored in local authority air quality monitoring results across London.

Measures that are being taken by the Council, to improve local air quality, including road transport related actions, are detailed in the Council's Air Quality Action Plan 2020-2025.

### **38) Question from Jane Dutton:**

Bromley has 3 School Streets, yet other outer London Conservative boroughs have more: Harrow with 7, Barnet with 11. Neighbouring borough Croydon has 26. School Streets improve road safety, air pollution levels and learning outcomes. Please can you explain what the Council will do to increase numbers of School Streets?

#### Response to Question 38:

The Council is actively investigating the impact of School Streets and has implemented a number where the school involved was keen to see one trialled. Bromley currently has 4 school streets being trialled. There were 4 further previous School Streets in the Borough, but these were not found to be a good use of resources and have ceased to operate.

A report will be brought to this Committee later this year, presenting evidence in regard to the current and recent School Streets in the Borough and making recommendations for their future use.

School Streets are a useful tool to support sustainable travel and safety around schools, but they are certainly not suitable in all locations and their overall value remains to be seen.

Some neighbouring boroughs have also suspended or stopped some School Streets, so it appears they are not always suitable elsewhere either.

**39) Question from Brendan Donegan:**

On 4 March, My London reported the share of nitrogen oxide emissions from diesel and petrol cars has risen in every borough except City of London, with Bromley the worst borough, where diesel and petrol cars represent 52% of all nitrogen emissions (10% increase since 2013). What will Bromley Council do?

**Response to Question 39:**

Table 2 from the link provided shows the 'Percentage of road transport NOx emissions from diesel and petrol cars in 2013, 2016 and 2019'. Whilst this is interesting information it does not necessarily mean that NOx levels in Bromley have increased over this time. The figures are a reference to the proportion of NOx that is a result of road transport emissions. From the information cited, it cannot necessarily be concluded that there has been an increase in road transport emissions. It could be that there has been a decrease in other sources of NOx which have resulted in a proportional rise in the percentage of transport emissions as one of the sources of NOx.

The Council is hoping to continue with its educational programmes that encourage behaviour change to more active modes of travel. This is however somewhat dependent on the continuation of funding streams that have been hindered dramatically by factors stemming from the Covid pandemic.

The Council has facilitated the rollout of fast and rapid EV charge points on borough roads. The Council has also recently established an electric vehicle charging strategy, an update on which will be provided during this meeting. The aim of this strategy is to increase, by way of a pilot scheme, the number of electric vehicle charging facilities in the Borough on roads without off-street parking, helping residents switch to electric vehicles.

The London Borough of Bromley's [Annual Status Report](#) for Air Quality for the year 2020 contains information on the measured levels of NO<sub>2</sub> in the borough. It generally demonstrates a gradual decline in measured NO<sub>2</sub> levels in the borough year on year since 2014 (see Table D). The trend of gradual reduction in pollution levels is mirrored in local authority air quality monitoring results across London. Measures that are being taken by the Council, to improve local air quality, including road transport related actions, are detailed in the Council's [Air Quality Action Plan 2020-2025](#).

**40) Question from Brendan Donegan:**

Climate change requires that we make local high streets the go-to place for people to meet every day needs. This requires investment in high streets, which in turn means we need to increase the number of people who live within walking distance. Would you agree this means we must build higher?

#### Response to Question 40:

The Bromley Local Plan generally supports development in town centres, however any tall buildings would need to comply with other relevant planning policies governing development including those in the London Plan so it is not possible to provide a generalised answer to this question. Additionally more intensive residential development does not necessarily require higher buildings. It is also important to distinguish between higher and high buildings and the definition of high does depend on the context. Every planning application is considered on its merits and conformance with the Bromley Local Plan.

#### **41) Question from Georgina Dayanc:**

In the carbon emissions section in the draft budget the council said that there may be an expectation in the future to address borough-wide carbon emissions. Polling by London Councils in October 2021 shows that 82% of Londoners are concerned about climate change now. Will the council act urgently for its residents?

#### Response to Question 41:

The Council acknowledges the seriousness and impact of climate change, and the need for everyone to play an important part in reducing their emissions, including residents, businesses, and community groups.

