

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 19 July 2011

Present:

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)

Councillors Reg Adams, Kathy Bance, Julian Grainger, David Hastings, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Nick Milner, Ian F. Payne, George Taylor and Stephen Wells

Also Present:

Councillor Colin Smith

16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillor Ellie Harmer. Apologies were also received from Councillor Peter Fortune as Portfolio Executive Assistant.

17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman declared a personal and prejudicial interest at item 8a of the agenda. Accordingly the Chairman vacated the chair to Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher for the duration of the item.

18 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

There were no questions to the Committee.

19 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 16TH JUNE 2011

Referring to minute 7D and a street scene matter related to the leaving of wheelie bins, Councillor George Taylor felt that the resident in his ward concerned about the problem was primarily concerned about wheelie bins left on the street edge rather than curtilage edge. The Assistant Director (Street scene and Green space) explained that feedback from Resident Associations indicated the matter was not an issue. Nevertheless enforcement powers were available and infringements could be dealt with on a case by case basis where details were provided. The Chairman referred to keeping the matter on the Committee's radar.

Concerning minute 10 and consultation on traffic schemes, Councillor Grainger felt that if there were both a low number of consultation responses in favour over those not supporting and a low response rate overall then a greater store should be put on ward Councillor comments.

The minutes were agreed.

20 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

Three questions had been received from Mr Colin Willetts for written reply and two questions had been received from Mr John Eveson for written reply. The questions and replies are at **Appendix A**.

21 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS

Decisions of the Portfolio Holder taken since the Committee's previous meeting were noted.

22 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

Members were provided with Decisions of the Portfolio Holder taken since the Committee's previous meeting on 16th June 2011.

A) BUDGET MONITORING 2011-12

Report ES11089

Based on expenditure and activity levels to 31st May 2011, the controllable budget for the Environment Portfolio was projected to balance by year end although there were some major variations.

Details were provided of the 2011/12 projected outturn with a forecast of projected spend for each division compared to the latest approved budget. The background to the variations was also outlined.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the latest 2011/12 budget projection for the Environment Portfolio.

B) LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (LIP) - FINAL LIP FOR SUBMISSION TO TFL

Report 11036

Following submission of a draft LIP to Transport for London (TfL) on 20th December 2010, approval was sought on a Final LIP which reflected comments from TfL and a number of consultees. It also contained a number of factual updates.

The proposed Final LIP remained similar in structure and content to the Draft LIP, the main changes relating to:

- a general update of facts and figures where available;
- changes to funding programmes to reflect the latest position on TfL financial support;
- changes to some of the monitoring targets in response to comments received; and
- other changes arising from consultation which were generally minor.

A summary of comments from TfL on the Draft LIP and the Council's response was appended to Report 11036 as was a summary of other consultation comments and the Council's response to the points made.

In introduction the Chairman explained that the Transport Statement Working Group had met on 14th July to look at the Final LIP and he highlighted the notes of the meeting which had been tabled. It was necessary to finalise the document and provide it to the Mayor. Few comments were made by TfL on the draft LIP and the Chairman congratulated the Head of Transport Strategy for the document.

Referring to Objective B8 *"To improve accessibility to all forms of transport for people whose mobility is impaired for any reason"* Councillor Grainger felt that this objective was unrealistic and indicated that some of the objectives should have been challenged. The Head of Transport Strategy referred to Bromley's LIP Objectives being previously reported to the Committee and to the inclusion of the Objectives in the draft LIP that was brought to the Committee in November 2010. The Objectives had received a good degree of scrutiny. The Chairman felt that as an aspiration Objective B8 was reasonable and that overall there was reasons to support it.

In discussing steps towards finalising the LIP and taking account of Member comments, the Head of Transport Strategy outlined factors influencing the time frame for submitting the document. It was originally expected by TfL that LIP approval would take place between April and June 2011 but there were funding changes which then had to be worked through. At the Committee's meeting on 4th October Members would need to consider a detailed programme for spending the 2012/13 funding; delaying finalisation of the LIP and its submission for too long would hinder preparation of the 2012/13 funding submission. TfL had set a deadline of 7th October 2011 for submission of borough funding proposals.

