

LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

MINUTES

of the proceedings of the Meeting of the
Council of the Borough
held at 7.00 pm on 27 February 2023

Present:

**The Worshipful the Mayor
Councillor Hannah Gray**

**The Deputy Mayor
Councillor Christine Harris**

Councillors

Jeremy Adams	Adam Jude Grant	Alexa Michael
Jonathan Andrews	Dr Sunil Gupta	Angela Page
Jessica Arnold	FRCP FRCPATH	Chris Price
Felicity Bainbridge	Alisa Igoe	Chloe-Jane Ross
Kathy Bance MBE	Julie Ireland	Will Rowlands
Yvonne Bear	Mike Jack	Shaun Slator
Nicholas Bennett J.P.	Simon Jeal	Colin Smith
Kim Botting FRSA	David Jefferys	Diane Smith
Mike Botting	Charles Joel	Mark Smith
Mark Brock	Kevin Kennedy-Brooks	Alison Stammers
David Cartwright QFSM	Josh King	Melanie Stevens
Graeme Casey	Jonathan Laidlaw	Harry Stranger
Will Connolly	Andrew Lee	Ryan Thomson
Aisha Cuthbert	Kate Lymer	Michael Tickner
Peter Dean	Keith Onslow	Pauline Tunnicliffe
Sophie Dunbar	Tony Owen	Thomas Turrell
Robert Evans	Christopher Marlow	Sam Webber
Simon Fawthrop	Ruth McGregor	Rebecca Wiffen
Kira Gabbert	Tony McPartlan	

The meeting was opened with prayers

In the Chair

The Mayor, Councillor Hannah Gray

62 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Colin Hitchins.

63 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

64 To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 12th December 2022

A minor correction was made to Appendix A, page 1, where “embers” should have read “members.”

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 12th December 2022 be confirmed.

65 Personal Statement from Councillor Shaun Slator

With the agreement of the Mayor, Councillor Shaun Slator made the following personal statement –

“Thank you, Madam Mayor, for this opportunity to put forward my public apology. I would like to apologise unreservedly to Council colleagues and to the public for a tweet that I sent in December in response to a news article about an alleged rape. My aim was to highlight the issue of the exploitation of women in Plumstead where I lived for a number of years. However, I recognise it can be read very differently. As soon as this was brought to my attention it was the case I deleted the tweet. It was not my intention to cause any hurt or offence and I apologise whole-heartedly for that which was caused.

I am not ashamed to admit that I am fallible and I have made a mistake. I now understand that with the privilege afforded me as a councillor to better serve my community comes a responsibility to reflect more deeply on what I say and post online. To this end I have de-activated my Twitter and enrolled on a course regarding interacting online and equality and inclusion. I am grateful to be able to take important learnings from this incident and be a better councillor going forwards. I apologise unreservedly for my mistake and pledge to be better going forwards as I continue to serve my community.”

66 Questions

Eight questions had been received from a member of the public for oral reply. The questions, with the answers given, are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

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

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

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

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

At the request of Councillors Alisa Igoe and Simon Jeal, the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families, Councillor Kate Lymer, made a statement on the announcement by the Mayor of London that he would fund free school meals for all primary school children in 2023/24.

The Portfolio Holder stated –

“In the request for a statement, Councillors opposite state that the Mayor is funding free meals. The Mayor, in fact, is not funding them – hard working Londoners and businesses are. The answer, for Labour politicians, is always to keep giving away free stuff, which is not, in fact, free. The answer should be to not take as much money from people in the first place. Sadiq Khan will be raising his precept by 9.74% this coming year. That is an extra £58m he will be taking from all Londoners. When Boris was Mayor, he did not raise his precept once in eight years. In real terms, Boris gave Londoners a tax cut. Sadiq Khan’s precept will have risen by an eye-watering 57% since he was elected. If he wants to help people with the cost of living he should stop taxing them to the hilt. He says he wants to encourage people onto public transport. Strange, then, that he thinks the way to do that is by raising fares by 6% this next year in order to compensate for his own financial mis-management of TfL and despite the Government bailing him out to the tune of over £6bn. If he wants to help people with the cost of living he could stop putting up transport costs, especially as in his last manifesto he said he would freeze them. If he wants to help people with the cost of living he would not be ignoring consultations and pushing on with a pointless ULEZ scheme which punishes the poorest people in and around London for having the audacity to own a car in a semi-rural area, damaging and bankrupting businesses along the way. So, although this money will come from unexpected business rate income this money is still part of the Mayor of London’s gigantic tax collection pot. If he did not want to pass it on to Londoners as a reduction of his precept this money could have been spent on other things which are actually part of his remit such as tackling serious youth violence, or, if not, at the very least he could have had a more targeted approach to who receives a free school meal. We now find ourselves in a situation where the least well-off Londoners are not just paying for the lunches of the children of the middle classes but also the least well-off are now paying for the lunches of children of millionaires. The Councillors opposite in the request for a statement describe the announcement as excellent. I personally do not see how that can be described as an excellent outcome in any way whatsoever. This has the potential to result in anyone, whether they are a lower income household with no children, those saving up before they can afford to start a family or get on the housing ladder, those with pre-school children, those with secondary school children, those with university children, single person households and

pensioners struggling to make ends meet all paying for the lunches for all primary school pupils and for families much wealthier than themselves. That is excellent is it? That is progressive?

Councillor Igoe and Councillor Jeal, who asked for the statement, appear to think it is right that the residents of their wards, such as those living in the Downham Estate in Plaistow, or, for example, the Royston Estate in Penge, pay for the lunches of the children in the Bickley Park Estate in my ward. We, on this side of the chamber, do not think that is right and we are flabbergasted that you appear to be celebrating it.

Another important issue that is a result of this important announcement is that this policy is a total nightmare for schools to administer and finance. Many schools will not have the kitchen and dining facilities that can cope with loads more extra pupils taking more meals at the same time. The Mayor was asked last week at the London Assembly if he would be providing funding for the schools that needed added infrastructure and equipment. The Mayor evaded the question, so we take that as a no, he is not. This means that schools on already tight budgets will have to fork out themselves or juggle around their timetable to do multiple dining sessions, which will disrupt the school day.

Next, let us take a look at the timing of both his announcement and the scheme's implementation. Firstly, he is starting the scheme in September, for one year only. He has been very clear on this point, that it is for one year only. Well, if he is so worried about children in primary school why did he not start it now? Or, at least, after the upcoming Easter holidays. They need the meals right now, don't they? But no, he is waiting to start it in September because if he starts it now, or after the upcoming Easter holidays, the scheme would finish just before his Mayoral election, and that would not be helpful to his campaign, would it?

Secondly, why has he announced it now? Because he is feeling the heat about his disastrous ULEZ expansion scheme which punishes the poorest in London and he is trying to divert attention away by buying votes ahead of next year's election.

In summary, this is ill thought-out, politically motivated gesture politics by a Mayor desperate to deflect attention from the bad press he is getting about ULEZ. He is trying to buy people's votes with freebies. However, the problem is that whilst he is giving with one hand he will be taking much, much more away with the other. But the real moral of this story is that there is no such thing as a free lunch."

In response to questions, the Portfolio Holder stated that there was no intention to reverse a decision by the previous portfolio holder in October 2020 not to provide food support to children in the school holidays, emphasising the range of support available including support and food for 9,200 children in the holiday period. She argued that if the Mayor wanted to help poorer families he should stop making excessive tax and public transport fare rises and the ULEZ expansion. She agreed that, according to the

Mayor's own statement, 30% of children in London already qualified for free school meals, and she was aware of concerns from some educational charities that schools could miss out on vital Pupil Premium funding.

68 2023/24 Council Tax
Report CSD23033

Before the start of this item Councillor Nicholas Bennett declared an interest as a member of the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority.

It was moved by Councillor Nicholas Bennett and seconded by Cllr Colin Smith that Council Procedure Rules be varied at this meeting to allow for one debate on each report covering the original motion, any amendments and where necessary the substantive motion. This was accepted by the Members present.

The Director of Finance reported that there were no changes to the final Mayoral precept accepted by the London Assembly on 23th February 2023.

Since the last meeting of the Executive, there had been further changes on levies and the final position was shown in recommendation 2.1 (e) below.

Members were requested to note that the 2023/24 budget included the impact of the recommended 2023/24 pay award, the supplementary 2022/23 award to meet inflationary pressures and the proposed increase for merited rewards that was reported to Executive on 18th January 2023 and was subject to full Council approval (agenda item 10).

It was important to note that the 2023/24 Central Contingency sum included costs not yet allocated to Portfolio budgets at this stage. Therefore, there would be further changes to the Central Contingency to reflect allocations to individual Portfolio budgets prior to publication of the Financial Control Budget.

The above changes would require the following proposed amendments to be made to the recommendations of the Executive:

“Amended Recommendation (2.1)

- (b)** Approves the draft revenue budgets (as in Appendix 2) for 2023/24 to include the following updated changes in (d) and (e):
- (d)** Approves a revised Central Contingency sum of £17,560k to reflect the changes in (e);
- (e)** **Approves the following provisions for levies for inclusion in the budget for 2023/24:**

	£'000
London Pensions Fund Authority	448
London Boroughs Grant Committee	246

Environment Agency (flood defence etc.)	266
Lee Valley Regional Park	341
Total	1,301

- (f) Notes the final position on the GLA precept, as accepted by the London Assembly on 23rd February 2023;
- (g) Sets a 4.99% increase in Bromley’s council tax for 2023/24 compared with 2022/23 (2.99% general increase plus 2% Adult Social Care Precept) and a 9.7% increase in the GLA precept.

Amended Recommendation (2.2)

Council Tax 2023/24 – Statutory Calculations and Resolutions (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).

Subject to 2.1 (a) to (k) above, if the formal Council Tax Resolution as detailed

below is approved, the total Band D Council Tax will be as follows:

	2022/23 £	2023/24 £	Increase £	Increase % (note #)
Bromley (general)	1,178.15	1,218.25	40.10	2.99
Bromley (ASC precept)	162.98	189.80	26.82	2.00
Bromley (total)	1,341.13	1,408.05	66.92	4.99
GLA *	395.59	434.14	38.55	9.7
Total	1,736.72	1,842.19	105.47	6.07

- (#) in line with the 2022/23 Council Tax Referendum Principles, the % increase applied is based on an authority’s “relevant basic amount of Council Tax” (£1,341.13 for Bromley) – see paragraph 6 below.

Amended Recommendation (2.3):

- (3) That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2023/24 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act):
- (a) £617,683k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
- (b) £429,053k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates or the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- (4) Notes that the Greater London Authority (GLA) has issued a precept to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council’s area as indicated in the table below.

- (6) That the Council hereby determines that its relevant basic amount of council tax for the financial year 2023/24, which reflects a 4.99% increase (including Adult Social Care Precept of 2%), is not excessive. The Referendums Relating to Council Tax Increases (Principles) (England) Report 2023/24 sets out the principles which the Secretary of State has determined will apply to local authorities in England in 2023/24. The Council is required to determine whether its relevant basic amount of Council Tax is excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.”

The recommendations as altered above were moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow and seconded by Councillor Colin Smith.

