

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

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

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 Thomas Turrell,

Councillor Nicholas Bennett MA J.P. and Councillor Aisha
Cuthbert

178 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no apologies for absence.

179 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Simon Fawthrop declared an interest as he had shares in BT, but he said they were below the threshold that would normally be declared as a pecuniary interest.

180 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 21st MARCH 2022

The minutes of the meeting held on the 21st of March 2022 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

181 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND THE PUBLIC FOR WRITTEN RESPONSE

Questions from Councillors and the public for written response were disseminated at the meeting and will be attached as an appendix to the minutes when they are published.

182 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL RESPONSE

21 June 2022

The Chairman and the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety received questions for oral response. The questions and responses will be attached as an appendix to the minutes.

183 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS FOR ORAL RESPONSE

A question for oral response was responded to by the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety. The question and response will be attached as an appendix to the minutes.

184 MATTERS ARISING AND WORK PROGRAMME

CSD22076

It was noted that the Chairman had asked Councillor Thomas Turrell to provide an update to the Committee at the meeting on 22nd November 2022 with respect to his role as Executive Assistant to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

RESOLVED that the Matters Arising report and Work Programme be noted and that Councillor Thomas Turrell provide an update to the Committee on 22nd November 2022 with respect to his role as Executive Assistant to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

185 ARBORICULTURE - GLENDALE - ANNUAL CONTRACT PERFORMANCE MONITORING REPORT

Attending to provide the update on the Arboriculture-Glendale-Annual Contract Performance Monitoring Report were Hugh Chapman, (LBB Arboricultural Services Manager) and Nick Brooks from Glendale. It was noted that this annual report outlined the performance of the contract which delivered the day to day arboricultural operations across the Council's administrative area relating to the financial year 2021 to 2022.

The Chairman expressed his thanks to Mr. Brooks for the sterling work undertaken by Glendale during storm 'Eunice'. He asked Mr. Brooks how he felt Glendale had been performing this year. Mr. Brooks referred to the KPI's and the response against the KPI's as listed in the report and expressed the view that overall Glendale had performed well. The Chairman asked Mr. Brooks what he felt Glendale could improve upon in terms of their services to the Council. Mr. Brooks responded and said that the contract had grown since its inception and that what he would like to improve upon was the level of resource in terms of people. Despite the offering of good salaries, it was difficult to recruit people into the arboricultural industry and this seemed to be a national problem.

A Member asked Mr. Brooks how the Council could be confident that they would not fall behind again and would cope well in the future. Mr. Brooks

responded and said that storm Eunice was a significant event which had involved responding to approximately 400 call outs. Their strategy team had to bring in additional contractors to provide support. In terms of resources, the company was looking to set up an internal academy to bring through and educate their own trainees and some of these new trainees had been taken on already. It was explained that the trainees could start basic work in 3-6 months, but it would take 1-2 years to become fully qualified.

The LBB Arboricultural Services Manager stated that Glendale had been asked to provide a corrective action plan together with a timeframe for the resolution of outstanding issues. Weekly performance against targets was now being monitored. LBB were waiting for Glendale to submit a revised timeframe.

A Member asked if the businesses that had been used to help to provide support and backlog recovery were local businesses. Mr Brooks responded that 2/3 of the businesses were locally based. It was difficult to allocate work out to smaller businesses as they would get overloaded and struggle to cope quite quickly.

A Member asked what was being done to reduce the transmission of Ash Dieback disease. The LBB Arboricultural Services Manager responded and said that there was no cure for this disease; in terms of prevention the main preventative measure was the clearing away of leaf debris. If more than 50% of the tree was dead or dying then it would be removed. The Chairman asked if the service was keeping an eye on other tree diseases. The Arboricultural Services Manager said that he and his officers undertook continued professional development and kept up to date with the latest briefings from the Forestry Commission.

A discussion took place concerning how the service would manage the target for tree planting whilst at the same time maintaining and keeping the same trees alive. The Arboricultural Services Manager responded and said that a decision had been made to separate maintenance from the main body of the contract. This being the case he, was confident that the targets for tree planting could be achieved.