Reducing emissions will be a nationwide endeavour as we will not change the future environmental projections if we just transfer the emissions from one area to another. National, regional and local Government plus every resident will have to make changes to achieve the ambitions of COP26. The Government is best placed to design and organise national initiatives to tackle the issues, a myriad of local schemes would be likely to have higher costs and cause confusion. The Council sees one of its roles as providing information and signposting to residents to help residents make their own choices and determine their priorities for action to reduce their carbon emissions. Local initiatives will be appropriate in certain cases.

In our role as community leaders we have recently announced that the Council aims to become net-zero in 5 years in 2027. We have and will continue to highlight to residents the actions and investments the Council is making to achieve that ambition to demonstrate worked examples for residents to consider. We have already facilitated the provision of a number of fast and rapid EV points on the boroughs roads and tonight's agenda includes the updated EV strategy as transport currently has the highest emissions in borough.

The Council is participating in the Local Authority Delivery scheme which aims to address energy efficiency of low income households. Approximately £920,000 has been allocated to improve the energy efficiency of approximately 130 homes, the delegated contractors are currently signing up Bromley households and residents.. The Council also provides a domestic energy efficiency advice service, funded by the GLA, to reach vulnerable residents across the borough in providing free advice and small energy saving measures to save money on energy bills and therefore reduce emissions.

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available). A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress) was presented at the ECS PDS committee meeting in January 2022 and can be accessed via the Council's website.

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.

In addition, the Carbon Management Team are represented at several London Councils Climate Change Steering/Working Groups to help develop a London-wide plan for achieving net zero emissions by 2030 through cross-borough working - the output will help inform and support the Council to address emissions at a borough-wide level.

**42) Question from Georgina Dayanc:**

In the NZAP (p41) the council refers to “green deals” being made available by Government to accelerate de-carbonization. What steps have the council taken to push the relevant Government departments for generous green deal options for residents (tenants and owner-occupiers) and businesses? For example, for building insulation and green energy grants.

Response to Question 42:

The Council is represented at London Councils which lobbies on behalf of all 32 London boroughs on issues such as this. The Council is currently participating in the Local Authority Delivery scheme which will address domestic sector emissions for all occupancy types. There is further funding being released nationally for similar schemes – albeit with a focus on hard to treat homes in the domestic sector. The government has also released £5bn of funding for businesses, with six such schemes available now. Please contact the Carbon Management Team for a link to these schemes.

**43) Question from James Brown:**

On 17 February, Planning Committee approved felling three mature trees at South Eden Park Road, which had been identified as potential roosts for bats and were covered by a TPO. As Portfolio Holder for Environment, what powers do you have to enforce the Council's "biodiversity species action plan" for bats?

Response to Question 43:

The Bromley Biodiversity Action Plan does not afford any species statutory protection, however legislation exists to protect UK bat species. All bats and their roosts are protected by Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and also under Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) Schedule 2 (as amended). It is an offence intentionally or recklessly to disturb, damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place that a wild bat uses for shelter or protection, to possess or advertise, sell or exchange a bat or part of a bat, and for any person intentionally to kill, injure or take any wild bat. Any activities which are likely to impact bats or their roosts are fully assessed and their presence considered before any works are undertaken. Any breaches under this legislation would be enforced by the Police Wildlife Crimes Officer.

**44) Question from Helen Brookfield:**

How many traffic lights at junctions in Bromley have no phasing for pedestrians?

Response to Question 44:

I have asked Officers to collate this information and will supply it to you as soon as it is available.

**45) Question from Helen Brookfield:**

Why isn't phasing for pedestrians a priority particularly at junctions with large numbers of pedestrians crossing on the way to schools?

Response to Question 45:

Making improvements for pedestrians is a priority for the Council, with 12 new controlled crossings being installed in the last couple of years, including zebra, tiger and toucan crossings, plus some refuges. Each location is considered on a case-by-case basis and at some locations adding a green-man phase is not appropriate, owing to the congestion it will cause. Congestion in turn that will lead to drivers rat-running along nearby residential streets and past local schools, along with additional air pollution from queuing traffic.

There is not one answer for each location so the Council will always try to do what is best and avoid making hasty changes that might lead to an overall decrease in road safety.

The Council will continue to try and identify options for pedestrians where roads present significant barrier to walking, but as above if initial options are found to have significant undesirable consequences, further options will be explored.