The following amendments were moved by Councillor Simon Jeal and seconded by Councillor Jeremy Adams.

“The following changes be made to the recommended budget for 2023/24:

Additional Recommendation (2.1):

- (k) Utilise total funding of £5.075m (as set out in Appendix 1) to be invested in services over the years 2023/24 to 2026/27 summarised by year as set out below.

	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	Total
See Appendix 1	£1.160m	£1.148m	£978k	£1.788m	£5.075m

- (l) To reflect the additional utilisation of the Central Contingency by an amount totalling £300,000, approving a revised Central Contingency sum of £17,236k, noting that over the 4-year period there will be a cumulative saving of £21k. All other amounts will be funded from Earmarked Reserves
- (m) Amend the council tax support scheme for 2023/24 to allow an increase in the maximum support provided by the Council from 70% to 75% for Band A to D properties. The 2022/23 scheme for Band E and above properties would remain unchanged. This will be for 2023/24 only at a net loss of income of £366k to be funded from earmarked reserves.
- (n) Reducing the merited pay award from £400k to £220k. The £180k saved will then be utilised as a payment for the lowest paid staff below the median.
- (o) Agree that ongoing costs beyond 2026/27 relating to the utilisation of Earmarked Reserves will need to be reviewed as part of any final

2027/28 budget proposal for 2027/28. Further details of (k), (l) and (m) are provided in Appendix 1 on the following page.”

The following members voted in favour of the amendment:

Councillors Jeremy Adams, Jessica Arnold, Kathy Bance, Alisa Igoe, Simon Jeal, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Josh King, Ruth McGregor, Tony McPartlan, Chris Price, Ryan Thomson and Rebecca Wiffen (12).

The following members voted against the amendment:

Councillors Jonathan Andrews, Felicity Bainbridge, Yvonne Bear, Nicholas Bennett, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Mark Brock, David Cartwright, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Sophie Dunbar, Robert Evans, Simon Fawthrop, Kira Gabbert, Adam Grant, Sunil Gupta, Christine Harris, Mike Jack, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Jonathan Laidlaw, Andrew Lee, Kate Lymer, Christopher Marlow, Alexa Michael, Keith Onslow, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Will Rowlands, Shaun Slator, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Mark Smith, Alison Stammers, Melanie Stevens, Harry Stranger, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe and Thomas Turrell (39)

The following members abstained:

Councillors Graeme Casey, Will Connolly, Hannah Gray, Julie Ireland, Chloe-Jane Ross and Sam Webber (6).

The amendment was **LOST**.

The following amendments were moved by Councillor Julie Ireland and seconded by Councillor Chloe-Jane Ross.

“The following changes be made to the recommended budget for 2023/24:

Additional Recommendation (2.1):

- (a) On the basis of potential costs of £140k relating to the legal challenge for ULEZ which would need to be funded from the Central Contingency, it is recommended not to proceed with legal challenge and use the potential monies released as follows;
- Funding for Air Quality Nodes (£20k)
 - Funding for School Streets (£50k)
 - Additional Funding for Road Safety Projects (£70k).
- (b) With the expectation of increased revenue as a result of increased interest rates and lower than expected inflation rates, it is recommended to set aside £500k for a Community Resilience Fund. The full £500k would be met from the inflation provision in the Central Contingency sum.

- (c) Ringfence 3 projects funded where Officers have identified equivalent revenue savings;
- Develop and implement a Digital Inclusion Strategy (£50k)
 - Support for Youth Services (up to £75k)
 - Install parking meters that take card payments at key locations (£50k)”

The following members voted in favour of the amendment:

Councillors Graeme Casey, Will Connolly, Julie Ireland, Chloe-Jane Ross and Sam Webber (5).

The following members voted against the amendment:

Councillors Jonathan Andrews, Felicity Bainbridge, Yvonne Bear, Nicholas Bennett, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Mark Brock, David Cartwright, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Sophie Dunbar, Robert Evans, Simon Fawthrop, Kira Gabbert, Adam Grant, Sunil Gupta, Christine Harris, Mike Jack, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Jonathan Laidlaw, Andrew Lee, Kate Lymer, Christopher Marlow, Alexa Michael, Keith Onslow, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Will Rowlands, Shaun Slator, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Mark Smith, Alison Stammers, Melanie Stevens, Harry Stranger, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe and Thomas Turrell (39)

The following members abstained:

Councillors Jeremy Adams, Jessica Arnold, Kathy Bance, Hannah Gray, Alisa Igoe, Simon Jeal, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Josh King, Ruth McGregor, Tony McPartlan, Chris Price, Ryan Thomson and Rebecca Wiffen (13).

The amendment was **LOST**.

Accordingly, the following recommendations of the Executive, with the changes proposed by the Director of Finance as moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow and seconded by Councillor Colin Smith were considered.

2.1 Council resolves that -

- (a) **Note the Final Local Government Settlement 2023/24, announced by DLUHC on 6th February, which included additional Services Grant funding of £61.5k and that these monies be set aside within the 2023/24 Central Contingency.**
- (b) **Approve the schools budget of £98.674m which matches the estimated level of Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) after academy recoupment;**
- (c) **Approves the draft revenue budgets (as in Appendix 2) for 2023/24 to include the following updated changes in (d) and (e).**

- (d) Approves a revised Central Contingency sum of £17,484k to mainly reflect the final changes in (e).
- (e) Approves the following provisions for levies for inclusion in the budget for 2023/24:

	£'000
London Pensions Fund Authority	448
London Boroughs Grant Committee	246
Environment Agency (flood defence etc.)	266
Lee Valley Regional Park	341
Total	1,301

- (f) Notes the final position on the GLA precept, as accepted by the London Assembly on 23rd February 2023.
- (g) Sets a 4.99% increase in Bromley's council tax for 2023/24 compared with 2022/23 (2.99% general increase plus 2% Adult Social Care Precept) and a 9.7% increase in the GLA precept.
- (h) Sets a 2% increase in Adult Social Care Precept with a 2.99% increase in Bromley's General Council Tax, compared with 2022/23 (1% Adult Social Care Precept) and notes that, based upon their consultation exercise, the GLA are currently assuming a 9.7% increase in the GLA precept.
- (i) Approve the revised draft 2023/24 revenue budgets to reflect the changes detailed above.
- (j) Approve the approach to reserves outlined by the Director of Finance (see Appendix 4).
- (k) Notes that the Executive agrees that the Director of Finance be authorised to report any further changes directly to Council on 27th February 2023.

2.2 Council Tax 2023/24 – Statutory Calculations and Resolutions (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).

Subject to 2.1 (a) to (k) above, if the formal Council Tax Resolution as detailed below is approved, the total Band D Council Tax will be as follows:

	2022/23 £	2023/24 £	Increase £	Increase % (note #)
Bromley (general)	1,178.15	1,218.25	40.10	2.99
Bromley (ASC precept)	162.98	189.80	26.82	2.00
Bromley (total)	1,341.13	1,408.05	66.92	4.99
GLA *	395.59	434.14	38.55	9.7

Total	1,736.72	1,842.19	105.47	6.07
--------------	-----------------	-----------------	---------------	-------------

- (#) in line with the 2022/23 Council Tax Referendum Principles, the % increase applied is based on an authority's "relevant basic amount of Council Tax" (£1,341.13 for Bromley) – see paragraph 6 below.

2.3 Council resolves as follows -

1. It be noted that the Council Tax Base for 2023/24 is 134,093 'Band D' equivalent properties.
2. Calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2023/2024 is £188,810k.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2023/24 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the Act):
 - (a) £617,683k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
 - (b) £429,053k being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates or the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - (c) £188,810k being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
 - (d) £1,408.05 being the amount at 3(c) above, divided by (1) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year.
4. Notes that the Greater London Authority (GLA) has issued a precept to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.
5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the table below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2023/24 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Valuation Bands	London Borough of Bromley £	Greater London Authority £	Aggregate of Council Tax Requirements £
A	938.70	289.43	1,228.13
B	1,095.15	337.66	1,432.81

C	1,251.60	385.90	1,637.50
D	1,408.05	434.14	1,842.19
E	1,720.95	530.62	2,251.57
F	2,033.85	627.09	2,660.94
G	2,346.75	723.57	3,070.32
H	2,816.10	868.28	3,684.38

6. That the Council hereby determines that its relevant basic amount of council tax for the financial year 2023/24, which reflects a 4.99% increase (including Adult Social Care Precept of 2%), is not excessive. The Referendums Relating to Council Tax Increases (Principles) (England) Report 2023/24 sets out the principles which the Secretary of State has determined will apply to local authorities in England in 2023/24. The Council is required to determine whether its relevant basic amount of Council Tax is excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

The following members voted in favour of the motion:

Councillors Jonathan Andrews, Felicity Bainbridge, Yvonne Bear, Nicholas Bennett, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Mark Brock, David Cartwright, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Sophie Dunbar, Robert Evans, Simon Fawthrop, Kira Gabbert, Adam Grant, Sunil Gupta, Christine Harris, Mike Jack, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Jonathan Laidlaw, Andrew Lee, Kate Lymer, Christopher Marlow, Alexa Michael, Keith Onslow, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Will Rowlands, Shaun Slator, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Mark Smith, Alison Stammers, Melanie Stevens, Harry Stranger, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe and Thomas Turrell (39)

The following members voted against the motion:

Councillors Jeremy Adams, Jessica Arnold, Kathy Bance, Graham Casey, Will Connolly, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland, Simon Jeal, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Josh King, Ruth McGregor, Tony McPartlan, Chris Price, Chloe-Jane Ross, Ryan Thomson, Sam Webber and Rebecca Wiffen (17)

The following member abstained:

Councillor Hannah Gray (1)

The original motion as altered was **CARRIED**.

During consideration of this item the Mayor informed Members under Council Procedure Rule 8 that the meeting had been in progress for three hours. Members agreed to continue the meeting to deal with all the business on the agenda.

69 Council Tax Support Scheme 2023/24
Report CSD23032

A motion to approve the Council Tax Support Scheme 2023/24, increasing the Discretionary Hardship Fund to £225 per annum and noting that from 2023/24

the Scheme will only be revised to incorporate any changes required by legislation and/or as a result of the annual uprating of benefits – public consultation will only be undertaken in future years when a fundamental change to the scheme is proposed - was moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow, seconded by councillor Colin Smith and **CARRIED**.

70 Capital Strategy 2023/24 to 2026/27 and Q3 Capital Programme Monitoring
Report CSD23034

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Jeremy Adams and seconded by Councillor Simon Jeal.

“Additional Recommendation:

- (v) agree a supplementary capital estimate of £15,275k for the period 2023/24 to 2026/27 to be funded by £400k from the Growth Fund earmarked reserve and £14,950k by sourcing a partner to acquire a 49% interest in the Direct Line building.”

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

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Julie Ireland and seconded by Councillor Chloe-Jane Ross.

“Additional Recommendation:

- (v) to make a provision of up to £1m to help community groups purchase Community House and the Public Halls and reduce the equivalent provision in the capital programme.”

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

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Mark Smith and seconded by Councillor Alison Stammers.