RESOLVED that the Glendale Annual Contract Monitoring Report be noted.

186 ECS PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

The Head of Performance Management & Business Support attended to brief the Committee regarding the ECS Performance Overview report.

It was noted that the number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic accidents had increased and this was disappointing. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking stated that this was a trend that was the same for neighbouring boroughs. The department would be looking at the trends and

21 June 2022

doing what it could to reduce the number of KSIs. A Member asked if these figures could be broken down so that Members could differentiate between those who were injured and those who were killed. She asked if this data could be provided for future reports. The Assistant Director for Traffic and parking said that the data was available and that he would disseminate it.

A Member commented that it was not good enough just to say that other boroughs had seen similar increases, she stated that what was required was not a reactive response but that the Council should be more proactive in taking measures to reduce KSIs. She felt the current KSI figures were unacceptable. She also asked if a breakdown of the figures could be provided for each Ward. The Assistant Director responded and said that this data could be extrapolated and sent out. He also said that the Council already identified dangerous roads and where accidents were happening. He said the Council did not have the resources to make every road safe, but they used data to try and identify if there was a pattern of accidents and hotspots. The Council would then prioritise these areas. It was also important to identify the age groups involved.

A Member stated that a 26.7% increase over target was not a slight increase but was a significant one, she also pointed out that a serious injury could be life changing or could in fact be fatal after 30 days. The Assistant Director responded and said that 99.9% of deaths would occur within the 30 day period. The Council would be informed by the police concerning this. He said that every fatality was fully investigated. A Member said that she objected to the use of the term 'accident' in these instances because careless driving was not an accident.

A Member stated that she had undertaken a survey with local residents before the recent elections and found out that a big concern was road safety. She expressed the view that smaller accidents were not being recorded on the Council's KSI database.

A Member pointed out that Bromley had more miles of road than any other borough in London.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and that in future, KSI data would be broken down by Ward and would also show the number of people killed and the number of people seriously injured.

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

An update was provided from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety. He said that he had met with the previous Portfolio Holder recently and found this meeting very helpful. By way of introduction he said that he had been working for the Council for 16 years and had previously worked as the Parliamentary Private Secretary for the Department of Transport. He said that he was a cyclist, a pedestrian, held a motorcycle

licence and used all forms of transport. He said that he had much reading to do and recommended that everyone read the Local Implementation Plan-- although it was a large document he described it as 'readable'.

The Portfolio Holder commented that at the moment there was no TfL funding available and LBB was waiting for a new tranche of funding to be released. He mentioned that the Government wanted to see improvements in the way that TfL functioned and that they particularly wanted to see three underground lines automated in the near future. He expressed the view that a longer term funding agreement with TfL was required. The Council had requested £2m and currently had been allocated £100,000 which had been earmarked for various projects.

The Portfolio Holder recommended travelling on the new 'Elizabeth Line' which had increased the underground network capacity by 10%. The Portfolio Holder mentioned that he wanted to visit every ward to gain a comprehensive understanding of any issues and problems that existed in each ward. He also said that he wanted to produce a policy document which would set down clear guidelines on policies and the future direction of the Portfolio.

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

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

An update was received from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces. The Portfolio Holder explained that she had been a Councillor for four years and represented the Shortlands and Park Langley Ward. She was excited about the step up to Cabinet. She explained that her first real political experience was when she was 18. She had campaigned to change a four acre forest into a public park that could be enjoyed by everyone.

She had a background in social housing where she had been involved in developing the organisation's decarbonizing policy. She had also worked for a company that was involved in training and providing a knowledge base for gold miners to help them use environmentally safe products for gold mining. The Portfolio Holder was now in the process of setting up key meetings with various stakeholders including a meeting shortly with the Friends Group. She was also involved in developing the Jubilee Criteria and was happy to hear from any Ward Members concerning any issues in their wards that were related to her Portfolio.

