

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 16 March 2023

Present:

Councillor Will Rowlands (Chairman)
Councillor Simon Fawthrop (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Kim Botting FRSA,
Mike Botting, Adam Jude Grant, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland,
Alison Stammers and Harry Stranger

Also Present:

Councillor Michael Tickner, Councillor Chloe-Jane Ross,
Councillor Thomas Turrell, Councillor Nicholas Bennett
J.P. and Councillor Aisha Cuthbert

Amelia Nicholas-Head of Client Partnerships-Society
Works.

19 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25th JANUARY 2023

The minutes of the meeting held on 25th January 2023 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no apologies for absence.

21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Alison Stammers declared an interest as the Secretary of The Friends of Chislehurst Recreation Ground.

22 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS OR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO THE CHAIRMAN

One oral question had been received from a member of the public to the Chairman. This was in connection with item 13b: Beckenham: Southend Road, Park Road, Foxgrove Road Safety Scheme. As there had been many questions regarding this item, the Portfolio Holder had prepared an answer that had covered most of the questions that had been asked regarding this item. The Chairman's response was covered by the answer that had been prepared by the Portfolio Holder.

23 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDERS

There were five questions to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety from members of the public. These were all related to item 13b on the agenda, which was the Southend Road, Park Road and Foxgrove Road Safety Scheme. The questions and responses will be appended to the minutes.

24 ORAL QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDERS

Two questions were received from Councillor Alisa Igoe. The questions and responses are appended in the minutes.

25 WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Nineteen written questions had been received from the public. The questions and responses were tabled at the meeting and had been disseminated to the questioners. They are also appended to the minutes.

26 MATTERS ARISING AND WORK PROGRAMME

CSD23047

It was agreed that the date of the June meeting would be changed from June 21st to June 29th.

A Member noted that an answer was due concerning the two hour emergency response time from Riney. The Director said that he was confident that this was very close to a 100% response rate, but he would check this to make sure. A Member said that she had not yet received a response to her request at the committee meeting on 25th January, for details of the total Low Service Damages paid by JB Riney to Bromley Council. This was requested again, on 16th March and the Director said that he would provide a response.

RESOLVED that the Matters Arising and Work Programme report be noted and that the date of the June meeting would move from the 21st of June to June the 29th.

27 UPDATE FROM THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR SUSTAINABILITY, GREEN SERVICES AND OPEN SPACES

An update was provided by Councillor Aisha Cuthbert, Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

A Member expressed concern that the watering of trees was not scheduled to take place until mid-May, she said that the water bags were now empty and the ground was dry.

The Portfolio Holder responded that her priority was to get new trees planted. She said that she had every confidence in the proposed schedule of watering. Residents would be encouraged to help but not in hot weather.

A discussion took place concerning Kelsey Park Bridge and rats in Kelsey Park. The Portfolio Holder said that she would speak to Friends Groups concerning the rats, but she had not received any emails concerning this matter recently. Cllr Igoe commented that the Idverde Annual Performance Tetra Tech report of Sept 2022 (which came to Environment PDS 22 November) did in fact state residents were complaining of rats in Kelsey Park. An update regarding the bridge had been posted on the Council website.

The Portfolio Holder briefed the Committee concerning the new Veolia and Street Friends launch of an anti-littering campaign and said that the Jubilee Parks Grant would be open for new applications from 1 April.

RESOLVED that the update from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces be noted.

28 UPDATE FROM THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ROAD SAFETY

An update was provided by the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety.

Councillor Igoe referenced Westminster Council because they used the RingGo app but, also used **RingGo Retail**, where people could pay for parking in retail outlets and Westminster Council also provided **pre-paid scratch cards**.

She asked if this was something that Bromley could consider. The Portfolio Holder responded and said this had been considered, but there were too many complications and it was too expensive. Feedback from most local authorities regarding the use of cards had been negative.

A Member referenced Sainsbury's car park and said that there had been a queue there to use the cash machines and that members of the public were not aware that the machines were being replaced. She stated that it was currently still the case that 25% of transactions involved the use of cash. She suggested that as there was £180k underspend in the budget, that in certain locations machines that used credit cards could be used at a cost of £8000 each with £600 a year maintenance.

Members were informed that in addition to different sources of publicity, staff would be going out into high streets to engage with the public to help them use the new machines. Councillor Stammers asked to be given prior notice of drop in sessions.

A Member raised the matter of collisions in Holmesdale Road and asked for a meeting to discuss this. The Portfolio Holder stated that he was aware of the issues associated with this road and that the Council had a programme of planned road safety improvements across the borough; this road had not been forgotten. The successful implementation of projects relied upon TfL funding and also on TfL Sign off. Suggestions for improvements could be emailed to the Portfolio Holder and the Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking.