The Portfolio Holder explained that there were now relatively minor textual amendments to be made. The Portfolio Holder offered to meet Members to discuss and he was keen to finalise the document and submit it to TfL.

It was agreed that within the next week Members would email any comments on the LIP to the Chairman based on the report to Committee and the notes of the Transport Statement Working Group meeting on 14th July (which could be considered in more time following the meeting). Comments would then be available for a special meeting of the Environment Portfolio Holder. The Chairman also agreed to forward any comments received to the Head of Transport Strategy as soon as possible after receipt.

RESOLVED that:

(1) Members email comments on the LIP based on the report to Committee and the notes of the Transport Statement Working Group meeting, 14th July, to the Chairman within the next week;

(2) the Portfolio Holder be then recommended to -

(a) approve the Final Local Implementation Plan attached as Appendix 1 to Report 11036 taking account of comments received; and

(b) delegate any further changes to the Final LIP, necessary to ensure approval by the Mayor of London, to the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder.

C) NUGENT AREA PARKING REVIEW

Report ES11078

In view of ongoing complaints concerning congestion and parking difficulties in and around the Nugent shopping area, a review of parking in the vicinity was undertaken and comprehensive traffic surveys identified that a large number of Nugent shoppers and commuters were parking in the area. Consequently a parking scheme had been designed to remedy the various problems on site.

Residents and motorists were also concerned about congestion on Cray Valley Road, partly due to overspill parking from the Nugent Centre and it was proposed to reduce the western grass verge by two metres for inset parking thereby creating wider running lanes on Cray Valley road. The wider running lanes would also be helpful to traffic diverted as a result of the Chislehurst Bridge re-build due to commence in October 2011.

Noting the low number of consultation responses, Councillor Wells felt that more weight should be assigned to ward Member comments i.e. comments provided by Councillor Fortune as a ward councillor. Councillor Grainger

asked for any projected numbers of displaced vehicles and where they would be displaced to. In response the Head of Traffic and Road Safety did not know exact numbers although officers did not believe there would be displacement to any specific areas. There could be some displacement to the carriageway but there would also be the works to provide inset parking. The Chairman also asked whether any s.106 funding was available for the scheme and he asked for the position to be checked.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) agree the plan to implement parking restriction on various roads around the Nugent retail park and to install inset parking on Cray Valley Road as detailed in drawings labelled ESD 10857-1 (1 to 3);**
- (2) agree that the scheme construction costs of £43k are met from the Transport for London 2011/12 funding for Congestion Relief and Casualty Reduction Schemes and from the LIP funding 2011/12 for Town Centres; and**
- (3) agree that authority to make any minor modifications which might arise as a result of any considerations be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services.**

D) PARKING ICT SOFTWARE AND MANAGED SERVICE CONTRACT; GATEWAY REPORT

Report ES11088

The Portfolio Holder's agreement was sought to start a tendering exercise for the Parking ICT software and managed service contract commencing 1st April 2012.

It was proposed to offer the service as two separate packages: one for ICT software provision and the other for managed services and hosting of data servers etc (both services currently provided by Civica). The rationale behind the packaging was to seek costings to test whether separate contracts might offer better value for money although it would be possible for one supplier to bid for both packages.

Report ES11088 requested that any further variation in services be included in the proposed contract which would require consideration of areas that could achieve better value for money. It was also proposed that the final contract would include scope for further services to be transferred at a later date to the successful tenderer where there was evidence of this securing improvements in value for money.

The proposed contract duration aligned the contract with the Council's parking enforcement contract enabling both to be tendered as a multi-lot package in 2016.

Noting that a 4.5 year initial contract was proposed (with options to extend for a further two years) Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher enquired of the position should there be concerns about the quality of the contractor and they were not investing in technology. In these circumstances she enquired whether it would be possible to break the contract and go elsewhere. The Head of Parking Services felt that 4.5 years would provide time to invest and work would be taken forward with the Council's legal department to ensure the provision of performance indicators for a contractor.