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

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

HOLDERS

**a APPOINTMENTS TO THE COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTATIVE
PANEL AND THE LEISURE GARDENS AND ALLOTMENTS
PANEL 2022/23.**

CSD 21143

The Committee noted the report regarding the proposed appointments to the Countryside Consultative Panel and the Leisure Gardens and Allotments Panel.

RESOLVED that the proposed appointments to the Countryside Consultative Panel and the Leisure Gardens and Allotments Panel be agreed.

b CONTAMINATED LAND STRATEGY 2022

ES20175

The Committee noted the report regarding the Contaminated Land Strategy for 2022.

RESOLVED that:

1) The Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces authorised the Head of Domestic Regulation to commence a consultation with relevant bodies on the updated draft Contaminated Land Strategy that was attached as appendix 1 to the main report.

2) The Committee agreed that a further report be received following the conclusion of consultation, when the Committee will be asked to approve the adoption of the Draft Contaminated Land Strategy 2022, incorporating any relevant amendments following the consultation.

c CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING

FSD22051

Members noted the Capital Programme Monitoring Report for Quarter 4 2021 to 2022.

RESOLVED that:

The Portfolio Holders noted and acknowledged the current position in respect of capital schemes, to be put to the Executive on the 30th of June 2022.

d PROVISIONAL OUTTURN

FSD 22050

The Committee noted the provisional outturn position with respect to 2021/22.

RESOLVED that:

The Portfolio Holders endorsed the 2021/22 outturn position for the Environment & Community Services Portfolio.

**e ONLINE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTING SYSTEM CONTRACT
(FIXMYSTREET PRO & WASTEWORCS)**

ES20191

The Committee noted the report regarding the Online Environmental Reporting System Contract which was presented by the LBB Technical Support and Marketing Manager. He provided further clarification regarding the data provided in section 3.18 of the report. A Member commented that there were no doubt 'hotspots' where issues were reported regularly on FIX My Street. She asked if this data was monitored so that remedial action could be taken. It was explained that there was a 'heat map' system that was part of the software that provided this data. This data was fed back to officers who would take relevant action in response.

A Member raised the issue of ward boundaries on Fix My Street, as the ward boundaries on Fix My Street at the time of the meeting were still aligned with the old ward boundaries which had now changed. The LBB Technical Support and Marketing Manager explained that there had been a delay in re-aligning the new ward boundaries as LBB had been waiting for the Ordinance Survey master map to be released. In the interim the LBB Technical Support and Marketing Manager was investigating ways to use other maps on a temporary basis.

A Member raised the issue of people being able to report issues if they did not have digital access. The LBB Technical Support and Marketing Manager said that in such cases, people could call the Council Call Centre and they would log the issue for them.

A Member asked if the original text of the reported issue could be incorporated into the response when the issue was being closed as being actioned. The LBB Technical Support and Marketing Manager said that this was something that could be looked into but there were no immediate plans to provide this service.

RESOLVED that:

The Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services & Open Spaces approved the direct award, via exemption to competitive

tendering, of a new online environmental reporting system contract to SocietyWorks Ltd for FixMyStreet Pro & WasteWorks at an annual cost of £54k (£30k for FMS Pro & £24k for WasteWorks) commencing 1 April 2023 for eight years with an option to extend for two further years (estimated whole life value of £540k):

f REVIEW OF SCHOOL STREETS

ES20192

The Review of the School Streets Report was presented by the Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking, along with the Road Safety Manager.

A Member stated that she had liaised with colleagues in other boroughs and found that the common denominator in terms of the successful implementation of School Streets was the use of ANPR cameras. She expressed the view that a reliance on Street Marshals was misplaced. She felt that the financial arguments outlined in the report were unacceptable and asked for the recommendations to be refused.