“Additional Recommendation:

- (v) agree that officers bring forward the development work of Chislehurst Library to be undertaken in 2023/24 (costs of £1m), rather than in 2024/25 as assumed in the latest Capital Programme.”

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

A motion to (i) approve the new schemes and other changes to the programme identified in the report, (ii) approve the refinancing of the Council’s existing Housing Schemes through long-term borrowing of £49.2m, (iii) approve the use of up to £10m of earmarked revenue reserves to support funding of the Council’s capital programme and (iv) agree that all new and existing Housing Schemes should be funded by long term borrowing, was

Council
27 February 2023

moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow, seconded by Councillor Colin Smith and **CARRIED**.

71 Treasury Management - Annual Investment Strategy 2023/24 and Quarter 3 Performance 2022/23
Report CSD23036

A motion to note the Treasury Management performance report for the third quarter of 2022/23 and agree to adopt the Treasury Management Statement and Annual Investment Strategy for 2023/24 including (i) the Prudential Indicators for the period 2023/24 to 2025/26, (ii) the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy statement and (iii) revised minimum credit ratings for Housing Associations (BBB+) and Corporate Bonds (BBB+) was moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow, seconded by Councillor Colin Smith and **CARRIED**.

72 2023/24 Pay Award
Report CSD23011

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Rebecca Wiffen and seconded by Councillor Josh King -

“Replace the text of recommendation (1) (iii): An additional £200k towards Merited Rewards, for 2023/24, bringing the total to £400k for rewarding staff for exceptional performance;

With:

(iii) An increase to Merited Rewards, for 2023/24, to a total of £220k, allocating £180k to provide an additional pay increase to the Council’s lowest paid staff- including ensuring that salaries of all staff are increased to the London Living Wage or more.”

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

A motion to approve (i) a flat 2% pay increase for all staff (excluding teachers who are covered by a separate statutory pay negotiating process) in response to the unexpected spiralling inflation post the 2022/3 pay award agreed by full Council; the increase would be effective from 1st April 2023; (ii) a flat 5.75% pay increase for all staff (excluding teachers who are covered by a separate statutory pay negotiating process) for 2023/24; (iii) an additional £200k towards Merited Rewards, for 2023/24, bringing the total to £400k for rewarding staff for exceptional performance; (iv) that the Trade Unions’ pay claim for staff be rejected (see paragraph 3.12 of the report and attached appendices) and to note that, as in the previous years since coming out of the nationally/regionally negotiated frameworks, Bromley staff will receive the 2023/24 pay increase in time for the April pay, was moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow, seconded by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe and **CARRIED**.

73 Pay Policy Statement 2023/24
Report CSD23012

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Josh King and seconded by Councillor Rebecca Wiffen -

“Add the following words to the end of the recommendation:

‘subject to the following change.

Section 5

5.4 London Living Wage

The Council believes all staff should be paid a real Living Wage, to guarantee that all of our staff, as a minimum, earn enough to reflect the current cost of living and what a household needs to get by, rather than be paid in reference to a percentage of median earnings.

The Council therefore ensures that no member of staff is paid less than the hourly London Living Wage rate- calculated independently by the Living Wage Foundation. For 2023/2024 this hourly rate is £11.95.”

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

A motion to approve the 2023/24 Pay Policy Statement as recommended was moved by Councillor Christopher Marlow, seconded by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe and **CARRIED**.

74 Members Allowances Scheme 2023/24
Report CSD23013

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Tony McPartlan and seconded by Councillor Alisa Igoe -

“(1) The Council has considered the proposed Members Allowances Scheme 2023/24 and the Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Allowances and recommends that allowances are retained amended from 1st April 2023, subject to the following changes:

1. The basic allowance should be increased by 4.5% to £11,905.69;
2. An increased allowance for the Chairmen of Audit and Risk Management Committee and Pensions Committee (bringing these posts into line with PDS Chairmen.);
3. The allowance for Executive Assistants shall be removed;
4. No other changes to allowances shall be paid;
5. That the saving of £61k against the cost of the Conservative Party's proposals be allocated to the Council's Welfare Fund.”

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

A motion to approve the Members Allowances Scheme 2023/24 and the Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Allowances for 2023/24 based on the proposals supported by General Purposes and Licensing Committee from the Conservative group for most allowances to be increased by 7.75% (rounded up as necessary) with increased allowances for the Deputy Leader, the Chairmen of Pensions Committee and Audit and Risk Management Committee and various Vice-Chairman roles, but removing the proposal to delete the allowance for the leader of the second largest minority group, was moved by Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, seconded by Councillor Mike Botting and **CARRIED**.

75 SACRE Annual Report 2021/22
Report CSD230014

A motion to receive and note the SACRE Annual Report 2021/22 was moved by Councillor David Jefferys, seconded by Councillor Robert Evans and **CARRIED**.

76 West Wickham Library and Housing Project Update and Award of Works Contract
Report CSD23035

A motion to note the decisions made by the Executive and approve a supplementary capital estimate of £3,959k to cover construction price inflation since November 2021, when the project was originally added to the capital programme, and an increased contingency allowance, was moved by Councillor Yvonne Bear, seconded by Councillor Tony Owen and **CARRIED**.

77 To consider Motions of which notice has been given.

(A) Comments made by Cllr Slator

The following motion was moved by Councillor Kathy Bance MBE and seconded by Councillor Simon Jeal:

"On 31 December 2022 Councillor Shaun Slator tweeted "more likely that it's a punter that didn't pay" in response to a news article entitled "Woman raped in Plumstead park in early hours".

The Council considers this comment to be misogynistic and perpetuates a negative perception of rape victims.

The Council's Violence Against Women and Girls Strategy sets out the support services provided to victims of sexual violence. Such comments by an elected member of the Council undermine it and risks victims of rape feeling unable to access such services if they feel the Council's representatives are prejudiced against them.

While the Council's Monitoring Officer and the Independent Person have concluded that the Councillors' Code of Conduct is not engaged and therefore

under the relevant legal requirements no Standard Committee investigation can take place, this Council unequivocally condemns Cllr Slator's comments and considers they are unacceptable for a member of this Council to have made.

On 31 December 2022 Councillor Shaun Slator tweeted "more likely that it's a punter that didn't pay" in response to a news article entitled "Woman raped in Plumstead park in early hours."

While the Council's Monitoring Officer and the Independent Person have concluded that the Councillors' Code of Conduct is not engaged and therefore under the relevant legal requirements no Standards Committee investigation can take place, this Council unequivocally condemns Cllr Slator's comments and considers that they are unacceptable for a member of this Council to have made.

It also be noted that Cllr Slator was suspended from the Conservative Group on Bromley Council on 5th January 2023 for said comments, and will remain thus, until such time as he attends Full Council to make an unreserved apology for his actions including an undertaking not to repeat similar assertions in future and also attend appropriate training or voluntary work, as deemed appropriate by the Administration."

The following amended version of the motion was moved by Councillor Colin Smith and seconded by Councillor Michael Tickner –

"On 31 December 2022 Councillor Shaun Slator tweeted "more likely that it's a punter that didn't pay" in response to a news article entitled "Woman raped in Plumstead park in early hours."

While the Council's Monitoring Officer and the Independent Person have concluded that the Councillors Code of Conduct is not engaged and therefore under the relevant legal requirements no Standards Committee investigation can take place, this Council unequivocally condemns Cllr Slator's comments and considers they are unacceptable for a member of this Council to have made.

It also be noted that Cllr Slator was suspended from the Conservative Group on Bromley Council on 5th January 2023 for said comments, and will remain thus, until such time as he attends Full Council to make an unreserved apology for his actions, including an undertaking not to repeat similar assertions in future and also attend appropriate training or voluntary work, as deemed appropriate by the Administration."

The following members voted in favour of the amendment:

Councillors Jonathan Andrews, Felicity Bainbridge, Yvonne Bear, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Mark Brock, David Cartwright, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Robert Evans, Simon Fawthrop, Kira Gabbert, Adam Grant, Sunil Gupta, Christine Harris, Mike Jack, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Jonathan Laidlaw, Andrew Lee, Kate Lymer, Christopher Marlow, Alexa Michael, Keith Onslow,

Council
27 February 2023

Tony Owen, Angela Page, Will Rowlands, Shaun Slator, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Harry Stranger, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe and Thomas Turrell (34)

The following members voted against the amendment:

Councillors Jeremy Adams, Jessica Arnold, Kathy Bance, Graham Casey, Will Connolly, Sophie Dunbar, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland, Simon Jeal, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Josh King, Ruth McGregor, Tony McPartlan, Chris Price, Chloe-Jane Ross, Ryan Thomson, and Rebecca Wiffen (17)

The following members abstained:

Councillors Nicholas Bennett, Hannah Gray, Mark Smith, Alison Stammers, Melanie Stevens and Sam Webber (6)

The amendment was **CARRIED**.

The following Members voted for the substantive motion:

Councillors Jonathan Andrews, Felicity Bainbridge, Yvonne Bear, Nicholas Bennett, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Mark Brock, David Cartwright, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Robert Evans, Simon Fawthrop, Kira Gabbert, Adam Grant, Sunil Gupta, Christine Harris, Mike Jack, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Jonathan Laidlaw, Andrew Lee, Kate Lymer, Christopher Marlow, Alexa Michael, Keith Onslow, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Will Rowlands, Shaun Slator, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Mark Smith, Melanie Stevens, Harry Stranger, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe and Thomas Turrell (37)

The following members voted against the substantive motion:

Councillors Jeremy Adams, Jessica Arnold, Kathy Bance, Graham Casey, Will Connolly, Sophie Dunbar, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland, Simon Jeal, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Josh King, Ruth McGregor, Tony McPartlan, Chris Price, Chloe-Jane Ross, Ryan Thomson, Sam Webber and Rebecca Wiffen (18)

The following members abstained:

Councillors Hannah Gray and Alison Stammers (2)

The substantive motion was **CARRIED**.

(B) ULEZ

The following motion (as altered) was moved by Cllr Nicholas Bennett and seconded by Cllr Aisha Cuthbert:

“This Council supports the action taken by the Leader and the Executive Member for Transport, Highways and Road Safety in not approving the erection of cameras and signs on Bromley roads and the commissioning, with other London and county local councils, of counsel’s opinion on the legality of Mayor Khan’s proposals to extend the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) to outer London.

Council notes the thoroughly misleading statements by Mayor Khan in reference to Bromley's air quality, which is amongst the best in London.

Council further notes the recent revelations, following a Freedom of Information request, by City Hall Conservatives, which showed that contrary to Sadiq Kahn's assurances.

- His senior officers and deputy Mayor for Transport were receiving weekly updates on the progress of the consultation and the voting;
- that he employed a social marketing company, at public expense, to target those most likely to be in favour of ULEZ to boost the 'Yes' vote;
- having seen how the vote was progressing then disallowed more than 5000 votes against ULEZ
- despite this more than 59% of respondents were opposed to the imposition of the Zone on outer London.

Council congratulates our local London Assembly Member Peter Fortune AM on his diligent research and forensic examination of Mayor Khan to expose the manipulation of the consultation."