Councillor Payne asked whether it was intended to replace technology and it was indicated to Members that there was already a good service providing real time information. It was not anticipated that there would be major improvements in the technology used.

Concerning any possibility of a joint contract with L B Bexley as referred to in Report ES11088, the Head of Parking Services indicated that Bexley's timing was different to the London Borough of Bromley and shared procurement was therefore not an option.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

- (1) approve the tendering process for Parking ICT software, hosted and managed services; and**
- (2) approve a contract term of 4 ½ years (end date 1st October 2016) with options to extend the contract for a further 2 years.**

**E) PARKING: CARERS; BLUE BADGE CHARGES;
ENFORCEMENT**

Report ES11057

Members considered a report on the option of introducing charges for Blue Badge holders in Bromley's car parks. The report also addressed certain parking management and enforcement issues.

Converting time-limited parking bays to Pay and Display - a number of 30 minute time-limited bays in the borough where some motorists parked longer than the maximum permitted period had generated complaints from shopkeepers asking for the situation to be addressed. A number of requests for additional enforcement activity had been recorded over a prolonged period and a proposal was made to convert time-limited free bays to Pay and Display bays at three locations: Carlton shopping parade, Orpington; Croydon Road shopping parade, Elmers End Green; and Mottingham Road.

A consultation letter was sent to local traders asking for views on the proposal but the majority of respondents at each location were unsupportive. Given the results and comments from Ward Members (who were provided with the consultation results) it was recommended that the proposal should not proceed.

Extension of CCTV parking enforcement to Petts Wood using existing cameras - the introduction of enforcement by CCTV cameras in Petts Wood was not supported in consultation by either the Petts Wood and District Residents Association or the Petts Wood Business Association. In light of this, ward Councilors had asked that the proposal is not taken forward and accordingly the change was not recommended.

Charges for Blue Badge holders in car parks - subsequent to the Committee's meeting on 5th April 2011, the Environment Portfolio Holder resolved the following: *"Following sufficient consultation and the completion of an impact assessment, a further report be provided on the possible introduction of charges for blue badge holders within Council off-street car parks as set out in section 4.4 of report ES11016"*.

An equalities impact assessment was undertaken on the implications of introducing charges for blue badge holders and Members were informed of the main issues and measures to address them as appropriate.

Members were also informed of consultation undertaken and it was highlighted that, apart from a few isolated supporting comments, organisations and individuals objected to the proposals. The range of views and comments received fell into three main categories (i) cost/ability to pay, (ii) additional time required and (iii) access. Key points from these comments were outlined.

It was also reported that many organisations commented on associated problems facing disabled people and comments were received concerning the legality of the proposals with specific reference to the Equalities Act in relation to indirect discrimination. Fraudulent use of Blue Badges was also referred to on a number of occasions and respondents wanted the Council to take active steps to address the concern.

A one day survey of Blue Badge use in all LBB car parks was undertaken to provide a more accurate estimate of potential additional income. This indicated an estimated total income of £40k per year slightly revising estimates reported to Committee in April.

Parking for Care Workers - recently a number of cases had arisen where care workers wished to park their vehicles in restricted areas to support clients. In the case of care workers directly employed by the Council or the NHS, parking availability could be satisfactorily addressed through management action but control of staff parking could not be directly exercised where external private or voluntary sector agencies provided care.

In rare cases where no practical parking solution could be found it was possible to issue a discretionary resident's permit for clients. In such circumstances a charging option was proposed for consideration along with two further options namely the offering of a 50% discount for "care worker's" permits or the offering of free "care worker's" permits. Discretionary permits would be valid for one year and reviewed annually.

In introducing the report and in the context of any possible introduction of charges for blue badge holders in car parks the Assistant Director (Customer and Support Services) advised that colleagues in the Adult and Community Services Department were in the process of developing a wide ranging report on blue badges and a further recommendation to the Portfolio Holder could comprise a request for the Adult and Community Portfolio Holder to address the charging issue in the wider context of blue badges.