Another Member agreed with this view and asked that the recommendations of the report be rejected. She said that she had taken the time to observe the School Street operating in Hayes at 8.00am. Her experience of the School Street was not as outlined in the report. She said that she saw hundreds of children, walking, scooting and cycling to school in a calm and relaxed atmosphere. Many families were enjoying the School Street. The Member had taken photographs and had drafted a report. In her report she had recommended the use of Traffic Enforcement Officers. She explained that the main problem that they had at the barrier (manned by one steward) was with delivery drivers and builders. The Member continued and pointed out that the Ward Councillor (Cllr Thomas Turrell) took a positive view of the School Street. She suggested that LBB could look to adopt the model used in Birmingham where they used mobile ANPR cameras. Another possibility (also used in Birmingham), was the use of body cameras by stewards. The Member stated that there were many positives about the scheme and many teething problems that could be fixed.

A Member asked that as the Council was earning approximately £3m from the moving traffic contravention cameras, could not some of this money be spent on School Streets.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking responded and pointed out that the report was not saying that the Council was not going to be involved in any School Street projects. He said that the recommendation of the report was that the Council would support schools that wanted to run School Streets. However, the Council was not looking to roll out School Streets everywhere because of the resource implications. He stated that the School Streets project in Hayes was initially a pilot and that other schemes had been piloted during lockdown. Some were successful and others were not.

The Assistant Director pointed out that the use of CCTV and mobile cameras was very expensive and even if the Council had the cameras, it was expensive to move them around. The Assistant Director explained that at the moment the Council did not have any mobile cameras in the borough and to purchase any would involve the Council in significant cost. There was also the additional cost involved in the running of the cameras. At the end of the day, it was a matter of the prioritisation of resources and budgets. There were numerous demands on resources, for example the installation of a zebra crossing. He stated that the likely revenue generated from ANPR cameras for School Streets would probably not cover the running costs of the cameras.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking said that the income generated from moving traffic cameras was covering costs at the moment. This income was not ring fenced and would be used to cover all aspects of the ECS Portfolio. Currently, not as much income was being generated as was anticipated—it was hoped to make the MTC cameras more effective going forward.

A Member drew attention to the table in section 3.17 of the report. He pointed out that the percentage figures for July 21 added up to 98% and not 100% and wondered where the other 2% had gone. The Road Safety Manager apologised and said that she thought this was an error with respect to the data submitted for travel by Trams.

A Member drew attention to the table in section 3.41 of the report. He pointed out that the percentage figure for June 21 was 92.3% and that the percentage figure for November 21 was 100.41% and so it was clear the figures were not adding up.

A Member stated that she had investigated several other boroughs and found that their School Streets were self-funding. She felt that this was something that the Council should look into further. She also emphasised the importance of School Streets in providing better air quality for young people.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking stated that School Streets were not the only way of reducing air pollution outside of schools. Things like active travel plans could also be used. There was indeed a broad spectrum of tools that could be used that were not as expensive. He said that the Council could not justify an investment in cameras at this stage.

A Member commented that Bromley was not a poor borough and that the Council should be proactive and join the other 500 School Streets in London.

Recommendations 2.4 and 2.5 of the report were as follows:

2.4 That funding for the ongoing support for existing School Streets continues to be found from the existing revenue budget for Traffic and Road Safety; and for the possible introduction of any new School Streets would need to be

21 June 2022

considered on a case by case basis, subject to funding being available within that budget.

2.5 That the decision to introduce or discontinue any School Street is delegated to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety."

Councillor Simon Fawthrop proposed the following amendments to the recommendations:

2.4 That funding for the ongoing support for existing School Streets continues to be found from the existing revenue budget for Traffic and Road Safety.

2.5 Any new School Streets would need to be considered on a case by case basis, subject to funding being available within budget and subject to approval from the Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety and scrutiny from the Environment and Community Services PDS Committee.

2.6 That the decision to discontinue any School Street is delegated to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety.

The Chairman asked for a vote on the revised recommendations and the motion was carried by five votes to four.

RESOLVED that:

2.1 That School Streets are not actively rolled out across the borough, due primarily to resource implications, but also the negative impact on some parents and on some nearby residents.