This Council reiterates its opposition to the imposition of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone on Bromley as it will have a serious impact on the self-employed, small businesses which rely on their vehicles to conduct their trade and on elderly residents and others on fixed incomes. The imposition of a daily charge to drive in the borough will be an additional financial burden and, for many, without the means purchase a compliant vehicle, it will mean they can no longer trade or afford to drive. The extension of the ULEZ charge on motorists, including those entering Bromley from neighbouring counties will also be detrimental, especially for those like nurses, police officers, supermarket shelf fillers and others working unsocial hours when public transport is not available.

This Council therefore requests the Leader and the Executive to continue to oppose the Mayor's ULEZ decision, challenge it by way of legal action and agree funding in the region of £140k to be met from the Council's 2022/23 Central Contingency Sum.

The following Members voted for the motion:

Councillors Jonathan Andrews, Felicity Bainbridge, Yvonne Bear, Nicholas Bennett, Kim Botting, Mike Botting, Mark Brock, David Cartwright, Aisha Cuthbert, Peter Dean, Robert Evans, Simon Fawthrop, Kira Gabbert, Adam Grant, Sunil Gupta, Christine Harris, Mike Jack, David Jefferys, Charles Joel, Jonathan Laidlaw, Andrew Lee, Kate Lymer, Christopher Marlow, Alexa Michael, Keith Onslow, Tony Owen, Angela Page, Will Rowlands, Shaun Slator, Colin Smith, Diane Smith, Mark Smith, Alison Stammers, Melanie Stevens, Harry Stranger, Michael Tickner, Pauline Tunnicliffe and Thomas Turrell (38)

Council
27 February 2023

The following members voted against the motion:

Councillors Jeremy Adams, Jessica Arnold, Kathy Bance, Graham Casey, Will Connolly, Sophie Dunbar, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland, Simon Jeal, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Josh King, Ruth McGregor, Tony McPartlan, Chris Price, Chloe-Jane Ross, Ryan Thomson, Sam Webber and Rebecca Wiffen (18)

The following member abstained:

Councillor Hannah Gray (1)

The motion was **CARRIED**.

78 The Mayor's announcements and communications.

The Mayor thanked Members who attended the Holocaust Memorial Day in January, the Whisky Tasting Evening and the Ukraine Remembrance Service.

The Mayor advised Members about her Charity Dinner at the Honourable Artillery Company on 6th April and reminded them to buy their Fly a Spitfire Prize Draw tickets – the draw would be on 21st April.

79 Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 and the Freedom of Information Act 2000

RESOLVED that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the item of business referred to below as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

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

80 West Wickham Library and Housing Project Update and Award of Works Contract (Part 2)

A motion to note the Part 2 information relating to the West Wickham Library and Housing Project was recommended by the Executive was moved by Cllr Yvonne Bear, seconded by Cllr Tony Owen and **CARRIED**.

The Meeting ended at 0.20 am

Mayor

Council

27 February 2023

Questions from Members of the Public for Oral Reply

1. From Thomas Murphy to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee

What specific steps are the Council taking to raise awareness of the new voter ID laws for elections? And would it be possible to have a page on Bromley Council's website outlining the new requirements, with a link to the Voter Authority Certificate application page on gov.uk?

Reply:

As there are no scheduled elections in Bromley this year (our next scheduled elections are the GLA elections on 2 May 2024), we are taking a 'soft touch' approach to raise awareness of the new Voter ID requirements.

We are in the process of creating new pages on the Council website outlining the new provisions of the Elections Act 2022 (including the requirement to produce photographic ID at polling stations). This will include a link to the Voter Authority Certificate application page on the new Government online service.

In the meantime, the Electoral Commission launched its public awareness campaign in January 2023 across England (not just in election areas) to ensure voters understand the changes. This includes adverts on national television and radio.

Next year here in Bromley we will undertake an extensive and targeted local awareness raising campaign – this will include updating the Council website, distributing posters and leaflets in prime locations and to local community organisations, using social media (Facebook and Twitter) and issuing timely local press releases.

In addition to these awareness activities, details of the new voter ID requirements will also be included on the poll cards which will be sent to every (eligible) voter in Bromley towards the end of March next year.

2. From Susan Moore to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee

The Council will be aware that the new voter ID laws will disproportionately affect young people and ethnic minority voters, who are less likely to have photo ID, what steps are the Council taking to ensure that these specific groups are not disenfranchised during elections?

Reply:

Where an individual does not have one of the accepted forms of photographic ID, they can apply for free for a Voter Authority Certificate from Bromley or their local authority.

We are in the process of creating new pages on the Council website outlining the new provisions of the Elections Act 2022 which I referred to in the previous reply, and this will include the requirement to produce photographic ID at a polling station. This will include a link to the Voter Authority Certificate application page on the new Government online service.

We here in Bromley will be undertaking an Equalities Impact Screening and full Assessment on the new measures being introduced through the Elections Act 2022 (including Voter ID) and the impact on any group of voters with one of the nine protected characteristics. This should ensure that any barriers to participation are identified (and where possible, removed) and voters are not disenfranchised or put off voting, whilst ensuring the effective implementation of the changes and maintaining the integrity of the elections.

Bromley was one of five local authorities along with Gosport, Swindon, Watford and Woking selected by the Cabinet Office to conduct Voter ID pilots at the Local elections on 3 May 2018. Following the election, both the Returning Officer's findings and the Electoral Commissions' evaluation indicated that there was no evidence any specific group of people who struggled with the ID requirement or that ID requirements significantly deterred voters from voting.

Supplementary Question:

Some other local councils have done calculations on how long it will take to put together all the resources and the time and capacity it will take to produce the ID that people will need. Have Bromley started to do any calculations or started to think about the amount of work and person hours that it will take to deliver ID for people who currently don't have it?

Reply:

I don't specifically know the answer to your question but I have every confidence in Carol Ling who is responsible for this part of the Council, and her team, to ensure that this will happen. If you have any further queries or would like some further information I will be happy to email Mrs Ling tomorrow.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Fawthrop:

Is Cllr Tunnicliffe aware that during the trials that took place in 2018 the turnout was not affected at all by Voter ID, and one of the most remarkable things was that more people spoilt their ballot papers than were turned away and deprived of a vote?

Reply:

Yes, I am aware of that and there were very few issues, a matter of a handful. Those voters returned and voted, as far as I am aware.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Graeme Casey:

Are we aware of how many incidences of voter fraud we have had in Bromley previously, just in the local elections?

Reply:

I cannot answer that specifically this evening, but I am happy to come back to you with an answer.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:

Is Cllr Tunncliffe aware of any incidence of voter fraud in the London Borough of Bromley?

Reply:

I am not.

3. From Angela Wilkins to the Leader of the Council

Please provide full details of consultations that the Council has undertaken with BVST (as leaseholder), and with other tenants or organisations who currently rent office or other space in Community House, regarding the sale of this building.

Reply:

I am advised that the Assistant Director for Integrated Commissioning discussed the plans with two of the key service providers located there on the 29th November and 8th December.

The Chief Executive and I met with BVST's Chief Executive on 19th January and I am advised that conversations remain ongoing.

Supplementary Question:

The decision in principle to sell this building was made in December – on the basis of that I would like to ask if it would have been better if Members had been aware that the tenants in Community House do not wish to move to the Direct Line premises. Would it not have been better to have an informed decision made by this Council – Councillors would have been aware in advance, had there been consultation, that the tenants were not prepared to move.

Reply:

We had two informed debates, one at the Executive and one at full Council. Members were fully aware of the decision that was being taken and I would remind all concerned that it is not as if the charities that are based there will not have a home – they will stay there as protected tenants if they wish to, even if and when the building is sold. They have a two and a half year protection over the fact that they are trying to turn it into an asset of community value which we wish them the best of luck over. That featured in the conversation with the Chief Executive and I. So, no, apart from the fact that the process was speedy it formed part of the operational

property review – it was a decision taken around many Council properties. Ultimately, as I told the last full Council anyone that wants to move to better, more modern offices will be very welcome if they wish to, but there is no compulsion

4. From Richard Honess to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

What is the criteria for a pothole to be fixed on a residential street?

Reply:

A defect measuring 40mm is the level at which we repair, but in the case of, say, a pedestrian crossing, we look at a lower one for pedestrian safety.

Supplementary Question:

I have been monitoring a street in my area in St Mary Cray called Elizabeth Way, which has been suffering severe deterioration of the road surface for a while - I think my first report was in July 2021. I have subsequently re-reported that particular street on numerous occasions – at least three or four times since then as the road surface has deteriorated – on Fix My Street. Every time I report it I get the reply that the deterioration does not meet the criteria for fixing. I looked at it today and it certainly has met that criteria on a number of occasions when I have been told it did not. I have also heard rumours that there are plans for that street to be resurfaced – can you confirm whether that street is due for resurfacing and if not, if I put another report on will it be fixed?

Reply:

I understand from your ward member that it is on the list. There are thirteen teams out repairing streets – they are doing about seventy a day. This is not quite the time to do most of them because once we get to April and the weather improves the repairs will stay in place. We do have 537 miles of road in Bromley – we are the biggest London Borough, and that would stretch from here to Zurich. It does take some time – this is a national, and an international problem – but I can reassure you that your road is one of the thirty four planned for resurfacing in the coming financial year. Nj j

5. From Ju Owens to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement

Could you please outline how much the Council have spent in the past four years, and on what, funding actions to make Bromley streets safer for women?

Reply:

There are a wide range of actions either fully or part-funded by the authority such as our CCTV network and street lighting. Regarding specific projects to make Bromley's streets safer for women, this spend is spread over several service areas and is mainly officer time spent working with partners. Therefore there is no specific budget but it is estimated at about £100,000. Such projects include the Licensing Team

carrying out anti-drink spiking publicity, and publicising Ask Angela and the Community Safety Officers working with churches and Street Pastors and encouraging licensed premises to sign up to the Night Safety Charter.

Supplementary Question:

Can you advise whether these measures have been successful and how such success has been measured?

Reply:

When we do put in for funding from the Mayor's Office or elsewhere we do not have much feedback because we are considered to have a very safe borough.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:

Is that £100,00 per year or over four years?

Reply:

That is per year.

6. From Angela Wilkins to the Leader of the Council

In deciding to put Community House up for sale immediately, what is the Council most interested in:

- a. Obtaining the maximum capital receipt; or
- b. Finding tenants to subsidise the costs of running its new, very large Council offices; or
- c. Ensuring that the social, health, economic and community benefits that are the outputs from Community House can continue and thereby support local residents.

Reply:

The answer is A and C in equal measure.

The Council will not be able to continue funding 'C' to the extent we would all prefer to see and do so in future, unless it takes numerous very difficult decisions such as 'A'. Both are inextricably linked.

Thus the decision to do so in December.

Supplementary Question:

Given that the decision to sell was made in the context of an assumption that the tenants would move, and given that Cllr Smith has just confirmed that obtaining the maximum capital receipt is one of the priorities of the Council, can he explain why the decision has been made in such a hurry to sell this property with sitting tenants?