**46) Question from Stephanie Birmingham-McDonogh:**

Speeding issues on Beckenham Road / South Eden Park Road; 30mph awareness signs have been placed at intervals along the South Eden Park stretch of this road but nothing along the Beckenham Road stretch which sees increased pedestrian footfall at school times. Could these signs be extended along Beckenham Road please?

Response to Question 46:

I have asked Officers to add Beckenham Road to the list for future rotations of these temporary road safety posters.

**47) Question from Sam Small:**

ECS Risk Register item 13 Climate Change: one of the further actions required is the detailed climate action plan for net zero organizational emissions. There's no mention of a detailed plan to reduce emissions borough-wide, which are 99% of the borough's total, and if unmitigated could lead to a "failure to adapt the borough....to our changing climate". Your comments would be appreciated.

Response to Question 47:

The Council acknowledges the seriousness and impact of climate change, and the need for everyone to play an important part in reducing their emissions, including residents, businesses, and community groups.

Reducing emissions will be a nationwide endeavour as we will not change the future environmental projections if we just transfer the emissions from one area to another. National, regional and local Government plus every resident will have to make changes to achieve the ambitions of COP26. The Government is best placed to design and organise national initiatives to tackle the issues, a myriad of local schemes would be likely to have higher costs and cause confusion. The Council sees one of its roles as providing information and signposting to residents to help residents make their own choices and determine their

priorities for action to reduce their carbon emissions. Local initiatives will be appropriate in certain cases.

In our role as community leaders we have recently announced that the Council aims to become net-zero in 5 years in 2027. We have and will continue to highlight to residents the actions and investments the Council is making to achieve that ambition to demonstrate worked examples for residents to consider. We have already facilitated the provision of a number of fast and rapid EV points on the boroughs roads and tonight's agenda includes the updated EV strategy as transport currently has the highest emissions in borough.

The Council is participating in the Local Authority Delivery scheme which aims to address energy efficiency of low income households. Approximately £920,000 has been allocated to improve the energy efficiency of approximately 130 homes, the delegated contractors are currently signing up Bromley households and residents.. The Council also provides a domestic energy efficiency advice service, funded by the GLA, to reach vulnerable residents across the borough in providing free advice and small energy saving measures to save money on energy bills and therefore reduce emissions.

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available). A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress) was presented at the ECS PDS committee meeting in January 2022 and can be accessed via the Council's website.

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.

In addition, the Carbon Management Team are represented at several London Councils Climate Change Steering/Working Groups to help develop a London-wide plan for achieving net zero emissions by 2030 through cross-borough working - the output will help inform and support the Council to address emissions at a borough-wide level.

**48) Question from Alison Martin:**

Bromley's traffic experts agree pedestrian crossings on SEP Rd need improving, but funding / prioritization is unclear. Will council commit to installing electronic signs at St David's crossing point in 2022 – and, if TfL zebra funding isn't secured, to implementing parking restrictions to finally stop vehicles parking alongside it and restricting visibility?

**Response to Question 48:**

The installation of electronic signs near to St David's School on SEPR / Bromley Road is currently being investigated by Officers. If suitable locations can be found, the signs will be installed later in 2022.

I have also asked Officers to look at the use of parking controls to help improve safety for pedestrians crossing the A214 at this location.

**49) Question from Alison Martin:**

I note the 85th percentile speeds, but please confirm the maximum speeds recorded at each measurement point during the 7-day study period. Please also provide

average (mean) speeds recorded at each point during off-peak hours only i.e., 10am-2pm and 8pm-7am.

Response to Question 49:

The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is the nationally recognised best measure of speed for any road. The use of this measure excludes any bias created by slow moving traffic during congested periods of the day and also by the “outliers” - the drivers who speed and who are not considered to be influenced by anything that a highway authority or Police force can sensibly implement. Another reason that this measure is used is that there will be no bias from the impact of the very high speeds sometimes attained by the blue-light services, especially on routes much used by the emergency services. It is likely that the higher speeds are those of police vehicles responding to emergencies. I do not have the average figures available or if they can be identified for the periods you request.