2.2 The Council supports schools that currently operate a School Street and that wish to continue running their School Street using their own marshals, where there is support from parents and local residents and the School Street is not causing significant negative knock on effects in nearby streets

2.3 That Members note that if the additional schools wish to install a School Street, consideration should be given to their Travel Plan status, catchment area, existent level of active travel and consultation to ascertain if there would be a significant parent buy in, in addition to consultation with affected residents. Also, that the schools agreed to commit to marshalling the School Street with their own resources going forward.

2.4 That funding for the ongoing support for existing School Streets continues to be found from the existing revenue budget for Traffic and Road Safety.

2.5 Any new School Streets would need to be considered on a case by case basis, subject to funding being available within budget and subject to approval from the Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety and scrutiny from the Environment and Community Services PDS Committee.

2.6 That the decision to discontinue any School Street is delegated to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety

g ONE MILLION POUNDS PLATINUM JUBILEE PARKS FUND

ES20189

The Strategic Commissioning Officer attended to provide the update on the One Million Pounds Platinum Jubilee Parks Fund along with the Environment Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces. The proposals had been promoted to Councillors, community activist groups and stakeholders. It was hoped that many bids could be submitted in the first tranche of funding applications. Funding was more likely to be provided for projects that were community led and supported by the community. The Portfolio Holder said that she was keen to promote projects that supported loneliness and community cohesion.

The report was presented to the Committee to outline the proposed rules of engagement for applications to the Platinum Jubilee Parks Fund, and to seek Environment Portfolio Holder approval for its adoption.

A Member referred to criteria 13 with respect to making funding applications. This criteria stated that for applications in excess of £3k, 100 signatures would be required from people on the electoral roll. It was suggested by a Member that this would be undemocratic because it would exclude anyone under the voting age that may wish to sign something that they believed in. The Portfolio Holder responded and said if anyone felt that they would like to comment in objection or support, they were very welcome to do so.

A Member suggested that projects concerning accessibility areas should be considered for funding as well as the provision of water fountains, cycle routes and public toilets. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking commented that funds were limited and the provision of toilets was expensive. A Member said that a meeting had recently taken place with the Friends Group with respect to Priory Park. They had taken note of what needed to be done, this was now being costed and the project was going ahead; it was suggested that a press release accompany this initiative. It was also suggested that this initiative should be promoted to all Friends Groups and it was noted that the application form would appear on the Council website at some point in July. The Portfolio Holder said that it was necessary for projects involving parks to be led by the Friends Groups first, as they were the custodians of the parks.

RESOLVED that:

1) The ECS PDS Committee noted the proposed rules of engagement to allocate funding for each round of the Platinum Jubilee Parks Fund as set out in Appendix A of this report.

2) The Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces approved the proposed rules of engagement for decision making on requests for funding from the Platinum Jubilee Parks Earmarked Reserve, based on the parameters and criteria set out in Appendix A to the report.

190 PRE DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS GOING TO THE EXECUTIVE and FULL COUNCIL FOR DECISION

191 NEXT STEPS FOR THE CRYSTAL PALACE PARK REGENERATION PLAN

HPR2022/022

The report was presented by the LBB Head of Regeneration.

The report provided an update on the Regeneration Plan for Crystal Palace Park and set out the next steps to take forward the capital scheme. It made recommendations in relation to securing the legal agreements to dispose of the residential sites as part of the Housing Enabling Development, securing funding for the first phases of works, as well as transferring the Park to the Crystal Palace Park Trust.

It was noted that the report had already been scrutinised by two other committees and that it was going to the Executive Committee to make the final decision.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

192 POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS

193 ECS CONTRACTS REGISTER

ES20184

Members noted the ECS Contracts Register Report.

RESOLVED that the ECS Contracts Register be noted.

194 ECS RISK REGISTER

ES20178

A Member raised the issue of the Waldo Road Depot improvement works. She asked if there was a plan that could be shared. She wondered why the original plan had been delayed and how long the depot would be closed. The Member expressed concern about the possible impacts on waste disposal and recycling. She asked that some detail be provided to her regarding this.