Reply:

It achieves best value, it helps us to achieve capital income which we need for other projects such as housing. It is an investment property and we deem it the correct

thing to do to sell it now. It is not as if the current tenants are going to be homeless. All that will happen, if and when it is sold, is that it will have different landlords and protected tenancy under the Tenancy Act.

Additional Supplementary Question from Ms Wilkins:

My point was that the property is being sold with sitting tenants, which in general lowers the value, so I do not believe my question was properly answered.

Reply:

I believe it was clear – I am happy with the answer given.

7. From Richard Honess to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

18 months ago, I asked a question about the upkeep of the Rookery Gardens Estate and was assured by the then RRH Portfolio Holder that the matter would be discussed and actioned. What discussions and actions have subsequently taken place?

Reply:

I'm pleased to say that we've taken action since your question in October 2021.

We have reviewed the ownership records to establish the green spaces that we own and officers have made several monitoring visits over and above what is normal for the Council's contract monitoring to ensure our land is being maintained.

Officers continue to work with the housing association that owns the estate, Clarion, to come up with a solution for maintenance on their land.

We are absolutely clear that when it comes to bulky waste for example, that is the responsibility of Clarion and as a responsible social landlord they should accept that responsibility.

Supplementary Question:

Yes, it is the bulk waste collection that continues to plague that estate with overflowing rubbish bins and bins that are not big enough. Do you know how long it will take Clarion to resolve these issues and what it is that they are planning to do?

Reply:

I cannot answer that today but if you do write to me I will take that up with some of the senior leadership team at Clarion.

8. From Ju Owens to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement

When launching their £200 million fund for active travel schemes (<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/200-million-to-improve-walking-and-cycling-routes-and-boost-local-economies>) the Government acknowledged that 1 in 2

women feel unsafe walking after dark in a quiet street near their home, and that all proposals must take this into account. How much of the fund will Bromley Council be applying for and how will you be ensuring women's safety is considered?

Reply:

This fund is only provided to local transport authorities outside of London, so unfortunately Bromley is not eligible for it.

Supplementary Question:

What plans do you have to both increase active travel in the area of Bromley while taking women's safety into consideration?

Reply:

Active travel does not come under my portfolio, but on anything concerning women's safety we will be working cross-portfolio - my fellow portfolio holder is agreeing.

This page is left intentionally blank

Council

27 February 2023

Questions from Members of the Public for Written Reply

1. From Carrie Heitmeyer to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

How much money has Bromley Council already spent challenging ULEZ expansion, how much will Bromley Council be eligible to pay when it loses its proposed legal action, and how can this be justified when the Council has recently claimed “a budget gap of £29.6million is predicted in three years’ time”?

Reply:

The Council has not yet paid any money in seeking legal advice and seeking a Judicial Review. Any legal costs which are incurred, will be shared with the four other authorities joined in the application.

2. From Laura Vogel to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

On 13 January Bromley Council published a statement in which the Leader claimed ULEZ is “cynical”. How is this statement in keeping with the [Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity](#) which states publicity by local authorities should be “even-handed” and “issued with care during periods of heightened sensitivity”?

Reply:

The Council is not in a period of ‘heightened sensitivity’. The quote from Leader of the Council is part of the background as to why the Council, in conjunction with four other local authorities is seeking a Judicial Review of the Mayor of London’s decision. I refer you to Paragraph 20 of the Code.

3. From Laura Vogel to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Council Leader Colin Smith has devoted a lot of Council time and resource to campaigning against ULEZ expansion. Does the Council have data on number of Bromley residents affected by ULEZ expansion, and wouldn’t it be better to focus on improving protections for those residents rather than opposing ULEZ?

Reply:

The Council and, we believe, the Mayor of London does not hold such information as it would include people working in the borough but whose vehicle is registered to an address in another authority. The Council, which has not received any money for the Principal Road Network from TfL for some years and very little for local schemes believes that if the money to be spent on cameras and signs was reallocated to the boroughs, they could take much more effective action to reduce air pollution.

4. From Gary Kent to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

Please provide details on proposed contract with Alliance Leisure for West Wickham Leisure Centre. Lack of information worries West Wickham residents given the rapidly deteriorating state of repair of this important local facility. Please also provide information on temporary alternative leisure facilities during the redevelopment/refurbishment of the Leisure Centre.

Reply:

Alliance Leisure Services has been contracted by the London Borough of Bromley to undertake feasibility and survey works for both The Walnuts and West Wickham leisure centres. This work will include: building surveys, high level block plans, research on need, and an extensive consultation process via surveys and focus groups. It is expected that any redevelopment of West Wickham Leisure Centre will be within the existing building envelope. There will be no temporary swimming pool during the works period as it is too costly and would use half the budget available, however, there is the possibility that the operator may be able to offer temporary provision of fitness classes.

5. From Brendan Donegan to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

On 13 January Bromley Council [published a statement](#) claiming the Mayor of London's decision to expand ULEZ is based on "highly questionable, selective and incomplete findings of a research paper commissioned by TfL". Why are the research findings "highly questionable" and do you have any evidence to support your assertions?

Reply:

The evidence will be part of the Council's legal case and will be published by the court.

6. From Brendan Donegan to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

4,000 Londoners die prematurely due to air pollution every year; in Lewisham, Ella Kissi-Debrah was the first person in the world with air pollution as cause of death. Bromley Council's recent [statement](#) opposing ULEZ expansion claims "Bromley already has amongst the cleanest air in London". Surely this misses the point?

Reply:

The Council, which has not received any money for the Principal Road Network from TfL for some years and very little for local schemes believes that if the money to be spent on cameras and signs was reallocated to the boroughs, they could take much more effective action to reduce air pollution.

7. From Janette Sewell to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety

Please provide: (a) number of operating HMOs in Bromley that the Council has licensed, (b) number of unlicensed HMOs operating in the borough, (c) number of HMO applications the Council has in progress, listing both applications received before 1 September 2022 and after 1 September separately.

Reply:

(a) 265

(b) The Council does not hold this information

(c) Applications in progress made prior to 01/09/22 = 76,
Applications in progress made after 01/09/22 = 32

8. From Susan Sulis to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Bromley worked with local landowners to improve an 'Ordinary Watercourse' in Seymour Drive, which had not flooded homes internally. In 2021, 20+ St. Mary Cray homes were flooded internally, when water from Greenbelt farmland owned by a land speculator, overflowed its 'Ordinary Watercourse'. Will Bromley approach the owners to seek improvements?

Reply:

The flooding at Seymour Drive was the result of a severe storm in which the exceeded the capacity of the drainage system. Liability lies with landowners who are responsible for the management Watercourse.

9. From Susan Sulis to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee

The Council's Constitution states that citizens have the right to see non-confidential reports and 'background papers.' When 'background papers', cited as evidence in reports, and relied on to a material extent in preparing reports, are not listed by the report's author, how can citizens enjoy their rights?

Reply:

Background papers are required to be listed in each report (a box is provided in the standard template for this purpose) and should be produced on request. Sometimes there are no background papers, but in most cases there are relevant documents used in preparation of the report which should be listed by the report author, whose contact details are provided on each report. I have asked officers to remind report authors of this requirement.

10. From Dermot McKibbin to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

How many households have been rehoused from houses in multiple occupation (hmo's) on the Council's rehousing list, how many of these properties are licensed, what steps does the Council undertake to ensure that rehousing applicants living in hmo's are in fact living in licensed hmo's?

Reply:

The Council does not hold this information in a reportable format as it is not part of the statutory returns. However, when an applicant applies for housing support if there are concerns about the status of the property they are currently living in a referral will be made to public protection colleagues for investigation. Any accommodation utilized by the Council would be subject to checks to ensure that the properties meet all required standards including licensing if applicable.

11. From Dermot McKibbin to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

Please show for all wards in the borough for the 2011 and the 2021 census the number of households renting privately, the number of owner occupiers and the number renting from a housing association. Please show these figures as a percentage of the total households in each ward.

Reply:

Please see attached spreadsheets providing data from the census ([Appendix 1.](#))

12. From Richard Gibbons to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

According to Census 2021 there are 135,800 households in LB Bromley. 23% of households do not own or have access to a car or van. Of the remaining 77% of households, how many households do not own or have access to one or more ULEZ-compliant vehicles?

Reply:

The Council and, we believe, the Mayor of London does not hold such information as it would include people working in the borough but whose vehicle is registered to an address in another authority.

13. From Richard Gibbons to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

According to Census 2021 there are 330,000 residents in LB Bromley. 76,600 residents are over 60 years of age and eligible for a 60+/Freedom Pass. How many residents currently have a valid 60+/Freedom Pass?

Reply:

No details are held of the number of people with a 60+ Oyster card as these are issued by Transport for London. The number of residents with an Older Person's Freedom Pass is 53,393

population
units Households

Numbers

Appendix B - Question 11 A

Code	Ward	Total Households	Owned			Shared ownership (part owned and part rented)	Total social rented	Social rented			Total Private rented	Private rented		Living rent free
			Total Owned	Owned outright	Owned with a mortgage or loan			Rented from council (Local Authority)	Other	Private landlord or letting agency		Other		
E05000106	Bickley	5,967	4,787	2,321	2,466	26	417	21	396	681	635	46	56	
E05000107	Biggin Hill	3,910	3,438	1,527	1,911	34	180	16	164	224	201	23	34	
E05000108	Bromley Common and Keston	6,209	4,543	2,082	2,461	46	975	144	831	597	554	33	58	
E05000109	Bromley Town	7,414	4,839	2,039	2,800	71	743	53	690	1,686	1,603	83	75	
E05000110	Chislehurst and Pratts Bottom	5,830	5,072	2,500	2,572	33	270	36	234	475	370	45	40	
E05000111	Chislehurst	6,084	4,863	2,476	2,387	14	433	42	391	694	649	45	80	
E05000112	Clock House	6,901	4,659	1,681	2,978	90	867	69	798	1,227	1,160	67	56	
E05000113	Coppers Cope	8,104	4,954	2,370	2,584	61	748	49	699	2,243	2,125	118	98	
E05000114	Cray Valley East	6,693	4,126	1,847	2,279	106	1,653	245	1,408	744	666	78	64	
E05000115	Cray Valley West	6,776	3,934	1,715	2,219	100	2,273	308	1,965	413	364	49	56	
E05000116	Crystal Palace	6,112	2,129	587	1,542	98	2,029	216	1,813	1,815	1,751	64	43	
E05000117	Darwin	2,082	1,726	957	769	17	114	8	106	195	142	53	30	
E05000118	Farnborough and Crofton	6,144	5,117	2,903	2,214	15	542	22	520	413	373	40	57	
E05000119	Hayes and Cony Hall	6,110	5,393	2,659	2,734	12	189	17	172	474	432	42	42	
E05000120	Kelsay and Eden Park	6,382	5,058	2,426	2,632	27	550	50	674	500	633	41	73	
E05000121	Mollington and Chislehurst North	4,257	2,356	985	1,421	45	1,359	178	1,181	448	424	24	49	
E05000122	Ovington	6,341	4,719	2,597	2,122	74	1,001	130	871	508	462	46	39	
E05000123	Penge and Cator	7,672	3,678	1,352	2,326	85	2,289	234	2,055	1,588	1,475	62	49	
E05000124	Pettis Wood and Knoll	5,445	4,865	2,575	2,290	8	146	14	132	377	345	32	49	
E05000125	Plastow and Sundridge	6,529	4,257	1,841	2,416	48	1,136	113	1,023	1,030	951	79	60	
E05000126	Shortlands	4,186	3,314	1,754	1,560	6	261	11	250	567	539	28	38	
E05000127	West Wickham	5,714	4,958	2,505	2,453	24	250	11	239	420	375	45	62	