Members discussed the issue of pot holes not being repaired to an adequate standard and that Riney should be encouraged to clear sites properly when they had finished their work. The matter of members of the public claiming compensation for damage to their vehicles because of potholes was also discussed. It was noted that in the case where potholes were reported and not repaired in time by Riney, then the liability would move to them. It was also noted that funding for the maintenance of main roads came from TfL and that this was a national problem.

RESOLVED that the update from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety be noted.

29 UPDATE FROM COUNCILLOR TURRELL REGARDING SNOW FRIENDS

Councillor Turrell provided data regarding the current number of Snow Friends and co-ordinators that had been re-registered under the new registration process. The Chairman asked Councillor Turrell to disseminate the data to the committee.

The re-registration process was required for insurance purposes. The Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces had offered to assist Greenwich Council if they wished to implement a Snow Friends scheme in their borough.

There was a general consensus that the re-registration process was too bureaucratic and that it was putting people off becoming Snow Friends. The Chairman requested that Cllr Turrell try and make the process simpler and less bureaucratic.

RESOLVED that the update from Councillor Turrell regarding snow friends be noted.

30 ECS PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

A discussion took place regarding KSI targets, data and classifications and what was being done to encourage school travel plans and active travel. A Member requested that data be separated so that it would distinguish between those who were injured, seriously injured and those who had died.

She expressed the view that more clarity was required and that LBB should provide this data---she said that TfL were already doing this.

The Portfolio Holder commented that every death was one too many. Each KSI incident was looked at in great detail. The LBB Road Safety Manager said that herself or another officer would meet with police before an inquest to ascertain what could be learned from the incident before the matter was considered at the Coroners Court.

A Member stated that she felt uncomfortable in considering targets. She felt that the focus should be on minimising accidents. She agreed with the principle that the term 'accident' should be replaced by 'collision' and expressed the view that the trend was upwards. The Portfolio Holder commented that the baseline had reduced and that the trend was downwards.

RESOLVED that the ECS Performance Overview be noted.

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

a ECS BUDGET MONITORING 2022/23

ES20271

Members discussed the overspend regarding arboricultural management and it was noted that this was because extra works had been instructed to the contractor as a result of cyclical inspections of trees in the borough. It was asked if the overspend regarding pest control was to do with rats. The Director for Environment and Public Protection answered and said that he believed this was probably the case.

RESOLVED that the ECS Portfolio Holders endorse the 2022/23 revenue budget monitoring for the Environment and Community Services Portfolio.

**32 BECKENHAM: SOUTHEND ROAD, PARK ROAD, FOXGROVE
ROAD SAFETY SCHEME**

A Member expressed concern that the proposed scheme failed to conform to the London Cycling Design Standards. She said that she had spoken to Active Travel England who had offered to provide a free formal design review. She offered this service to officers and to the Portfolio Holder and moved that the recommendations be deferred. The Chairman pointed out that the scheme had already been subject to a stage one road safety audit.

Ward Councillor Michael Tickner spoke in respect of the application and said that he had long campaigned for road safety to be improved at this junction. The area had become increasingly popular with the upgrade to Beckenham

16 March 2023

Place Park that had been undertaken by the London Borough of Lewisham with Lottery funding. He said that a pedestrian crossing was needed on the main Southend Road. There had been a history of accidents caused by motor vehicles exiting Park Road with limited visibility. He said that it was essential that something should be done. He proposed that the scheme should go ahead but that if accidents continued, then the option should still be available either to close Park Road or to at least to close it for vehicles emerging from it.

Councillor Chloe Jane-Ross said that she supported the proposal because it was a dangerous junction with a blind corner and it was urgent that action be taken to slow down speeds and to reduce the number of accidents at the junction. It was clear that a crossing was needed for children in the area going to school. She felt that the proposals would improve road safety and recommended that the proposal be approved. She recommended that any future substantive changes that may be required should come back to the committee but at this stage doing nothing was in her view not an option.

A Member stated that the Portfolio Holder was not an expert in these matters and therefore she would like the engineers to confirm to the Committee that the proposal was indeed compliant with national safety standards. She pointed out that this scheme would cost in the region of £125k and so there should be no doubt from the offset that this scheme would be successful and would meet safety standards, not requiring changing later. She felt that the proposal should be deferred so that the committee could have a proper consultation with engineers with respect to road safety. Councillors would not wish to support anything that jeopardised the safety of their constituents. She pointed out that no one from Park Road had shared in a consultation because they did not have the opportunity.