Please see below the maximum speeds recorded in SEPR below, as requested, they are most likely to be blue light services:

South Eden Park Road/Beckenham Road/St David's Close:

- Max speed (during 7 day study period): 80-85mph

South Eden Park Road/: Hawksbrook Lane:

- Max speed (during 7 day study period): 100+mph

South Eden Park Road/Oakfield Garden

- Max speed (during 7 day study period): 95-100mph

South Eden Park Road/: Creswell Drive

- Max speed (during 7 day study period): 70-75mph

**50) Question from Alison Stammers:**

In the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> September 21 (item 297) “re SEN FREE SCHOOL INCLUDING ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TRANSACTION Report CEF 21037 The Executive considered a report proposing that the Council enters into agreements for the property transactions and operating costs for a new special school in Chislehurst at a site off Bushell Way that had been identified for a 420-place primary school in the Local Plan. The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services, Councillor William Huntington-Thresher, confirmed that the proposals were not in conflict with the borough’s Open Space Strategy, and would preserve the open space. “

Can the portfolio holder please advise how the taking of two additional parcels of land in Walden Woods without consultation, which are NOT included in the Local Plan, and which sustain local biodiversity, is not in conflict with the Council’s Open Space strategy?

Response to Question 50:

It is important not to take comments out of context. The Open Space Strategy, is an Environmental Services strategy on the management of our open and green spaces for the benefit of our residents and biodiversity. However Environmental Services is a part of the Council and on occasion one resident priority will require a compromise between that and other resident priorities. For example, protecting the bio-diversity of some areas such as SSSIs might be best achieved by excluding public access; but public access helps environmental education and supports residents being active for many reasons including physical and mental health.

In the case of the school the land will only be moved inside of the fence if the maximum cohort of the SEN is given planning permission and built-out. If the cohort is smaller the parcels of land will remain publicly accessible. The land would not be built upon it would still be open space, but there wouldn't be public access as it would be inside the fence. The information provided by Education was that the biodiversity of the parcels of land would be maintained, just that it would be inside of a fence. In addition, as the building of the SEN school would move pupils from an out-of-borough to and in-borough setting the transport miles for the students would be reduced with the environmental benefits that would bring including increased time for the pupils with their families. Hopefully the planning process will ensure that the fence maintains a feel of openness and blends into the landscape.

**51) Question from Rajeev Thacker:**

On page 6 of the Draft Portfolio Plan it is said that "(PCNs) have been steadily issued over the year" Could you please clarify what this actually means and how many PCNs have indeed been issued?

Response to Question 51:

Considering seasonal fluctuations and Pandemic, Penalty Charge Notice figures have been similar to previous years/months prior to the start of the Pandemic.

Year/Month	PCNs issued
<b>2018/2019</b>	<b>74,125</b>
<b>2019/2020</b>	<b>78,466</b>
<b>2020/2021</b>	<b>56,962</b>
Apr-21	6,060
May-21	6,643
Jun-21	6,440
Jul-21	6,557
Aug-21	6,805
Sep-21	6,701
Oct-21	7,227
Nov-21	7,989
Dec-21	6,977
Jan-22	6,144
Feb-22	6,207
<b>2021/2022 11 Mths</b>	<b>73,750</b>

**52) Question from Rajeev Thacker:**

The Draft Plan also notes that rising numbers of cars leads to congestion and a reduction in air quality. Given this, why is one of the actions points to make parking "readily available across the borough"? How will this reduce congestion and encourage active travel?

Response to Question 52:

The Council's approach to travel is to make all modes of transport as useable as possible, including active travel modes and cars. Residents will continue to need to park, even as more drivers move to electric vehicles. Managing parking effectively can contribute to ensuring that residents have somewhere to park when they visit shops, travel to work etc.

Whilst not actually encouraging the use of cars when alternative modes of transport are equally viable.

Limiting parking can have the undesirable consequences that cars drive around for longer looking for a parking space increasing pollution or that residents drive to more distant locations increasing emissions and congestion whilst reducing income to local shops potentially affecting their viability. If they were to close more residents would then have to drive. At most destinations in the borough there is a charge for parking whereas walking to them does not incur a charge. There is therefore some discouragement to car use, though the reason for charging is to manage the road space.

More schools in Bromley have Gold standard Travel Plans than in other London boroughs, which is a reflection of the effort put in by Bromley is encouraging schools to adopt policies to encourage active travel, as many home to school trips are switchable to active travel modes.