Percentage of All Households

Code	Ward	Total Households	Owned			Shared ownership (part owned and part rented)	Social rented		Private rented			Living rent free
			Total Owned	Owned outright	Owned with a mortgage or loan		Total social rented	Rented from council (Local Authority)	Other	Total Private rented	Private landlord or letting agency	
EO5000106	Bickley	100.0	80.2	38.9	41.3	0.4	7.0	0.4	11.4	10.6	0.8	0.9
EO5000107	Biggin Hill	100.0	87.9	39.1	48.9	0.9	4.6	0.4	5.7	5.1	0.6	0.9
EO5000108	Bromley Common and Keaton	100.0	73.2	33.5	39.6	0.7	15.7	2.3	9.5	8.9	0.5	0.9
EO5000109	Bromley Town	100.0	65.3	27.5	37.8	1.0	10.0	0.7	22.7	21.6	1.1	1.0
EO5000110	Chelsfield and Pratts Belmont	100.0	87.0	42.9	44.1	0.6	4.6	0.6	7.1	6.3	0.8	0.7
EO5000111	Chislehurst	100.0	79.9	40.7	39.2	0.2	7.1	0.7	11.4	10.7	0.7	1.3
EO5000112	Clock House	100.0	67.5	24.4	43.2	1.3	12.6	1.0	17.8	16.8	1.0	0.8
EO5000113	Copers Cope	100.0	61.1	29.2	31.9	0.8	9.2	0.6	27.7	26.2	1.5	1.2
EO5000114	Cray Valley East	100.0	61.6	27.6	34.1	1.6	24.7	3.7	11.1	10.0	1.2	1.0
EO5000115	Cray Valley West	100.0	58.1	25.3	32.7	1.5	33.5	4.5	6.1	5.4	0.7	0.8
EO5000116	Crystal Palace	100.0	34.6	9.6	25.2	1.6	33.2	3.5	29.7	28.6	1.0	0.7
EO5000117	Darwin	100.0	82.9	46.0	36.9	0.8	5.5	0.4	9.4	8.8	2.5	1.4
EO5000118	Farnborough and Crofton	100.0	83.3	47.2	36.0	0.2	8.8	0.4	6.7	6.1	0.7	0.9
EO5000119	Hayes and Coney Hall	100.0	88.3	43.5	44.7	0.2	3.1	0.3	7.8	7.1	0.7	0.9
EO5000120	Keisey and Eden Park	100.0	79.3	38.0	41.2	0.4	8.6	0.8	10.6	9.9	0.6	1.1
EO5000121	Mottingham and Chislehurst North	100.0	55.3	22.0	33.4	1.1	31.9	4.2	10.5	10.0	0.6	1.2
EO5000122	Ormington	100.0	74.4	41.0	33.5	1.2	15.8	2.1	8.0	7.3	0.7	0.6
EO5000123	Penge and Cator	100.0	47.9	17.6	30.3	1.1	28.8	3.1	20.3	19.2	1.1	0.8
EO5000124	Petts Wood and Knoll	100.0	89.3	47.3	42.1	0.1	2.7	0.3	6.9	6.3	0.6	0.9
EO5000125	Plaiestow and Slumridge	100.0	65.2	28.2	37.0	0.7	17.4	1.7	15.8	14.6	1.2	0.9
EO5000126	Shortlands	100.0	79.2	41.9	37.3	0.1	5.2	0.3	13.5	12.9	0.7	0.9
EO5000127	West Wickham	100.0	86.6	43.8	42.9	0.4	4.4	0.2	7.4	6.6	0.8	1.1

E05013999	Kelsey & Eden Park	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	668	11.14448	5994
E05013999	Kelsey & Eden Park	6 Private rented: Other private rented	103	1.718385	5994
E05013999	Kelsey & Eden Park	7 Lives rent free	0	0	5994
		5994			
E05014000	Mottingham	-8 Does not apply	0	0	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	0 Owned: Owns outright	1050	22.6635	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	1485	32.05267	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	47	1.014461	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	179	3.863587	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	4 Social rented: Other social rented	1109	23.93687	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	658	14.20246	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	6 Private rented: Other private rented	101	2.180013	4633
E05014000	Mottingham	7 Lives rent free	4	0.086337	4633
		total	4633		
E05014001	Orpington	-8 Does not apply	0	0	4729
E05014001	Orpington	0 Owned: Owns outright	1870	39.54324	4729
E05014001	Orpington	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	1509	31.90949	4729
E05014001	Orpington	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	38	0.803553	4729
E05014001	Orpington	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	103	2.17805	4729
E05014001	Orpington	4 Social rented: Other social rented	647	13.68154	4729
E05014001	Orpington	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	492	10.40389	4729
E05014001	Orpington	6 Private rented: Other private rented	65	1.374498	4729
E05014001	Orpington	7 Lives rent free	5	0.105731	4729
		total	4729		
E05014002	Penge & Cator	-8 Does not apply	0	0	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	0 Owned: Owns outright	1447	17.21594	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2461	29.28019	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	105	1.249256	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	322	3.831053	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	4 Social rented: Other social rented	2053	24.42594	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	1867	22.21297	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	6 Private rented: Other private rented	145	1.725164	8405
E05014002	Penge & Cator	7 Lives rent free	5	0.059488	8405
		total	8405		
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	-8 Does not apply	0	0	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	0 Owned: Owns outright	3078	44.54414	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2711	38.233	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	25	0.361795	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	31	0.448625	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	4 Social rented: Other social rented	229	3.314038	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	746	10.79595	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	6 Private rented: Other private rented	89	1.287988	6910
E05014003	Petts Wood & Knoll	7 Lives rent free	1	0.014472	6910
		total	6910		
E05014004	Plaistow	-8 Does not apply	0	0	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	0 Owned: Owns outright	1579	28.74044	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	1990	36.22133	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	37	0.673462	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	80	1.456134	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	4 Social rented: Other social rented	803	14.61594	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	913	16.61813	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	6 Private rented: Other private rented	90	1.638151	5494
E05014004	Plaistow	7 Lives rent free	2	0.036403	5494
		total	5494		
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	-8 Does not apply	0	0	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	0 Owned: Owns outright	2347	35.01417	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2435	36.32702	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	26	0.387866	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	47	0.701179	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	4 Social rented: Other social rented	367	5.47516	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	1368	20.40877	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	6 Private rented: Other private rented	109	1.626138	6703
E05014005	Shortlands & Park Langley	7 Lives rent free	4	0.059675	6703
		total	6703		
E05014006	St Mary Cray	-8 Does not apply	0	0	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	0 Owned: Owns outright	2421	31.79869	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2450	32.3089	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	121	1.589178	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	220	2.889414	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	4 Social rented: Other social rented	1393	18.29525	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	885	11.62333	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	6 Private rented: Other private rented	112	1.470975	7614
E05014006	St Mary Cray	7 Lives rent free	2	0.026267	7614
		total	7614		
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	-8 Does not apply	0	0	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	0 Owned: Owns outright	1579	23.17288	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2089	30.65747	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	84	1.232756	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	355	5.209862	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	4 Social rented: Other social rented	1889	27.72234	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	724	10.62518	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	6 Private rented: Other private rented	93	1.364837	6814
E05014007	St Paul's Cray	7 Lives rent free	1	0.014676	6814
		total	6814		
E05014008	West Wickham	-8 Does not apply	0	0	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	0 Owned: Owns outright	2561	44.85899	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	1 Owned: Owns with a mortgage or loan	2250	39.41146	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	2 Shared ownership: Shared ownership	23	0.402873	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	3 Social rented: Rents from council or Local Authority	17	0.297775	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	4 Social rented: Other social rented	252	4.414083	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	5 Private rented: Private landlord or letting agency	527	8.231039	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	6 Private rented: Other private rented	78	1.386264	5709
E05014008	West Wickham	7 Lives rent free	1	0.017516	5709
		total	5709		

Council

27 February 2023

Questions from Members of the Council for Oral Reply

1. From Cllr Sophie Dunbar to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

Would the Leader of the Council please confirm what reasonable adjustments have been made under the legislation in the Equality Act 2010 and under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 by the Council since the election in May to accommodate disabled access to all meetings and facilities with specific attention to deaf and hearing impaired persons.

Reply:

In terms of access, all committee rooms have adequate access to facilitate disabled access and meetings are supported by attendant staff to assist in any necessary provision. A hearing loop is in place, however it was recently identified that the existing hearing loop did not accommodate the most recent hearing aid technology. To resolve this, additional portable hearing loops which accommodate the latest technology have been installed to complement the existing hearing loops infrastructure.

Supplementary Question:

Thank you, these units will make a huge difference to all hearing aid users. When I raised the issue nine months ago, and these units are next day delivery, why did it take so long?

Reply:

I am not aware of the specific response but I will follow up with officers and send you a written reply.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:

How long will the disabled toilets be out of action? They have been out of action for a very long time.

Reply:

I do not have the answer available, but there have been problems for some time not just with the disabled toilets in this building, reflecting its age, and that is one of the advantages of relocating to the new site.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Keith Onslow:

I support Cllr Dunbar's efforts to improve hearing facilities at the Council. Can you confirm that when we move premises state of the art facilities will be made

available? The current facilities in this building are clearly of some age, and it does not make much sense to spend a lot of money on them now, but it will be good to have upgraded facilities at that time.

Reply:

I am happy to confirm that we will do so.

2. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement

Has LBB received updates on the results of the Bromley Safer Street Survey which ended in Jan or Feb 2021.

We were advised that the local results would be shared via our SNP and the National would be shared by the Police.

Reply:

The Bromley Safer Streets Survey was actually a Metropolitan Police consultation on their draft Violence against Women and Girls Action Plan. The results have not been made available but have been incorporated into the final Violence against Women and Girls Action Plan.

Supplementary Question:

I did not quite understand the answer. We were told that the results would be circulated through our Safer Neighbourhood Panels – all the Bromley Safer Neighbourhood Panels were supposed to be getting a report that they could share with their residents and that the national one would be delivered and published online. We have not received any feedback whatsoever. This was advertised as an important piece of work around Violence against Women and Girls but it seems to have just happened and there has been no feedback or outcome. Can we ask the Safer Bromley Partnership Board if they can chase up some statistics, particularly those relevant for Bromley.

Reply:

I certainly can do that. This has come directly from the Police and has been followed up by officers. The information due to come through to Safer Neighbourhood Panels was about the Street Safe service where people can submit public spaces where they felt unsafe. When I last checked up on that the response was there was not a great deal of input, so there was little in the way of statistics that they could give us. We will look at it again through the Safer Bromley Partnership Board.