In response the Principal Transport Projects Manager addressed the committee and said there was nothing unusual with the design. Indeed such schemes had been implemented across the UK and one had recently been implemented at Scotts Lane in Bromley. Therefore as the Council had implemented such schemes for many years he did not understand the level of concern that had been generated. He informed the committee that the Council had used Watermans who were independent, experienced and competent design consultants. Judgement and experience were also required. Watermans would not have signed off the project if they felt it was dangerous, as they would not wish to incur reputational damage.

The Principal Transport Projects Manager explained that the design would go through a road safety audit process using independent road safety engineers who were experienced in design. They would make a determination concerning the safety of the scheme. It was explained that there would be another three stage process after this. Stage three would check to ensure the scheme had been implemented in accordance with the actual design and that no issues had arisen. In stage four, 12 months of collision data would be collected to ensure that the design was safe. All these stages would be

undertaken by independent parties. The Council would be obligated to address any issues that arose in these stages.

The Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety urged the committee not to defer the scheme but to accept it. He explained that £125k included the cost of two pedestrian crossings; each pedestrian crossing costed about £25k. He pointed out that Bromley already had four arm and five arm roundabouts in various locations.

Councillor Igoe moved for a deferral and this was supported by Cllr Bance. The Chairman moved for acceptance of the scheme and this was seconded by Cllr Fawthrop. A vote was taken and eight members voted to accept the scheme as per the recommendations in the report.

RESOLVED:

1) That the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the proposal to improve the safety of the Southend Road/Park Road/Foxgrove Road junction, including the provision of new pedestrian crossing and cycle facilities.

2) That the Portfolio Holder be recommended to delegate any minor changes to the design at the detailed design stage to the Director of Environment and Public Protection after discussion with the Portfolio Holder.

a PROPOSALS FOR SUSTAINABLE PLANTING

ES20265

An explanation was provided by the Assistant Director for Carbon Management and Green Space as to how the Grass Verges Project and the Sustainable Planting Projects would synch together. It was noted that there would be separate consultations but they would be similar in content and style.

RESOLVED

1) That the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces be recommended to approve the proposal to trial sustainable planting at the ten sites identified in the report.

2) That the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the allocation of £75k from the Invest to Save Earmarked Reserve for the upfront costs associated with establishing regenerated planting, to realise an annual saving of £29k from a variation to the management regime applied to the ten sites under the contract with Idverde for park management and grounds maintenance.

3) That the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the variation of the Idverde contract of £75k as a one off cost to cover the purchase, preparation and installation of the regenerated planting schemes at the ten trial sites.

b ECS DRAFT PORTFOLIO PLAN

ES20257

A Member queried when the residential electric vehicle charging infrastructure project report would be presented to the committee as there was no mention of it in the work programme. It was clarified that the report would be presented to the committee no later than March 2024. A Member commented that she was disappointed that there was no mention of air quality and PM 2.5 in the Draft Portfolio Plan. Members were reminded that a report on air quality was scheduled for the September 2023 meeting. A discussion took place regarding green garden waste recycling sites and the Director stated that there were other green garden recycling sites apart from Waldo Rd and that details regarding these would be forwarded the day after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: This information was sent to Cllr Ireland (who raised the issue) on 22nd March by the Head of Environmental Strategy, Tech Support & Commissioning.)

A Member expressed frustration regarding utility companies and the fact that often they did not make sufficiently adequate repairs to roads in the borough after digging them up. She said that they were tearing up the borough's roads. The Assistant Director for Highways responded and said the Council had no direct control over utility companies and that a change in the law was required. The Chairman said that he was hoping to secure a meeting with Thames Water by the end of April.

(Post Meeting Note: The meeting with Thames Water was subsequently confirmed for 25th April at 6pm)

The committee discussed the issue of the collection and disposal of nitrous oxide containers. It was explained that the small bullet like containers could be placed in a normal recycling box. The larger containers were sometimes picked up in the course of fly tipping collections. These were taken by Veolia to Waldo Road and stored in a cage because of issues with compressed gas. The Council were in discussions with Veolia as to how to dispose of these containers. An update would be provided at the next meeting. The committee was informed that the local MP Bob Stewart had written to the Government concerning this matter, seeking a review and possible tightening up of licencing laws concerning the selling of nitrous oxide. The Vice-Chairman suggested that it may be prudent if the Portfolio Holder also drafted a similar letter.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the residential electric vehicle charging infrastructure project report would be presented to the Committee no later than March 2024.**
- 2) That an update would be provided at the next meeting concerning the collection and disposal of nitrous oxide containers.**
- 3) That the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holders be recommended to endorse the outcomes, aims and performance measures set out in the draft 2023/2024 Environment and Community Services Draft Portfolio Plan.**

**c ARBORICULTURE - TREE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY
REVISION**

ES20244

It was noted that in the incidence of any notable tree removals or if it was proposed to remove a number of trees, councillors would be informed. The Vice Chairman raised the possibility of residents paying to select a particular tree in their ward for planting. The Arboricultural Manager responded and said that LBB was looking to move away from monoculture and was planting a diverse range of trees to promote resilience in the tree population.

