

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 28 February 2012

### **Present**

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)  
Councillor Ellie Harmer (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Reg Adams, Kathy Bance, Julian Grainger,  
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, David Jefferys, Nick Milner  
and Ian F. Payne

### **Also Present**

Councillor Peter Fortune and Councillor Colin Smith

#### **70 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Councillors David Hastings and Stephen Wells.

#### **71 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Reg Adams declared a personal interest in item 7g by virtue of living in one of the roads covered by the proposed extension to the Clock House Controlled Parking Zone.

Councillor Ian Payne declared a personal interest in item 7c. Following the meeting Councillor Payne subsequently declared a personal interest in item 7b by virtue of residing in a road proposed as a location for an on street car club bay.

#### **72 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

There were no questions to the Committee.

#### **73 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 18 JANUARY 2012**

In agreeing the minutes, it was recommended that the Constitution Improvement Working Party (commissioned by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee) consider whether minutes of Council meetings should consistently identify the names of Members making comments.

**RESOLVED that:**

- (1) the minutes be agreed; and
- (2) the Constitution Improvement Working Party, commissioned by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee, be asked to consider whether minutes of Council meetings should consistently identify the names of Members making comments.

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

Two questions to the Portfolio Holder had been received for written reply. The questions and replies are detailed at **Appendix A**.

**75 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS**

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

**76 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**A) CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING Q3 2011/12 AND ANNUAL CAPITAL REVIEW 2012 TO 2016**

**Report RES12029**

At its meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> February, the Executive agreed a revised Capital Programme for 2011/12 to 2015/16 and changes to the Programme for the Environment Portfolio were highlighted. The Executive also approved new capital schemes supported by Chief Officers in the annual capital review process and changes related to the Environment Portfolio were identified.

The revised Programme for the Portfolio was provided as were comments on individual schemes along with latest 2011/12 expenditure figures.

The Committee supported the changes approved by the Executive on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2012.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the changes approved by the Executive on 1<sup>st</sup> February.**

## **B) CAR CLUBS IN BROMLEY**

### **Report ES12032**

Members considered a report setting out the potential expansion of car clubs in Bromley. Portfolio Holder approval was sought for the implementation of up to fifteen new car club bays in the Borough during 2012/13, subject to statutory consultation.

Two on-street car club spaces were currently provided within the Borough. Bromley submitted a bid to Transport for London in February 2011 and was successful in gaining £25,000 over 2011/12 and 2012/13 to implement up to 15 bays across the Borough.

Ten further 'reserve' locations had also been proposed as potential for either future implementation or as substitutes should any of the fifteen bays not be favoured at formal consultation stages.

In discussion the Chairman felt that the scheme should be reviewed at either 6 or 12 months after implementation.

A contract would be set for a three to five year period. If the scheme was a success, competition would be sought and there would be a number of operators. In response to a suggestion for a one year contract and assessment, advice would be sought from the Council's procurement team although another view suggested there should be an operational review and report at say 12 months rather than have a 12 month contract. Starting the scheme with two operators was also proposed but one operator was preferred to operate a small number of bays in a small area.

The Chairman suggested some flexibility to the cost of an on-street bay if car clubs were not prepared to commit to a long contract. He felt that the proposed charge for a permit should not be seen as a barrier to receiving a good tender and proposed that £200 per annum for a car club permit should be an aspiration.

**RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to:**

- (1) approve the 15 proposed locations for car club bays, subject to local and statutory consultation;**
- (2) authorise officers to proceed with a tendering exercise to appoint a commercial car club operator to manage the approved locations;**
- (3) delegate authority to the Director of Environmental Services to implement alternative bay location(s) in consultation with Ward Members and the Portfolio Holder, should valid objections be received during the consultation process;**

**(4) agree an aspiration of setting the cost of a car club permit at £200 per annum; and**

**(5) review the success of the scheme within 12 months of its implementation.**

### **C) PARKING CHARGES**

#### **Report ES12029**

A new pattern of parking charges was recommended across the borough, benchmarked against inflation since prices were last increased during 2004-2008. The opportunity had been taken to address a number of anomalies in the current charging policy, and to link charges in town centres more closely to the needs of the local economy.

In their 2009 report, the Committee's Parking Working Group recommended the development of a new Parking Strategy for the borough, and that proposals were developed for reform of parking charges.

The proposals set out in Report ES12029 had been drafted to ensure consistency with the objectives of the Parking Strategy agreed by the Environment Portfolio Holder following the Committee's consideration on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2012. The Parking Working Group met on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2012 to consider the proposals and further recommendations from the Group along with notes of its meeting were tabled for Committee Members.