3. From Cllr Tony McPartlan to the Leader of the Council

The first some of our operational property tenants, such as those at Community House, found out about the potential sale of their premises was by reading Council meeting agenda papers. Does the Leader of the Council think that's right and fair?

Reply:

Clearly not, as I have commented on previously. Information flow could and should have been better, both to keep those potentially affected better advised and also to help negate unhelpful scaremongering as to the Council's true intentions.

Supplementary Question:

At the last full Council meeting you said that you had received correspondence from current tenants in support of the Community House disposal and move to the Direct Line building. Why does this freedom of information reply say "The Council has not received any correspondence in support of the disposal of Community House." What is inaccurate, this freedom of information response or yourself?

Reply:

Me on this occasion. I have spoken with some of the lessees who think it is a good idea – that is a simple fact. There are lessees that do think that moving to Direct Line is a good idea. And I will, through the chair of the BVST, as I cannot divulge private information without the correct permissions, pass that information on to you.

4. From Cllr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

Can the Portfolio Holder quantify how many times refuse or recycling collections have been rescheduled to a later date on the expected day of collection?

Reply:

The answer is 17. Just to put that into context, that accounts for just 1% of the waste we collect each year. I will take the opportunity to remind Members that changes to recycling and our waste services do happen around holiday times. Please remind your residents that Easter is coming up, and there will be slight changes to collection services.

Supplementary Question:

The experience of residents in Clock House is that this happens frequently. Can the Portfolio Holder comment on the residents' belief that the reason that this is happening is because the wagons do not have sufficient capacity?

Reply:

I have never heard of this issue before. I do not believe you have emailed me – members here can testify that if they do email me about any issues in my portfolio I do get back to them quickly. I would encourage you to email me with any issues and I will follow them up.

I am concerned to hear that – this is not what the data is telling us.

5. From Cllr Alisa Igoe to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

Bromley's 2020 draft AQAP stated "declaration of an AQMA places a statutory duty to monitor and take action to reduce levels of pollutants." In 2020 our AQMA was expanded to cover more than half of the borough due to exceedances of Nitrogen dioxide (NO2). Why was Defra's UK Air Information Resource page not showing it until February 2023, after receiving a complaint, and where is the map?

Reply:

The AQMA has been expanded in line with new WHO guidelines which are very ambitious. Bromley meets all the national air quality guidelines, including NO2 and our air quality continues to improve.

In relation to your DEFRA question, we are not sure why they have not updated Bromley's information, including the map, but I have been assured by officers that they did send the information on time before the deadline. It appears to be just an administrative error, and officers will continue to follow up with DEFRA.

Supplementary Question:

Since I submitted that question, I have had another look at DEFRA's website and we seem to have the Air Quality Action Plan uploaded, but it is the March 2010 plan. Officers have obviously communicated with them, and they have put something back onto that website, but it is the 2010 plan. It does not show the AQMA of 2020 which covers Crystal Palace to Mottingham down to Cray Valley and across to Chelsfield and back up to West Wickham which is over half the borough.

Why does the AQMA map and the Air Quality Action Plan prepared in 2020 not appear on the DEFRA UK map and why are we not speaking to them about it?

Reply:

As I said, officers are speaking to DEFRA about that. They had a 2007 map originally so we are getting closer, but not we are not there yet. I have been assured by officers that they are following this up. We will continue to push to get the right information published on their website.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Fawthrop:

Is the Portfolio Holder aware that, when it comes to air quality, the World Health Organisation set targets in 2021 and we meet 50% of those targets fully. In terms of the other 50%, we are well on the way to meeting interim targets 2 and 4 for other measures, so we meet the targets for ozone and PM2.10

Reply:

I was aware of some of those statistics, however I would say that we do need to be careful with this debate and some of those statistics were taken over the Covid period. We should be careful not to over-promise on our air quality. It is very good, but it is important that we use facts in this debate.

6. From Cllr Kevin Kennedy-Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Children, Education and Families

Would the Portfolio Holder accept that the few Teaching Assistants paid by Bromley would gain more job satisfaction and be more likely to stay in their position if they received the same financial benefits as those working for our Academy Trusts?

Reply:

The Teaching Assistants and Higher Level Teaching Assistants employed by Bromley Council provide a key role in our work to support children across the Borough. The Council publishes job adverts for schools across the Borough and therefore has evidence that the Bromley rate of pay is competitive and often higher than the starting pay from recent academy advertisements. 25% of academies still follow the Bromley pay awards.

The Teaching Assistants employed by Bromley will receive the imminent 7.75% pay rise, subject to the agreement of full Council this evening, and also benefit from inclusion in the Council's merited rewards scheme. The turnover of Teaching Assistants remains low, at less than 15%.

Supplementary Question:

Bromley still has some Teaching Assistants especially in the SEN area, and this is an extremely important role in protecting our children and shaping their future. There is about to be a rise; you have said in your answer that there are some paid less and some paid more. If, in an individual situation, somebody was being paid lower, would you agree to match-fund at an average or higher than average pay for those staff?

Reply:

If you can send me examples of when that has happened I can forward that to the Director of Education and he can look into it.

7. From Cllr Jeremy Adams to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management (answered by the Chairman of the Audit and Risk Management Committee)

In July 2020, auditors EY warned the Council of, 'significant additional time incurred to complete our work, leading to additional fees'. How much did EY bill Bromley Council in additional fees for 2019-20, and how much has EY billed Bromley Council for audits in subsequent years?

Reply:

Cllr Marlow referred the question to the Chairman of the audit and Risk Management Committee, Cllr Michael Tickner.

In relation to 2019-20, the audit remains incomplete owing to issues concerning asset valuations. The Council has therefore not been notified as to the amount of any additional fees. EY, the external auditor, has stated that a final fee for that

period will be determined shortly. Consequently, confirmed final audit fees for subsequent years are not yet available.

Supplementary Question:

Referring to page 31, setting out that we have five vacancies in the Finance Department, two of them for more than six months, how confident is the Chairman that we will avoid additional fees in the future?

Reply:

The number of staff in Internal audit has nothing to do with the work of the external auditor. Their work seems to be increasing – the accounts for 2019/20 are expected to be signed off by April this year, but CIPFA, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy, do seem to be issuing more and more guidance and this is just creating more work for accountants. It is not all about headcounts – when it comes to staff it is also about productivity and outcomes, and whether we are getting what we want from the number of staff.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:

Regarding the link between internal staff and external, does he recall the letter that we were sent by our external auditors referring to the lack of resource in the Finance Team and the delays that there had been in responding to their queries, and does he agree that this lack of resource contributed to the additional time taken for them to sign off the accounts?

Reply:

There has been a turnover of staff, particularly in the section that deals with the external auditors, but as I was trying to explain the external auditors are asking more questions, with more detail, for instance wanting a valuation of all the roads that the borough owns, based on how often they need to be repaired. Does it matter? Are the road assets worth nothing or are they worth what it would cost to renew them? Is it worth the staff spending all this time making an evaluation of our public roads which wear out at different rates? All these issues will be discussed at the next Audit and Risk management Committee and I invite any Members interested to come along and hear more detail.

Councillor Marlow reminded members that in a similar question asked some months ago about the number of staff supporting audit the answer he had given was that the number of staff had doubled. Within the last five years – the Director of Finance could correct that if necessary. Before considering any further increase in staff we need to look at productivity and the regulatory environment that we find ourselves in, rather than the default reaction being to hire more staff, albeit we are aware that many local authorities, particularly in inner London, follow that policy.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Tony Owen:

Give that valuing buildings is a matter of opinion, and we only know their true value when they are sold, does the Chairman think that EY are just making work for themselves which comes to different valuations from the previous auditor, and if

there is a disagreement and PWC were wrong and EY are right, should any additional fees be billed to the previous auditor?

Reply:

I know that EY are speaking to the previous external auditor and I do hope that they are sharing information and saving costs to Bromley taxpayers. This is what we are pressing for and to a certain extent our hands are tied because the external auditors are appointed for us through the scheme that we are in and we have to accept what they say. The amount of work is driven by CIPFA who are thinking up all sorts of new guidance every year.

8. From Cllr Chris Price to the Portfolio Holder for Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management

Please can you inform the chamber;

- a) In the current round, how many residents have applied for the household support fund?
- b) Of these, how many were successful?
- c) How many were not?
- d) What is the total spend to date?
- e) How much is still available for residents?
- f) If it is not all spent by the end of March 2023, how much are we expecting to return to the government?

Reply:

- (a) 1949. In addition 9,200 school children have received 4x £15.00 food vouchers for the school holidays in the period October 2022 to February 2023
- (b) 743
- (c) 124
- (d) £700,600
- (e) £893,800
- (f) We expect to spend all the funds.

Supplementary Question:

These numbers are very low for the number of people coming through, and the money still outstanding is higher than the money we have already spent. We have until the end of this coming month to spend it. Our promotion on this has been irregular, to say the least. The "How to apply" button on the website keeps coming on and going off. Cllr Igoe has been amazing trying to make sure that we get that back on – it was still off over this weekend. This is money that the Conservative Government has given Bromley to give to people who are disadvantaged. I am really concerned that we are going to be handing money back - how are you going to assure me that all of this money is spent and goes to people in need?

Reply:

Applications not awarded as yet consist of 478 new cases under investigation and within the 15 working day time limit, 552 cases await further information or clarification from the applicant to enable them to proceed and there are 52 duplicate

applications. The scheme has been publicised through the Bromley website, on social media through our partner organisations and via internal teams. We continue to raise awareness of the scheme. Thank you for raising the issue of the website – I will take that up with Mr Bridgewater.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:

Will the Portfolio Holder tell me if he has been involved with the Communication Plan for the Household Support Fund? I have been fairly loud emailing when I have noticed that the links are not working and I would like to know if the Portfolio Holder was involved in the Communications Plan.

Reply:

I can confirm that I have discussed it with officers but we have generally followed a similar approach for all of these awards introduced since the start of the pandemic.

9. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

Over the past two years how many incidents of fly-tipping have been reported, either directly or through Fix My Street, around the area outside the parade of shops in Newlands Park outside Penge East Station?

Reply:

Between January 2021 and January 2023 there have been 41 reports of dumped rubbish on Newlands Park Road by Penge East Station. Of the 41, 40 were received via Fix My Street.

Supplementary Question:

Given the continued and consistent fly-tipping over the past few years can you tell me how many fines have been issued or how many prosecutions have begun in relation to the fly-tipping at that location in the last two years?

Reply:

I can confirm that there have been none. This question was the first time I was aware of this issue, I have asked officers to follow up; their sense was that it is the nature of the rubbish and it is hard to find out where it has come from. Officers have agreed to look at this area and see what more can be done to track down the criminals, but I do not want to give away too much about this in public.

10. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Enforcement

A Metropolitan Police gang task group was set up to hopefully route out the known gangs in Bromley. At the time all 4 gangs were believed to be located in Penge. Serious crime and murders are still happening in Bromley so can the police be requested to present the outcomes affecting Bromley borough at a PP&E PDS?