It was asked if developers could be prosecuted for the unauthorised removal of trees. The Arboricultural Manager said that this responsibility sat with the Planning Team.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces be recommended to endorse and to adopt the revised Tree Management Strategy and associated policies.

**d FIXMYSTREET PRO & WASTEWORX REPORTING SYSTEM
REVIEW**

ES20270

The LBB Technical Support and Market Manager (Technical Support Team) attended to update the committee and answer questions. He was supported by Amelia Nicholas-Head of Client Partnerships-Society Works.

The Head of Client Partnerships informed the committee that Society Works had 11 million users globally across a variety of platforms and that their aim was to facilitate and increase citizen engagement. They aimed to provide a swift response to interactions and so get people democratically engaged. They sought to improve processes for local authorities and to make things easier and reduce costs. They were continually evolving and were aware of

the digital transformation that was rapidly taking place in local authorities. They analysed points of failure to see where improvements could be made.

The LBB Technical Support and Marketing Manager ran through some key points and assorted items of data. He said that the Council received approximately 3000 reports on a weekly basis and 93% of them came via Fix My Street. Eighty seven percent of the reports were closed with no follow up comments. Various reporting platforms existed to check on comments and progress. The Wasteworks system was also popular with members of the public with a high level of engagement.

The Head of Client Partnerships said that Society Works were aiming to use data more effectively and also for pre-emptive communications to avoid complaints. They also wanted to look at the administration of the system and see how officers were physically using it to see if any improvements in this area could be made.

There was a general consensus that terminology and categories should be simplified. It was anticipated that in the future the software would be upgraded so that individuals could use the system in a more human and fluid manner.

A Member asked if the word 'accident' could be replaced with 'collision' and it was agreed that this would be instigated. The matter of incidents closed off prematurely was also discussed.

RESOLVED that the ECS Portfolio Holders be recommended to approve the direction of travel and Roadmap of FixMyStreet Pro as outlined in the report.

e REDUCTION AND RECYCLING PLAN 2023-

ES20269

The Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety declared an interest as a member of ReLondon.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve Bromley's Reduction and Recycling Plan as set out in the report.

33 POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS

34 ECS CONTRACTS REGISTER

ES20261

RESOLVED that the ECS Contracts Register be noted.

35 ECS RISK REGISTER

RESOLVED that the ECS Risk Register be noted.

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

37 ECS PDS PART 2 CONTRACTS REGISTER

RESOLVED that the ECS Part 2 Contracts Register be noted.

Oral Questions from Members

Oral Questions from the Public

Written Questions from the Public

The meeting ended at 9.55pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

ECS PDS—16th March 2023

Oral Questions to the Portfolio Holders from Members

1) Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:

Reference: the Portfolio Holder's reply to question 17 at Environment PDS Committee on 22 November 2022

Your answer to public question 17 at Environment PDS Committee on 22 November stated that “School Streets have overall seen even more pupils ‘park and stride’ to school, the closure of roads has led to the visibility of more cycling and scooting amongst the primary age group”. How many School Streets are operating today, 16 March, in Bromley borough?

Response to Question 1

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Three.

.

2) Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe

Smart Movers scheme rewards primary school children with badges, for travelling to school by all forms of active transport. Bromley website currently states 26 schools taking part. All primary schools are eligible as long as they have a valid travel plan. With the number of schools with a valid plan showing as 82 on the ECS Portfolio Performance Monitoring report on 25 January, having dropped below the Council target of 90+, what communications plan is active to reach out to schools?.

Response to Question 2:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety:

All primary schools are contacted by our Road Safety Team, but ultimately the decision to participate in one of more of our schemes is in the hands of the schools themselves. Unfortunately, a disproportionate amount of time has had to spent on issues surrounding a very small number of school streets.

Oral Questions from the Public1) Question from Dr Jan Davison

Agenda Item 13b - BECKENHAM: SOUTHEND ROAD, PARK ROAD, FOXGROVE ROAD SAFETY SCHEME (Report No: ES20241)

To the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety.

The UK design manual for roundabouts states a 4-arm mini-roundabout should not be used where the peak traffic flows at the junction exceed 500 vehicles an hour. The Southend/Foxgrove/Park Road junction has more than three times this flow.

How can the Council bring forward a scheme that breaches this guidance?

Response to Question 1:**Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety:**

The junction of Southend Road with Park Road, Foxgrove Road and Beckenham Place Park has been the location of a high number of injury collisions for many years. Not only did the high number of casualties trigger an investigation by Bromley, but a cost-effective solution has also been identified.