**53) Question from Lorraine Anim-Addo:**

Residents of Beckenham/SEPR remain concerned about the speed on the road, raising the issue multiple times. You monitored when temp traffic lights were used and only a limited section of the road. Could speed be monitored at various times at different points in the road for a more accurate picture?

Response to Question 53:

A number of speed surveys were placed on the route and operated over a 24/7 period for a full week. The measure used to analyse the higher speeds that drivers choose to travel is the 85th percentile. The use of this measure excludes any bias created by slow moving traffic during congested periods of the day and also by the "outliers" - the drivers who speed and who are not considered to be influenced by anything that a highway authority or Police force can sensibly implement. I am confident that the surveys recently undertaken are an accurate measure of speeds in SEPR and Beckenham Road.

**54) Question from Lorraine Anim-Addo:**

Could you elaborate on the lower cost interim measures referred to bottom of pg 1. Is there a list? If not, when will one be developed?

Response to Question 54:

This is currently being looked at and will be developed as funding becomes available. The main consideration is the utilisation of part-time 20mph flashing signs outside schools for use at school arrival and departure times

**55) Question from Angela Hulm:**

Please confirm the detailed results of the research or formal consultation used in January 2022 to justify the costly removal of segregated cycle lanes and reintroduction of two-way traffic on Albemarle Rd, contrary to the results of the two previous public consultations in favour of keeping the scheme.

Response to Question 55:

Please see the linked report that was presented to the ECS PDS Committee in January: [Enc. 2 for Albemarle Road and Bromley Road Cycle Schemes.pdf](#)

**56) Question from Angela Hulm:**

Please detail cycle parking made available over past year, and numbers of cycle parking hangars to be installed this year particularly for those in multiple occupancy dwellings.

Response to Question 56:

There were 2 bike hangars installed last year. It is hoped to install at least 6 more this year funding permitting

**57) Question from Dermot McKibbon:**

Will the Council take action to deal with the smelly male toilet at Kelsey Park and explain what improvements are planned to update this dated facility? Is the council deliberately running down this facility?

Response to Question 57:

Routine cleansing is contracted to take place twice per day at the Kelsey Park toilets. Condition surveys of the Borough's toilet facilities have been requested and are being undertaken by our Property Colleagues. A formal assessment will follow.

**58) Question from Dermot McKibbon**

What investment is planned for Kelsey Park and how will the public be able to influence investment for this park?

Response to Question 58:

Kelsey Park has been identified as a location for improvement within the Open Space Strategy. Suggestions can be made to enhance and improve Bromley's Parks through idverde's Community Managers for the area: [Penelope.read@idverde.co.uk](mailto:Penelope.read@idverde.co.uk) (Bromley West).

**59) Question from Parisa Wright:**

What holistic Strategy and written Plan does the LBB Carbon Management Team have in place (or imminently planned) for addressing the three main sources of carbon emissions in the borough (IE domestic, transport and consumption emissions), beyond the proposed signposting initiative for reducing domestic emissions. Is a 360' strategy for our borough's emissions a risk management priority?

Response to Question 59:

The Council is already moving forward its work to tackle borough-wide emissions (as and when appropriate funding is made available). A Carbon Management progress report setting out what has already been done (or is currently in progress) was presented at the ECS PDS committee meeting in January 2022 and can be accessed via the Council's website.

In addition, the Carbon Management Team are represented at several London Councils Climate Change Steering/Working Groups to help develop a London-wide plan for achieving net zero emissions by 2030 through cross-borough working - the output will help inform and support the Council to address emissions at a borough-wide level.

Bromley does not exist in isolation and as you highlight consumption emissions may actually be emitted elsewhere in the country or London but still affect our climate. That is why our strategy involves signposting and educating residents and business on the choices they can make and supporting the strategy the Government set out at COP26 as a start to moving the Country to a sustainable carbon footing.

**60) Question from Parisa Wright**

Please confirm when a comprehensive "borough wide" LBB Green Recovery Plan will be published by the Council and how they will support residents to get involved with local green jobs and halving emissions by 2030 (ideally a wide range of community groups, stakeholders and residents are consulted e.g. citizens assembly).

**Response to Question 60:**

This is not within the remit of Environmental Services, though we are playing out part by signposting and educating residents on this subject so there will be a demand for a 'green' industry locally, e.g. green retrofits. Green jobs following from the presence of a local need to be satisfied.



This page is left intentionally blank