The Chairman proposed that the Committee note recommendations 2.1 and 2.2 of the report. Concerning recommendation 2.3 the Chairman was of the view that the proposed charges for blue badge holders should not be introduced and that the Adult and Community Portfolio consider the issuing of blue badges; it was important that the badges were only issued to those fully qualifying for them. He also suggested reviewing the number of disabled parking bays in Council car parks and exploring the demand for the bays - including whether they should be reserved for blue badge parking only at specific times (outside of which the bays could be used for paid parking).

Councillor Payne was not supportive of charging blue badge holders. Instead he felt that enforcement should be looked at to consider how abuse of the blue badge system could be tackled. Councillor Grainger suggested consulting a wider set of motorists on charging. Councillor Bance supported the freeing up of disabled parking bays for all users during certain times of the day.

In not supporting charging, Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher felt that it could compromise on-street parking and there would be an expense in changing pay and display units. Referring to the fraudulent use of blue badges Councillor Wells referred to minutes of the Committee's previous meeting and references therein to (the work of) Audit Sub Committee and he reminded Members that a report would come back to the Committee on the matter. Councillor Taylor asked that an urgent press release be issued: (i) to indicate a rejection of charging for blue badges in Council car parks; (ii) to advise that disabled parking spaces would be assessed for efficient use and (iii) to notify that action would be taken to deal with fraudsters. The Chairman offered to talk to the Portfolio Holder and the relevant Communications Officer. On wording for the action against fraudulent use of blue badges Councillor Wells also suggested consulting the Council's Chief Internal Auditor.

Concerning parking for care workers, Councillor Grainger suggested that a single permit be issued for care workers looking after a number of clients in different controlled parking zones. The Assistant Director indicated that this was already the case for Council or NHS employed care workers but there was not the capacity to control a wide variety of organisations. The proposals for care workers focussed on rare cases that were (mostly) in controlled parking zone circumstances and when it was necessary to visit a client during a time of parking restriction. The Assistant Director indicated that the proposals were solely aimed at paid care workers attending a client for which there was a care package in place.

Councillor Payne enquired of the position with registered carers and Councillor Grainger felt that volunteer carers also needed help.

Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher proposed that care worker's permits be offered free (for paid care workers as part of a Council care package). For other registered carers she felt that it was important for similar permit arrangements to be provided and requested a report on the subject. The Chairman agreed that a report was necessary on the position for more informal carers.

In concluding, Members voted on whether charging should apply to parking permits for care workers. With reference to the options at paragraph 4.5.3 of report ES11057, there was no support for option (i), making the same charge as applied to other residents; but for the options of either (ii) a 50% discount for care worker's permits or (iii) provision of the permits at no cost, each option was equally supported by Members i.e. half of voting Members supported option (ii) and half supported option (iii).

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to -**
- **note the withdrawal of the proposal to convert on-street time-limited parking bays to Pay & Display bays at the locations set out in section 4.2 of report ES11057;**
 - **note the withdrawal of proposals for on-street CCTV enforcement in Petts Wood;**
 - **continue with the current arrangements of not charging blue badge holders for parking in Council off-street car parks;**
 - **request that the Adult and Community Portfolio Holder consider the introduction of charges within a wider consideration of blue badge issues;**
 - **endorse the proposals for handling requests for assistance with care workers' parking and to take account of the Committee's views when deciding on charging for carer's parking permits; and**
- (2) a further report be provided to the Committee on whether parking permit arrangements could also be provided for registered and volunteer carers.**

23 MINOR TRAFFIC/PARKING SCHEME REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

A) PROPOSED STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAY AT BAPCHILD PLACE, HARBLEDOWN PLACE AND LAND ADJACENT TO 97 HIGH STREET, ST MARY CRAY - S 247 TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Report ES11080

The Chairman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and accordingly vacated his Chairmanship of the meeting for the duration of the item to Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher.

Following the grant of planning permissions on 14th April 2011 to Broomleigh Housing Association for the development of both the site adjacent to 97 High Street and that of Alkham and Horton Towers in St Mary Cray (refs. 10/03697 and 10/03698, the latter subject to the completion of a legal agreement), it was necessary for these sites (including the surrounding grassed/wooded areas which would form part of the developed sites) to be stopped up in order that the developments could take place.