During the design of this proposed solution, all national guidance was taken into consideration. There are many locations across the UK where four-arm mini-roundabouts have been successfully used where traffic flow is not balanced. If we were to introduce a three-arm mini-roundabout there is more chance of displacing traffic to other routes and thereby inadvertently causing what is known as “collision migration”. A five-arm mini-roundabout was considered, but was not a recommended approach due to the limited benefits and because the existing geometry and restricted space would not enable a safe layout to be achieved.

Residents and visitors will be able to enter and exit Beckenham Place Park in a similar fashion to now, but in a safer and controlled way than is currently possible. The introduction of the roundabout will reduce speeds and present more opportunities for side road traffic, including from Beckenham Place Park, to enter the main junction.

In regard to the previous consultation in early 2022, that was based on the premise that Park Road would be closed to allow the possibility of a three-arm mini-roundabout to be installed, which could have had a major impact on traffic flows in this area. That consultation led to a significant number of concerns being raised with the Council, which were difficult to disregard. Due process was therefore followed. Although the current proposal may have a small impact on the routes drivers choose to take, it would not have the same potential impact on residents as the closure of Park Road might have done.

The recommended design represents good value in terms of collisions prevented per pound spent and is thought to be far more effective as a casualty reduction scheme than would be a 20 mph speed limit. The siting of speed cameras is not a matter for the Council but for the Police and TfL. Fundamentally the Council cannot ignore the serious problem at this junction and the fact that a solution has been identified. If there was not a high probability of further, preventable casualties at the junction we would not be proposing these changes.

Over the years, Bromley Council has developed an effective policy of implementing junction safety improvements. This has resulted in serious and fatal road casualties falling by 54% from the 2005-2009 baseline. Our team of highly trained officers identify locations where a safety intervention is required based on data collected over a substantial period, in many cases collected over several years and this has subsequently led to Bromley's road network being one of the safest in London.

Supplementary Question from Dr Jan Davidson:

How do you substantiate the claim that the current proposal would have a small impact on the routes that drivers wish to take when there is no evidence to support this assertion? Should not the amenity value of Park Road be considered?

Response to Supplementary Question:

The closing of Park Road would result in the transfer of traffic onto Brackley Road and Copers Cope Road. So it would result in an increased pressure on other roads. We would not wish just to simply transfer the problem somewhere else.

2) Question from Steven Ramm

Agenda Item: 13b

Title: BECKENHAM: SOUTHEND ROAD, PARK ROAD, FOXGROVE ROAD SAFETY SCHEME

To the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety:

RE: 3.2

The 'consultation' figures which led to scrapping the trial closure of Park Road, are misleading. Park Road residents, many in favour of the scheme, were led to understand formal consultation would take place **after** 12 months, they did not see the need to submit comments beforehand.

Since this promised consultation has been revoked, how can Cllr Bennett assure the committee due process was followed?

Response to Question 2:

I refer to the answer I gave a few moments ago to Dr Davison.

Supplementary Question from Steven Ramm:

It is incredible arrogance on behalf of the Portfolio Holder that he should dismiss national guidelines. How can the committee sanction this?

Response to Supplementary Question:

The engineering officers of the Council have followed all national guidelines.

3) Question from Anandha Ponnampalam

Agenda Item: 13b

Title: BECKENHAM: SOUTHEND ROAD, PARK ROAD, FOXGROVE ROAD SAFETY SCHEME

To the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

The proposed scheme is not fit for purpose. With very high traffic flows, pedestrians and cyclists, a three-arm mini-roundabout is the only safe option at this junction. This requires closure of Park Road, mistakenly scrapped for ideological reasons over residents safety.

Should the committee not be presented with both schemes, with relevant data, in order to make a properly informed decision?

Response to Question 3

[I refer you to the answer I gave some moments ago to Dr Davison.](#)

Supplementary Question:

I can't see how this solves the problem.

Response to Supplementary Question:

[From Beckenham Place Park Road, traffic can go into Foxgrove Road and then into the roundabout. The roundabout will be a four arm roundabout not five.](#)

4) Question from Dr Jan Davison

Agenda Item 13b - BECKENHAM: SOUTHEND ROAD, PARK ROAD, FOXGROVE ROAD SAFETY SCHEME (Report No: ES20241)

To the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety.

RE: 3.4

The data is misleading – it lumps together statistics for *all* mini-roundabouts. The mean accident rate at four arm mini-roundabouts (22.8) is almost **double that** of three arms (12.5) (Transport Research Laboratory). These rates are for roundabouts operating at the correct capacity - not three times that. The projected reductions in collisions are therefore erroneous. Can you explain why the report glosses over the facts?