Reply:

Yes, this will be built into the annual crime needs assessment review of crime performance within the borough which is reported to the Safer Bromley Partnership and scrutinised by Public Protection and Enforcement PDS Committee.

Supplementary Question:

Was that the Metropolitan Gang Task Force? We do need to hear regularly because, going back probably six years, we have had five murders in Penge, three are still unsolved and if you look at the statistics these incidents of knife crime and stabbings have spread from Penge into the rest of Bromley, which I warned at the time if we did not do something about tackling them when we knew where they were. Can we keep these reports coming in because we should not have a Gang Task Group that never reports back.

Reply:

Absolutely. There are quarterly reports but they are not very detailed, so that can be one of the things we push for.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Fawthrop:

Can the Portfolio Holder remind me who has overall responsibility for policing in London?

11. From Cllr Tony McPartlan to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

Some housing associations are starting to compile damp and mould registers for all their properties as a way of ensuring their tenants live in safe conditions. Will the Council commit to work alongside Pinnacle and do something similar for the properties they manage on our behalf?

Reply:

Yes, this is already being undertaken by Pinnacle and also by Mears for More Homes Bromley to identify any issues and an action plan to resolve them as soon as identified.

Supplementary Question:

Is this something that we can get reported to Renewal, Recreation and Housing PDS Committee so that we can monitor progress?

Reply:

We review these reports via the Operational Board meetings that we have with Pinnacle and Mears so if there are some trends coming out of that there is no reason why that cannot be reported to PDS.

12. From Cllr Josh King to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

Does the Portfolio Holder think it acceptable that on a recent clean-up of a street in Clock House residents were able to collect more than 20 bags of litter and composted leaves etc?

Reply:

The Council has collected over 2,000 tonnes of leafing this season and continues to collect from hard-to-reach areas where there are parked cars or where further leaf fall has accumulated.

Likewise, our street cleansing teams deal with over 1,500 enquiries per month as well as attending to scheduled work to ensure litter is removed from the public highway.

I want to put on record my thanks to the volunteers in Clock House. Our Friends groups are key stakeholders in helping us to keep Bromley beautiful, and I would encourage all residents to get involved in one of our Friends groups, whether that is Tree Friends, Street Friends or Park Friends.

Supplementary Question:

Will you investigate scheduled cleaning of gutters and gulleys including requesting access and the moving of parked cars. Do you understand that without this residents will not think they are getting value for money?

Reply:

All streets across Bromley are monitored but if there is a specific issue please email me or report it to a senior officer.

13. From Cllr Chris Price to the Portfolio Holder for Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces

Will the Council commit to building a high quality perimeter fence around Hoblingwell in the coming financial year?

Reply:

The anti-social behaviour at Hoblingwell is very sad. I know that you are aware that I have met with the Friends Group a number of times. I know that the community and the Friends group are super dedicated to the park and I want to do what I can as Portfolio Holder to keep the environment as it is and to stop motorbikes from entering the field. But this must be a joint partnership between the Council and Police – this is really crucial. I have asked officers to look at options that are cost effective while not spoiling the natural beauty of the park. Options continue to be explored but funding and fiscal prudence must be considered when exploring new infrastructure projects.

Supplementary Question:

Is that yes, we are going to get a perimeter fence around the park?

Reply:

I do not know yet. We are looking at options but I have to weigh up the issue of protecting the park from motorbikes with the issue of Council finances - that has to be an issue for all of us here and the taxpayers of Bromley.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Simon Jeal:

I believe that around £500,000 was found for fixing a bridge in Kelsey Park from the Healthy Bromley Fund – does the Portfolio Holder consider that this fund might be somewhere where the funds to provide fencing for Hoblingwell could also be found from?

Reply:

This is a new infrastructure project while that was an old bridge – 50+ years old – so that is the difference. Every time this Council makes a decision to put new infrastructure projects in we have to think about the maintenance and maintaining that new infrastructure. These are decisions that do require additional thinking and ensuring that this is the best use of taxpayer money

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe :

We got all that money for Hoblingwell – it is an amazing facility there for the community, for children, for cycling. It seems ridiculous not to put a fence around it considering that the bollards get knocked down regularly.

Reply:

It is a different field to the tracks on the upper field – what we are talking about now is the lower field.

14. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

The Council-owned Churchill Theatre is one of the South East's leading live entertainment venues, welcoming over 200,000 people a year and providing a huge benefit to arts and culture in the Borough - over the past decade how much has the Council spent on maintaining the theatre building and how much do officers estimate the works needed to bring the theatre back to an acceptable condition will cost?

Reply:

The Council does not hold historic specific repair costs relating to the theatre as the maintenance previously formed part of the overall block contract with Amey. The Churchill Theatre, as has previously been reported, is contained within the operational property review. Work is underway to complete a full feasibility and options appraisal and a report will be provided to members in due course. This work is being undertaken in full liaison with the Theatre.

Supplementary Question:

I note that the costs of maintaining the Churchill are not covered in the Operational Property Review and there is reference to a future report. Can you assure me that the Council will do everything in its power to ensure the continued viability and operation of the theatre which many members will agree is the jewel in the crown of Bromley's arts and cultural scene.

Reply:

We are working with the theatre to try to work out a sustainable future for it.

Additional Supplementary Question from Cllr Sam Webber:

Cllr Ireland and I have also met with the Team at Trafalgar. We welcome the ongoing discussions they are having with the Council. We have specific concerns about how run-down the building has become both internally with regard to plumbing and waste water and the mosaic tiling issues on the outside. We would welcome those discussions and the theatre being fully refurbished. If we could be kept involved as appropriate that would be welcome.

Council

27 February 2023

Questions from Members of the Council for Written Reply

1. From Cllr Tony McPartlan to the Leader of the Council

The Leader of the Council previously stated that all tenants at Community House could move to our new headquarters at no additional cost. Community House provides service users with a quiet welcoming space and is also home to the South Street Cafe run by the fantastic CASPA charity. How will the Council replicate this at our new, busy HQ?

Reply:

The BVST has thus far declined to consider the option of moving to the Direct Line building so no detailed plans to do so have been developed in this regard, as things currently stand.

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

Can you please publish a list of all Assets of Community Value (ACVs) across Bromley with their expiry dates and the holder of the ACV?

Reply:

This information is already published on the Council's website and can be accessed via the following link:

[Assets of community value – London Borough of Bromley](#)

3. From Cllr Alisa Igoe to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee

Public questions and Members' questions (and responses) at Scrutiny committees are added to the committee webpage within appendices, which at times sit at the very bottom of that committee's webpage, where they can be missed. Could we please follow other Councils excellent example, such as Merton, and attach these questions and answers within the Minutes via a hyperlink?

Reply:

We have not received any complaints about questions not being visible, but I have asked the Democratic Services Team to look at how questions and replies are presented.

4. From Cllr Simon Jeal to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing

Could you please provide figures for how many adults and children have presented to the Council as homeless in the past 12 months, and of these:

- A. How many did so having been evicted under a 'section 21' notice?
- B. How many were currently in arrears in respect of energy bills, rent or council tax?
- C. How many had received support from the Council's hardship fund before becoming homeless?
- D. How many were care leavers previously supported by the London Borough of Bromley?

Reply:

- (A) Of the 1669 homeless assessment, 102 were owed a homelessness duty due to eviction under a section 21 notice.
- (B) Of the above 115 provided rent arrears as the main reason for homelessness. 73 were in council tax arrears. We would not hold data on whether a household was in arrears in respect of energy payments.
- (C) Of the above 6 had received hardship payments, 4 received council tax hardship reward and 53 were in receipt of council tax support.
- (D) Of the 1669, 17 were care leavers

Minute 68 2023/24 Council Tax: Labour Proposals APPENDIX 1

Item	2023/24 (£000)	2024/25 (£000)	2025/26 (£000)	2026/27 (£000)	Total Cost (£000)	One-off or Recurring	Funding Source	Narrative
Cancel ULEZ challenge	140				140	One-off	Resources Saving	Saving in legal costs
Savings in fly tipping	200	200	200	200	800	Recurring	Environmental initiatives	Providing skips reduces fly tipping and improves service for residents
Reduction in maintenance costs for Direct Line building	250	250	250	250	1,000	Recurring	Maintenance Saving	Reduction in maintenance costs - 50% partially offset by reduction in rental income
Net income from Community House	100	100	100	100	400	Recurring	Property Income	income from lettings net of maintenance
Net income from Chipperfield Road	25	25	25	25	100	Recurring	Property Income	income from leasehold
Net income from Beckenham Halls	10	40	70	80	200	Recurring	Property Income	income from lettings net of maintenance
Cancel increase to Councillors allowances	35	35	35	35	141	Recurring	Reduced member allowances	reduced increase in allowances
Digital Advertising Boards		98	98	98	294	Recurring	Miscellaneous Income	Assumed installation of 10 more advertising boards from next year
Generated from spend to save				1,000	1,000	One-off	Invest to Save	cost savings £1mpa going forward
Unallocated earmarked reserves	400	400	200		1,000	One-off	Miscellaneous earmarked reserves	Release miscellaneous reserves
Total (£000)	1,165	1,148	978	1,788	5,075			

APPENDIX 2

Item	2023/24 (£000)	2024/25 (£000)	2025/26 (£000)	2026/27 (£000)	Total Cost (£000)	One-off or Recurring	Narrative
Council Tax Support restore to 75%	366	366	366	366	1,464	Recurring	Restore to 25% contribution (30% budgeted)
Care leaver 100% council tax support	101	101	101	101	404	Recurring	Assumes all claim for band D
Reduce 7% rent increase	38	56	56	56	206	Recurring	Propose no increase (7% budgeted)
Cost of living grant to charities	400	400	200	0	1,000	Recurring	Core funding grants to assist charities responding to cost-of-living crisis
Ending Food insecurity post	60	60	60	60	240	Recurring	Council post to coordinate public, private and voluntary sector to provide support and leadership in ending food insecurity in Bromley
Community bulk waste collection	200	200	200	200	800	Recurring	Provision of skips at selected locations
Clean air monitors	120	120	120	120	480	Recurring	Installing 10 air monitors assuming cost of £11.6k each p.a. - assume 10
School Streets Funding	50	50	50	50	200	Recurring	Funding the cost for manning 10 school streets (assuming 2 hours per day, £11.95 london living wage)
Care home Options review	80				80	One-off	One off funding for review into options for reducing residential care costs, working with NHS/ICB to identify medium- and long-term options
Churchill Theatre Creative Workshops for looked after young people	40	40	40	40	160	Recurring	Continue grant funding to Churchill Theatre to deliver creative learning workshops to looked after young people
Pay award	0	0	0	0	0	Recurring	Reducing merit pay from 400k to 220k - rising in line with inflation. Then allocate the remaining 180k as a payment to the lowest paid staff (below median)
Bromley Community Celebration Fund	5	5	5	5	20	Recurring	Setting up a fund, to which councillors, residents and businesses can contribute, to provide funds for community groups to run events celebrating holidays, festivals or other events to celebrate communities living in the Borough, e.g. Remembrance Sunday, Black History Month, Pride month, Chanukah, Chinese New Year etc.
Total (£000)	1,460	1,398	1,198	998	5,054		