Members were advised that authorisation for the making of a highway stopping up order under section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was a non-executive function and as such the Portfolio Holder could only make a recommendation, in this case to the Development Control Committee.

Members agreed to support the recommendation in the report.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to indicate his support to the Development Control Committee for the recommendation outlined in Report ES11080.

24 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE

A) NORMAN PARK MULTI HUB SITE

Report DRR11/058

Members considered a report on proposals for the development of a multisport hub site at Norman Park.

The report outlined proposals to seek a suitable and appropriately qualified leisure investment and management company to design, construct, manage, fund manage and operate a new multi sport hub site at Norman Park, which would look to incorporate the current athletics track and playing pitches within the park.

The current changing facilities, infrastructure within the park and athletics track were becoming outdated and unfit for purpose. Significant investment and maintenance would be required going forward. Additionally the formal sports and recreational offer in the park was currently limited to athletics and

football and the play area in the park required upgrading and potentially re-siting. The park would also benefit from the addition of a modern high quality cafeteria.

Potentially there were significant future liabilities for the Council in continuing with current arrangements for the operation of Norman Park and the athletics track and it was proposed that the ongoing liabilities would be the responsibility of the new management partner. A soft market testing exercise was proposed with potential partner companies to develop a "Partner Brief".

A successful management partner would:

- develop existing facilities and provide a range of new facilities and services to enhance the leisure, sporting and recreational offer available in the park, under a full repairing and insuring lease;
- develop and implement plans that would enable access and increase participation in sport and physical activity, support active lifestyles and enable people to develop their sporting potential; and
- ensure the park and its facilities were developed for use by clubs, community and voluntary groups, schools and colleges, local businesses and the local community.

It was assumed there would be no capital or ongoing revenue costs to the Council in delivering the project and its subsequent operation during the lease agreement.

Councillor Adams enquired about the future position of current staff working at Norman Park and whether there would be an obligation for a new company to take on the staff. Members were advised that this would be a choice for a new company.

Councillor Hastings enquired about the football side providing income and was advised that this would be provided from a "Goals" type facility. There would also be covenants in lease arrangements concerning the use of buildings/facilities.

Councillor Grainger enquired further about financial aspects and Members were advised that football (on an Astro turf type facility) would bring in income to fund remaining activities. Councillor Grainger also understood that Planning Permission was granted to Bromley FC for floodlit football subject to conditions. There had been concern from local residents about the floodlights and Councillor Grainger asked whether more floodlights at Norman Park would cause problems. Members were advised that Bromley FC had not yet started to deliver their plans including the use of any new floodlights; the potential floodlit football pitches at Norman Park would also be further away and there was likely to be a minimum impact on residents.

Councillor Taylor expressed his support for the recommendations. Councillor Wells also commented on a “Goals” operation within his ward referring to parking and floodlighting being issues.

The Chairman suggested that it was necessary for nearby allotments and park friends to be part of consultations.

RESOLVED that subject to comments made by the Committee, the Portfolio Holder be recommended to indicate his support to the Executive for the recommendation at 2.2 of Report DRR11/058.

25 METROPOLITAN POLICE ROAD TRAFFIC PRESENTATION

A short Presentation was given by the Head of Traffic and Road Safety on key aspects of the Council’s road safety work with partners at the Metropolitan Police. This was followed by a longer Presentation from Chief Inspector Nick Hancock and Sergeant Rob Philip on the role of the Metropolitan Police Traffic Unit for South East London (CO15) concerning traffic enforcement.

Points from Chief Inspector Hancock’s presentation included the following:

- Road safety is a vital part of making people feel safe in London
- Traffic Police are keen not to see Bromley “plateau” from progress made in reducing numbers killed and seriously injured (KSI)
- Bromley KSI clusters indicate where there is to be an enforcement emphasis

On the way forward Chief Inspector Hancock also expanded on points highlighted in his presentation. This included:

- Traffic Police being keen to educate and work in schools
- The achieving of “Road Watch” in the borough whereby residents can monitor speeds using speed detection machines
- Traffic Police being keen to introduce enforcement activity signs in association with visible policing activity at the roadside.
- “*Bike Safe*” as additional training offered to motorbike and moped drivers.