Response to Question 4:

[I refer you to the answer I gave you a few moments ago](#)

Supplementary Question from Dr Jan Davidson:

As Park Road is an important road for many commuters in Beckenham and Penge to get to Beckenham Park Place should not the view of Park Road residents and its amenity value be taken into account?

Response to Supplementary Question:

My job as Portfolio Holder is to look at the whole situation in terms of how all roads in the area may be affected. Transferring traffic issues to other people's roads would be very unfair on them.

5) Question from Steven Ramm

Agenda Item: 13b

Title: BECKENHAM: SOUTHEND ROAD, PARK ROAD, FOXGROVE ROAD SAFETY SCHEME

To the Chair of the ECS PDS Committee

Government highways experts state four-arm mini-roundabouts should not be used where traffic exceeds 500 vehicles/hour. At this junction, traffic exceeds 1500 vehicles/hour, plus pedestrians and cyclists. The council has a preferred option which they are pushing through ignoring expert advice and risking lives.

Is the committee happy to approve a flawed scheme that knowingly disregards national safety standards used by every council in the UK?

Response to Question 5

I refer you to the answer I gave to Dr Davison some moments ago

Supplementary Question from Steven Ramm:

The residents of Park Road are still under the idea that there is going to be a road closure. They were not informed before the scheme was scrapped. Therefore no genuine consultation with the people in Park Road has been undertaken and due process has not been followed. Why is this scheme being scrapped on the quiet and my question is has due process been followed?

Response to the Supplementary Question

Yes, due process has been followed. The original proposal was dropped. The information regarding the new scheme will be public information if it is approved by the committee and myself.

ECS PDS—16th March 2023

Written Questions from the Public (30)

1) Question from Sue Sulis

BROMLEY'S ROLE AS THE LEAD LOCAL FLOOD AUTHORITY.

Bromley, as LLFA, is required to prepare and maintain a strategy for local flood risk management in their areas, coordinating views and activities with other local bodies and local communities through public consultation, scrutiny and delivery planning.

Please detail documents and dates when Bromley has carried out these public consultation requirements.

Response to Question 1:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

Public consultation was undertaken when the Local Flood Risk Strategy was prepared in 2015.

The Council cooperates with other bodies including Thames Water, Environment Agency and Thames 21.

2) Question from Sue Sulis

Q.2 The Council has stated that three significant flooding incidents on 10/06/19, 20/07/21 and 21/11/21, in which properties were affected, were reported to the Borough Resilience Forum and the Environment Agency.

Please give the details and dates when each of these reports were published, and where they can be found

Response to Question 2:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

The Borough Resilience Forum was made aware of these incidents, along with the Environment Agency, no formal reports prepared or published.

3) Question from Dermot McKibbon

What is the Council's plan to tackle air pollution outside schools and for older people in the borough ? Why is it taking so long to publish the Council's air pollution plan ?

Response to Question 3:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

The plan is now live on the website after it was amended to meet new accessibility guidelines.

4) Question from Dermot McKibbon

Has the Portfolio Holder read the report by the Environmental Research Group at Imperial College London ["London Health Burden of Current Air Pollution and Future Health Benefits of Mayoral Air Quality Policies"](#) ? What plans does the Council have to reduce deaths in Bromley due to toxic air ?

Response to Question 4

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

Yes, I am aware of the report and in fact, we met the writers of the report with the Director of Public Health to understand their methodology. The report concludes that anyone in Bromley who has died of any respiratory or cardiovascular causes, died from air pollution. As there are a number of reasons/ causes for these types of deaths, the report cannot conclude these same people died of poor air quality.

The authors failed to adjust their results to consider the age profile of each London borough.

In LB Bromley the age profile has significantly greater representation from older age groups, this caused the results and the conclusions of the report to be exaggerated for Bromley, as the numbers of death per head of population is, quite naturally, generally higher than for other boroughs. In comparison LB Lambeth, who have greater representation from younger age groups saw their results significantly minimised. To have considered the boroughs to be homogenous in terms of age profile is unfortunate and has led to results that do not reflect reality with regards to the conclusions regarding number of early deaths due to poor air quality.

It must be noted that air quality in the LB Bromley has met all UK air quality standards for the last 2 years, has arguably the best air quality of all London Boroughs and it continues to improve.

The Council's approved Air Quality Action Plan outlines the many commitments the Authority has made and is actioning to continue to improve air quality for all residents in the borough. A hard copy of the Plan is available by emailing ehs-customer@bromley.gov.com

5) Question from Eileen Welsh

I am shocked by the amount of unsightly litter and decaying leaf debris left along the streets and kerbsides of the residential roads in Beckenham, creating slippery pavements and blocked drains. Does the Council have a schedule for street and kerbside cleaning in residential areas, or do they totally rely on residents to report build-up of litter and blocked drains?