The Director for Environment and Public Protection responded and said that this was a project for significant improvement works at the Waldo Road Depot; it was a £6.4m capital programme project. More detail would be provided to Members in the future when a new and final report would be presented to the Committee, when permission would be sought to appoint a contractor for the improvement works. The current economic climate was having a negative impact on large scale capital projects nationwide as costs were increasing and supply chains were being affected. Detailed design work would be undertaken by officers and then a new report would be brought back to Members to seek to procure the new contract. The Director promised to provide copies of the previous report regarding Waldo Road to any Members that required it.

The Director stated that Veolia had strong views on how the works should be completed and discussions with Veolia were ongoing. A discussion took place concerning the possible impact of the delay in progressing the Waldo Road capital improvement works and also how the Council could improve the recycling of paper that had got wet.

A Member noted that on this occasion, the opportunity had not been provided to scrutinise the Portfolio Holders and she requested that this be addressed going forward. She raised the matter of how LBB measured air quality. She asked that either a report come back to the Committee regarding this or if a PowerPoint presentation could be disseminated to Members. A Member commented that a report had been undertaken by Imperial College regarding air quality and this had been based on extrapolated data from a monitor by the Glade. He believed that another 10 monitors existed in the borough. He agreed that more information should be provided to Members regarding this and the Chairman suggested that an update on this be brought to the September meeting. A Member informed the Committee that the PRUH had a live air quality monitor and that DPD monitored air quality via their delivery vans.

RESOLVED that

- 1) The ECS Risk Register is noted**
- 2) The previous Waldo Road Improvement Works report be disseminated as required.**

(Post meeting note: this was disseminated on 11th July 2022)

3) An updated Waldo Road report would be brought to Members in due course when it was time to appoint a contractor for the capital programme works.

4) An update or report would be brought to the September meeting concerning how LBB monitored air quality.

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

196 PART 2 CONTRACTS REGISTER REPORT

Members noted the items listed in the Part 2 (exempt items) Contracts Register Report.

RESOLVED that the Part 2 Contracts Register Report be noted.

197 NEXT STEPS FOR THE CRYSTAL PALACE PARK REGENERATION PLAN--Part 2

HPR2022/022A

The LBB Head of Regeneration attended to update members on the Crystal Palace Park Regeneration Plan. Members noted the report as requested and also noted that the final decision would be made by the Executive.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 9.12 pm

Chairman

ECS PDS—June 21st 2022

Oral Questions from Councillors

1) Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe

Is it correct that a request for pedestrian refuges to assist residents crossing Park Avenue (Plaistow Ward), a very wide straight road which suffers constantly from vehicles exceeding the speed limit, was refused and in particular, that the addition of a refuge opposite the exit from Parish CofE Primary School was refused?

Response to Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:

In response to an enquiry by Peter Morgan when he was one of the ward councillors it was estimated that the cost of providing a refuge would be £10,000 and would require the removal of a mature street tree. Requests for facilities such as refuges outside a school are made in a school's Travel Plan. Parish Primary School have made no such request, but should they add this as a request, then the Council will look at the necessity for such a refuge, its feasibility and the priority in respect of similar requests for funding.

This page is left intentionally blank

ECS PDS—21st June 2022

Oral Questions from the Public to the Chairman:

1) Question from Richard Gibbons:

Given all but two appointments to ECS Committee are new, would all members and portfolio holders introduce themselves, stating: (a) name; (b) relevant skills, experience and interests; (c) wards represented and frequency of proactive engagement with residents by way of surgeries, newsletters, social media, etc.; and (d) mode of travel this evening?

Response to Question 1:

Thank you for your question.

One of the first items on the Agenda tonight will be for the Portfolio Holders and Executive Assistant to briefly introduce themselves and tell the Committee what they are responsible for and what projects they have been assigned this year.