There were also a number of anomalies in the pricing structure for residential and business parking permits; the Portfolio Holder was asked to agree revised permit charges and there was a proposed increase in the charge for a book of Visitors Vouchers.

For the discussion, Councillor Julian Grainger also provided data indicating the hourly usage by shoppers of Station Road Car Park, Orpington, between 7am and 6pm. The data included parking income received each hour which was compared to income that might have been received if prices were differentiated by time. Councillor Grainger's work suggested lower charges at times of less demand and higher charges for periods of increased demand.

The Chairman indicated that a varied rate of charging by time of day for on and off street parking had not been supported by the Parking Working Group. Differential charging had only been supported to accommodate overnight use of off-street car parks in Bromley. The Chairman indicated that he was proposing limiting scrutiny of the report to the level of charges and at this time not extending it to consider new charging structures. The Portfolio Holder supported the Chairman's view, suggesting that the charging structure could be the remit of a future working group. The Chairman of the Parking Working Group, Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher, explained that the original working group had looked at the issue of differential charging. Greater harmonisation was suggested a few years ago but total uniformity was not

ideal and she felt that some flexibility was necessary. The suggestions now brought forward were, she felt, the best of both positions and also provided a greater understanding for the public. The proposals did not over harmonise and it was important to be as efficient as possible and to take account of local idiosyncrasies. At this stage the report provided a good base to go forward.

A vote was taken at this point and it was agreed that the remaining discussion of the item during the evening should focus on the level of charges and not consider the charging structure.

In view of current parking charges, a parking permit scheme was advocated between 10am and 1pm on Sundays for worshippers attending various churches in Bromley Town Centre. It was confirmed that this would be investigated.

A question was asked about the percentage of core demand and discretionary car park usage for any particular location. Members were advised that different car parks served different interests e.g. commuters and shoppers. The demand for car parks used by commuters would generally be for all day use whereas demand for car parks used by shoppers would generally reach a peak just before lunch time. There was however no extensive research on elasticity of demand. Officers had tried to avoid increases higher than cumulative inflation and there was a possibility of customer resistance to steep increases.

On proposed charges for residential and business permits, the Portfolio Holder wanted to look carefully at the proposed charges. Councillor Reg Adams indicated his support for the move to standardised permit charges referring to previous standardisation in Clock House ward which he saw as positive.

Concerning the tariffs outlined at Appendix 1A to report ES12029 (Charging Group 1 – Off Street excluding Bromley Town Centre), Councillor Reg Adams referred to the proposed increase for charges at the Spa Beckenham and West Wickham Leisure Centres. Councillor Adams considered the Beckenham Spa car park to have a low rate of utilisation and suggested the current cost at £0.70/hour could be a reason for this. Rather than pay £0.70/hour at the two car parks, Councillor Adams suggested that motorists would prefer to park on street in neighbouring roads and he advocated no further increase in the hourly rate. Councillor Nick Milner agreed and highlighted parking along Turners Meadow Way, Beckenham. Councillor Adams also indicated that if charges were held at £0.70/hour there could be greater revenue through increased use.

In response reference was made to customers arriving at 5pm and an average of 678 people per day used the Beckenham Spa car park. The charge had also been held at £0.70/hour for five years and the rate of increase was broadly in line with inflation. There were also obligations from parking income for budget assumptions.

Referring to the proposed increase in the fixed tariff at Chelsfield Car Park, Councillor Grainger expressed concern for any displacement of parking in roads close to Chelsfield station. He also referred to the CCTV camera at the car park not being operational.

Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher referred to commuter displacement from Knockholt to Chelsfield car park in view of parking charges at Knockholt and she hoped the proposed increase at Chelsfield would curb displacement. She supported the CCTV at Chelsfield Car Park becoming operational and was advised that it was originally owned by Network Rail. Details were provided of the cost to approve a live link to the Council's CCTV room - there was already a live link to the station office even though Network Rail did not own the CCTV.

Overall, the Assistant Director (Customer and Support Services) emphasised the importance of the proposed review after six months to assess whether there were any problems associated with the new parking charges following implementation. If there were, further proposals could be provided to remedy difficulties. It was suggested that data on hourly parking and off peak charging be included in a six month review and Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher suggested that the Parking Working Group be reconvened following the review.