Chief Inspector Hancock also highlighted an open day at the Warren on 20th August 2011.

Sergeant Rob Philip had responsibility for working with Bromley and he expanded on points highlighted at the end of the presentation. These included the following comments:

- There was a targeted approach to where police traffic enforcement was undertaken and what was done
- CO15 worked with the Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) and would attend if requested by the SNT
- In future there would be larger tasking

Councillor George Taylor was pleased to hear of a Police emphasis on partnership and enquired about (i) staffing resources that were available to Chief Inspector Hancock for the seven London boroughs under his command; (ii) how those resources were allocated between boroughs and (iii) the trend on resources in the next few years. In response the Chief Inspector explained that overall there was a deployable asset of about 200 officers. There was a focus on where recent fatal collisions had occurred to provide high visibility activity; intelligence led policing was also undertaken in an attempt to move away from habitual locations. On the future of traffic policing, staff resources had been reduced elsewhere with some being absorbed into mainstream policing.

Councillor Reg Adams enquired about the availability of speed awareness courses in London. Chief Inspector Hancock confirmed that there was no centre for speed awareness courses in London. The Metropolitan Police did not offer alternatives to speed prosecutions although there was an intention to bring in such courses – this was currently in the work stream and there was a desire to educate on driver behaviour. Something similar was currently undertaken for vehicle defects.

Councillor Grainger highlighted that the number of KSIs had reduced and he felt that a time was approaching where numbers would get so low that it would be difficult to identify causes and treatments. There was possibly a case for spending less money on more locations and Councillor Grainger questioned whether there was still scope for large engineering projects.

Chief Inspector Hancock explained that engineering had a role – there were less expensive engineering options and he indicated that a 20mph restriction could be appropriate in certain areas. He also indicated that Bromley's KSI figure could still be lower and the financial cost associated with fatal collisions could run into millions of pounds. Rather than being random, collisions resulted from a combination of errors both large and small. Some engineering options could influence driving behaviour and speeding could typically drop for some four to six months after traffic officers were seen to be enforcing at a particular site. Motorists would often remember the location.

Chief Inspector Hancock explained that 5% of fatalities in Bromley were pedal cyclists and for inner London the figure would be higher. He also indicated that there is a variety of education to primary and secondary schools supplemented with specialist training.

Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher explained that there were clusters of near misses or errors at a number of locations and the police representatives were asked how such locations were monitored to prevent a future KSI accident. Chief Inspector Hancock referred to the SNT being the antenna for such clusters and referred to an example of working with a team in Lambeth; this resulted in offences such as no insurance were discovered during enforcement checks. Traffic Officers would be on site for enforcement checks for about two hours; Chief Inspector Hancock also referred to "Road Watch".

Councillor David Hastings enquired about guidelines for the use of sirens on police vehicles. He was particularly concerned about officers using sirens when roads were clear. Chief Inspector Hancock explained that Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) guidelines referred to police vehicles using "*warning equipment*" – it was important for the police to arrive on time.

The Chairman asked whether the owners of unlicensed and uninsured vehicles caused a disproportionate amount of accidents involving KSI casualties. Chief Inspector Hancock referred to East London (Hackney) being the worst area for uninsured drivers.

The Chairman sought assurance that the Borough would receive its fair share of traffic policing. Chief Inspector Hancock referred to the deployment of officers to where there had been recent fatal collisions and areas with lower KSI numbers would see a lower proportion of traffic policing - traffic offers would be allotted to locations where they would have the greatest impact.

Councillor Grainger quoted statics showing a reduction in accidents by decade from 1980 and he suggested that it would be unrealistic to get much lower. The level was being approached where accidents would be occurring on a random basis and it seemed that it was now worth focusing on the totality of accidents. Chief Inspector Hancock commented that people wanted to feel safe on the road. He indicated that vehicle improvements provided a significant contribution towards casualty reduction and the vehicle scrappage scheme also helped to remove a number of old vehicles from the road. He advocated effort to improve further highlighting a desire not to be complacent.