Due to the fact that many of the Committee members are new, as well as the extensive agenda for tonight's meeting, it is essential that the Committee prioritises carrying out its obligations to scrutinise, as well as ensuring that new members familiarise themselves with the task in hand. As a result, the committee simply doesn't have the time to carry out your request. Please feel free to contact members directly after this meeting to discuss your requests should you wish.

Supplementary Question:

Thank you, Chairman, disappointing that you choose not to answer the question. It would have been good to hear how members are engaging with residents. As founder of Friends of Green Street Green Common (which now straddles two wards), I emailed Councillors on 11th April requesting a meeting. Request declined. I emailed again on 24th May. No reply. What would you say to the councillors that appear disinterested in their local environment, considering one of them is on your committee?

Response to the Supplementary Question from the Chairman:

I would say that this is something that you would need to take up with your Councillors after this meeting.

Response from Councillor Mike Botting:

Unfortunately, what Mr Gibbons has said is not 100% correct. He did email Cllr Page, Cllr Page sent out an invitation to all the other Councillors in Mr Gibbons' email. As far as I am aware, Cllr Page is dealing with it, otherwise give me a call.

ECS PDS—June 21st 2022

Oral Questions from the Public to Portfolio Holders with Answers

1) Question from Richard Gibbons:

305 Bromley borough streets opened for residents to celebrate the Platinum Jubilee; free from cut-through traffic, neighbours of all ages enjoyed the occasion. Do you agree that it would be a fitting legacy to review policies and enable residents to organise regular 'community streets' events where neighbours meet and children play out?

Response to Question 1:

The Platinum Jubilee was a one-off national celebration. The highway is a public thoroughfare.

Street closures inconveniences the public, preventing free movement and deliveries and can impede emergency services and has the unwelcome effect of redirecting traffic along other nearby streets to the detriment of residents living there. Such closures are therefore kept to the absolute minimum. The Borough has many green spaces suitable for play and residents are, of course, very welcome to make use of them

Supplementary Question from Richard Gibbons:

Are you aware that Michael Gove wrote to local authorities on 20th May saying, quote "I would like to hear from you to understand what more we can do to make it quicker and easier for communities to come together regularly in the future, including loosening any rules to deliver a lasting legacy". If the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities; the Local Government Association; Active Travel England and Sport England all support Community Play Streets; why not Bromley Council?

Response to Supplementary Question:

I have nothing further that I wish to add to my answer.

2) Question from Brendan Donegan

All Bromley schools exceed WHO guideline for NO2. Children are at most risk of dangers of air pollution. 60% of their pollution intake is during school run and breaks. 25% of cars driving at peak times is doing school run. How can you justify not actively rolling out School Streets?

Response to Question 2:

This matter is being discussed by the committee later this evening.

The Council has supported a number of schools to implement such a street and has provided barriers and the necessary signs, however it is clear from the report, that without the support of the school and/or local residents to operate the barriers, a number of schools have either not joined the scheme or are finding it difficult to continue the necessary commitment. The Council has no additional money to provide ANPR cameras at an estimated cost of £60,000 per school and has numerous other requests for safety improvements across the borough.

Supplementary Question from Brendan Donegan:

I would like to ask for clarification about what is meant by 'no additional money' when on the agenda is an item for the use of reserves for parks to the value of £1m. Also my understanding is that over the last 10 years on an annual basis, there has been an underspend of between £10 and £15m. I am aware that the Council has won awards for sound financial management, but I'm confused by this, as I would have thought that part of sound financial management would be to provide services to the public within budget rather than under spending.

Response to the Supplementary Question:

All budgets have to be controlled. If you take for example the £60k for two ANPR cameras, for that money I could buy two zebra crossings. These would be there for residents 24 hours day, 365 days per year. So I have to use the money that I have to balance priorities. I would also remind you that this is only one part of the Council. We have other parts of the Council that are grossly over spending at the moment, particularly in education for example which is a demand led service. We have an example of a child that is costing £14k per week. So this is not an isolated budget.