Response to Question 5:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

The Council does have a full, published schedule for street cleansing across the full 56 square miles and 3,000 plus roads in the borough as well as a client monitoring team that oversees the service provider's outputs. Operating across such a large area has its challenges admittedly, but there is no reliance on residents or volunteers. That said however, the work those residents or volunteers do is highly valued and supported through our Street Friends scheme. Beckenham is a broad area and comes with challenges of its own including heavily parked-up sections and tree-lined streets. If there are specific locations that we can look at with a view to improving the amenity we would be very happy to receive those and would work hard to improve standards.

6) Question from Laura Holdgate

Park Road/Southend Road Junction:

Why has the decision been made to go ahead with a different road design without gathering any clear evidence as to its impact, in particular given the limited effectiveness of four arm roundabouts, as noted in paragraph 3.3 of the public report? This seems contrary to the original plan to have a 12 month trial period of the initial solution, which clearly has merit in understanding traffic flows and displacement.

Response to Question 6:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

During the design of this proposed solution to the ongoing collision problem at this location, all guidance was taken into consideration. There are many locations across the UK where four-arm mini-roundabouts have been successfully used and do result in a reduced number of casualties and their severity.

If we were to introduce a three-arm mini roundabout there is more chance of displacing traffic to other routes and thereby inadvertently causing what is known as “collision migration”.

7) Question from Laura Holdgate

Park Road/Southend Road Junction:

Why has there been no consultation on the new solution? Given that 108 people responded to the last proposal it is clearly an issue of interest, surely this revised solution should be given the same opportunity to receive support or objection?

Response to Question 7:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

The previous consultation was based on the premise that Park Road would be closed, which would have had a possible major impact on traffic flows in this area. Although the current proposal may have a small impact on the routes drivers choose to take, it would not have the same potential impact on residents as the closure of Park Road might have done.

8) Question from Jennifer Geary

Proposal for roundabout at Foxgrove Road Junction:

How will BPP residents access the roundabout (via Foxgrove Road or Southend?) and how will sufficient priority be given to BPP residents at times of high traffic?

Response to Question 8:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Residents and visitors will still be able to enter and exit Beckenham Place Park (BPP) but in a more safe and controlled way than is currently possible. The introduction of the roundabout will reduce speeds and present more opportunities for side road traffic, including BPP, to enter the main junction

9) Question from Jennifer Geary

Proposal for roundabout at Foxgrove Road Junction:

Was a 5-arm roundabout, incorporating access from BPP, considered?

Response to Question 9:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

A five-arm mini-roundabout was considered but was not a recommended approach due to the limited benefits and because the existing geometry and restricted space would not enable a safe layout to be achieved.

10) Question from Martin Beasley

Mini roundabout at junction of Southern Road, Parke Road and Foxgrove:

Agenda Item Para 3.2 is misleading. Council Letter Feb 2022 stated:

*".....invited to take part in a **formal consultation after the experimental closure has been in place for a minimum of 12 months** to provide their views....."*

Residents misled to believe no comments needed immediately, hence comments which were received are distorted, giving people in favour less likely to comment.

Why has the Council changed and embarked on £1.3m scheme based on incomplete and biased comments?

Response to Question 10

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety:

The cost of this scheme is estimated at £125k, not £1.3M. The previous consultation was based on the premise that Park Road would be closed, which would have had a possible major impact on traffic flows in this area. Although the current proposal may have a small impact on the routes drivers choose to take, it would not have the same potential impact on residents as the closure of Park Road might have done.*

11) Question from Martin Beasley

Mini roundabout at junction of Southern Road, Parke Road and Foxgrove

Southend Road daytime traffic exceeds +1100 vehicles/hour (Council survey 2021), over double National recommended volume for 4 arm mini-roundabout.

If include Park, Foxgrove, Covid etc, likely volume is 3X National limit (recent resident survey +1500 vehicles/hour).

Report makes superfluous safety claim as not based on the proposed junction.

Why have the Council ignored National recommendations on maximum traffic volume and based safety gains on data not related to the 4 arm/high volume roundabout in question?

Response to Question 11:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety:

During the design of this proposed solution to the ongoing collision problem at this location, all guidance was taken into consideration. There are many locations across the UK where four-arm mini-roundabouts have been successfully used where traffic flow is not balanced. If there was not a serious problem at this junction we would not be proposing these changes.