Responding to a request from Councillor Taylor on clarifying achievements over recent years, The Head of Traffic and Road Safety indicated that it was not always possible to see a pattern for accidents. He also indicated that non-injury collisions were evidential. Less was now being spent on large schemes. The road safety service had been adapted in accordance with accidents. He explained that priorities had always been made on a cost/benefit basis and having the right balance between education and engineering. He also cautioned against complacency.

In concluding the Chairman thanked the police representatives referring to an interesting presentation and working closer together.

**26 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME, MATTERS ARISING FROM
PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

Report ES11081

Concerning the Committee's work programme, two further reports were highlighted for inclusion on the agenda of the Committee's 4th October meeting; there was to be a report from the Waste Minimisation Working Group and a report on the proposed spending programme for LIP funding.

Noting the items for consideration at the Committee's meeting on 4th October, Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher asked if any items could be moved away from that meeting. The Chairman indicated that consideration would be given to any possibilities for this along with a possibility of starting the meeting at 7pm.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) the forward work programme be agreed subject to the additional items for the 4th October meeting as outlined above and consideration of moving any other items away from that meeting;**
- (2) progress related to previous Committee requests be noted; and**
- (3) a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio be noted.**

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

**28 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON 16TH JUNE 2011**

The previous Part 2 minutes were agreed.

29 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE
A) EXTENSION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

Report ES11092

Members considered a Part 2 report to the Executive concerning a possible extension of the waste management contract.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR WRITTEN REPLY

Questions from Mr Colin Willetts

1. Having noted on the 21/6/11 that the public disabled toilet in The Walnuts (opposite college square) had a temporary closed notice sign on it, could the Portfolio Holder tell me i) how long this has been closed? & ii) and when will it be reopened again?

Reply

- i) The toilet was closed on 10th June
- ii) It re-opened on 8th July.

2. Having extended our Association's commitment to progress a 'Friends Group of St Paul's Cray Recreation Ground' (following our litter pick on 2/7/2011), could the Portfolio Holder take the necessary action to install a pedestrian path across the unmade and muddy area directly in front of the main entrance to the Recreation Ground in Brooksway?

Reply

The making up of this area, is being considered within the 2011/12 minor works programme for Parks and Greenspace. This may well be progressed subject to the comments and agreement of the local 'Friends' Group.

3. During LCRA Leeson's Estate inspection 1/6/11 with Councillors John Ince and Harry Stranger/Affinity Sutton we queried the ownership of plots of grass (suggested by Affinity as LBB responsibility) in the lower Wynford Grove garage areas and following this inspection LCRA contacted the Contract Liaison Officer, Green Space Division who stated that the plots in question were the responsibility of Affinity. Could the Portfolio Holder tell us i) if Affinity have accepted their ownership of all these grass plots? and ii) is Affinity now cutting these grass plots as opposed to the Council's grounds maintenance contractor?

Reply

- i) I am advised that these areas were transferred from the London Borough of Bromley to Broomleigh Housing Association on 6th April 1992, under Transfer Number L001/UR1/L34.

- ii) I am further advised that Affinity Sutton are responsible for grass cutting in these areas.

Questions from Mr John Eveson

4. Following drainage works across the frontage grass verge in Sevenoaks Way (between No. 116 and the junction with Normanhurst Rd) by the contractor O' Rourke's, we still await rectification work involving the removal of chalk trench back-filling, followed by scouring and grass reseeding. This is taking a considerable time to action and so could the Portfolio Holder please pursue this on behalf of the Little Chislewick Residents' Association as a matter of urgency.

Reply

I am advised these works were completed on Tuesday 5th July.

5. Could the Portfolio Holder take the necessary action as a matter of urgency and renew missing perimeter railings around the pelican crossing on the southbound side of Sevenoaks Way (opposite The Broomwood public house).

Reply

I am advised these works were completed on Tuesday 12th July.

The Meeting ended at 10.30 pm

Chairman