12) Question from Marc Briggs

Reference to agenda item 13b

When the junction of Southend Road and Park Road suffers from a very poor injury crash record (item 3.1), and 3-arm roundabouts are more effective than 4-arm roundabouts at reducing collisions (item 3.3). What evidence do the council members have that the installation of a 4-arm roundabout will reduce the risk to pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers sufficiently, when a 3-arm roundabout is achievable?

Response to Question 12

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

During the design of this proposed solution to the ongoing collision problem at this location appropriate design guidance was taken into consideration. There are many locations across the UK where four-arm mini-roundabouts have been successfully used.

If we were to introduce a three-arm mini roundabout there is more chance of displacing traffic to other routes and thereby inadvertently causing what is known as "collision migration".

13) Question from Marc Briggs

Reference to agenda item 13b

If the closure of Park Road, and the installation of a 3-arm roundabout offers the safest option (item 3.3) for all road users (item 8.1), and the council is rejecting this solution based on the feedback from 79 emails (item 3.2). Can the council explain why the revised 4-arm solution is not given the same opportunity for public consultation?

Response to Question 13

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

The previous consultation was based on the premise that Park Road would be closed, which would have had a possible major impact on traffic flows in this area. Although the current proposal may have a small impact on the routes drivers choose to take, it would not have the same potential impact on residents as the closure of Park Road might have done.

14) Question from Gareth Anderson

Proposed roundabout at Foxgrove Road/South End Road Junction.

What allowances are in place to prevent this congestion, for example will vehicles continue to be able to enter and exit BPP from or onto Southend Road via the cobbles as they do now?

Response to Question 14

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Residents and visitors will still be able to enter and exit BPP but in a more safe and controlled way than is currently possible. Drivers will still be able to cross the cobbles where this will help. The introduction of the roundabout will reduce speeds and present more opportunities for side road traffic, including BPP, to enter the main junction.

15) Question from Gareth Anderson

Proposed roundabout at Foxgrove Road/South End Road Junction.

Given the very high cost of the roundabout and the fact it could increase rather than decrease congestion and safety concerns, could alternative measures be imposed such as a 20mph speed limit and potentially adding speed cameras for this section of Southend Road?

Response to Question 15

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

The recommended design represents good value in terms of collisions prevented per pound spent and is thought to be far more effective as a casualty reduction scheme than would be a 20mph speed limit. The siting of speed cameras is not a matter for the Council but for the Police and TfL.

16) Question from Silvano and Gillian Deblasi

Proposal for roundabout at Junction of Foxgrove Road, Park Road, Southend Road, Beckenham Place Park.*

It is currently nearly an impossibility to access Southend Road from the Park, as we normally end up blocking the access into Foxgrove Road on trying to join Foxgrove Road to exit, with a roundabout there we would have to do a virtual U-turn to turn right into Southend Road, we may even have to turn left into Foxgrove Road, do a U-turn at some point, then join the traffic queue to access Southend Road. How will priority be given to vehicles exiting Beckenham Place Park?

Response to Question 16

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Residents and visitors will still be able to enter and exit BPP but more safely and controlled than is currently possible. The introduction of the roundabout will reduce speeds and present more opportunities for side road traffic, including BPP, to enter the main junction.

17) Question from Silvano and Gillian Deblasi

We believe that a 4-arm roundabout is untenable, a 5-arm roundabout would be a better option as this would include Beckenham Place Park; is this an option you are prepared to consider?

Response to Question 17:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

This was considered and not recommended because of the limited benefits and because the existing geometry and restricted space would not enable a safe layout to be achieved.

18) Question from Richard Gibbons

Re. Item 12. ECS Performance Overview and 13d. Draft Portfolio Plan. Notably absent is any reference to the epidemic of casual littering, and specifically the discarding of nitrous oxide cylinders and disposable vapes,

both of which are misused by and injurious to young people. How do you plan to tackle these issues?

Response to Question 18

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

Any variety of fly-tipped, dumped or illegitimately discarded waste, including that which has been specifically mentioned, that is on the public highway, will be proactively removed via baseline cleansing frequencies or via targeted reactive resources such as upon receipt of a report from a member of the client team or public.

We are teaming up with Veolia to launch a new anti-littering campaign and we hope residents will help us to encourage everyone to look after our environment.

19) Question from Richard Gibbons

Re. Item 13e. Tree Management Strategy 2023-2027 and Indicator 7, (a) how many Tree Friends are currently registered, (b) what are your targets/dates for recruiting more Tree Friends, (c) when will the Tree Database website go public, and (d) when will the updated Tree Friends Toolkit be published?

Response to Question 19

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

- a) Only coordinators are currently registered. There are 90 coordinators.
- b) Targets will be defined after the re-launch and existing tree friends have re-registered.
- c) Seeking clarification

We are working toward a release date of the 30/04/23 in time for the tree watering season.