In concluding, it was agreed to support the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder and to agree the further recommendations from the Parking Working Group as tabled. Concerning recommendation 2.3, it was also agreed to recommend that consideration be given to whether further work is necessary by the Parking Working Group following the six month review.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree -**

**(a) the proposed scheme of parking charges as set out in Section 4 and Appendix 1**

**(b) the revised permit charges as set out in Section 8 and Appendix 2**

**(c) the undertaking of a review on the impact of revised parking charges after six months**

**(d) that Zone D be left as it is for now but included as part of a future review of Zone A i.e. to consider whether a higher cost on-street premium zone (within the current Zone A and including Zone D) is needed for Bromley town centre;**

**(2) following completion of the review at (1)(c) above, the Committee consider convening the Parking Working Group to look at any further proposals;**

**(3) for six month review at (1)(c) above, policy consideration be given to whether the uniform pricing of Bromley Town Centre Car Parks has increased demand at the Civic Centre MSCP causing congestion, or whether a further increase is needed;**

**(4) policy consideration also be given to making the maximum tariffs for The Hill and Westmoreland MSCPs the same;**

**(5) the tariff for Churchill Way coach parking be looked at as a separate policy exercise; and**

**(6) policy consideration be given to whether a permit scheme for faith groups would be appropriate.**

**D) PRIVATE STREET WORKS - KENT HOUSE STATION  
APPROACH - SECOND RESOLUTION**

**Report ES12027**

A Resolution of Approval was sought under the Private Street Works Code in respect of the unadopted section of Kent House Station Approach. This would enable the street to be made-up and adopted as a highway maintainable at the public expense.

Members supported the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder and Councillor Kathy Bance offered thanks for the matter being taken forward.

**RESOLVED that the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder be supported namely that:**

**(1) the specification, as detailed in plan No. ESD-10935-1 revision A, sections, estimate and provisional apportionment, now submitted by the Director of Environmental Services, in respect of the scheme approved by the Environment Portfolio Holder on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2011, be approved without modification; and**

**(2) the Council bears the whole of the cost of the street works, which will be met from funding provided by Transport for London, under the provisions of s. 236(1) of the Highways Act 1980.**

**E) BROMLEY TOWN CENTRE PARKING REVIEW: BICKLEY  
EXTENSION**

**Report ES12033**

Members supported a proposed extension of the existing Bromley Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) into the Bickley area.

Residents and businesses in the Bickley area were consulted in December 2011 and the extent of the consultation was shown in plan ESD-10916-1.

Implementation of an extension to the Bromley CPZ was recommended as follows:

- (i) Beechfield Road, Cedar Road, The Glade and Glenview Road be omitted from the scheme, as there was either a clear consensus against the proposal or no overall consensus;
- (ii) the existing Bromley 'C' permit zone be extended to include Amesbury Road, Widmore Lodge Road, Lewes Road and Nightingale Lane (part of); and
- (iii) Bird in Hand Lane, Westwood Close, Shawfield Park and Page Heath Lane have free parking bays installed and no other road markings to help manage indiscriminate parking and aid smoother traffic flows

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:**

**(1) approve changes to the parking controls in the Bickley area as set out in paragraph 3.4 of Report ES12033; and**

**(2) delegate authority to make further minor modifications, which may arise as a result of any further consultations or considerations, to the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder and Ward Councillors.**

**F) PENGE PARKING REVIEW: LINDEN GROVE AND NEWLANDS PARK CPZ**

**Report ES12035**

Members considered a report setting out the results of consultations for three small Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) in Penge. These follow on from the initial consultation regarding parking problems in the centre of Penge during early 2011.

In view of the consultation outcomes, approval was sought for implementing a CPZ at Zone 3 but not for the proposals involving Zones 1 and 2. However, a single disabled bay was recommended for introduction in Cottingham Road, near the junction with the High Street, and adjacent to the Mobility Shop (plan ESD-11017-1).

Zone 3 was the subject of two consultations. The first covered Nos. 1 to 30 Linden Grove (plan ESD-10855-1A), excluding the area in the vicinity of the shops. This showed a majority of 64% of residents supporting a CPZ operational from 12 noon to 2pm.

However, with further consideration given to the shops, a second consultation was issued concerning pay and display bays, enforced from 8.30am to



6.30pm with a maximum 2 hour stay, and residential/business permit bays, enforced from noon to 2pm, as shown in plan ESD-10855-3B.

Latest consultation results were reported at the meeting (consultation deadline was 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2012) and in view of these it was recommended that Newlands Park should not form part of the scheme with Zone 3 implemented as Option 1b (plan at ESD-10855-1A).

It was also reported that following concerns raised by residents on the lack of available parking in Kingswood Road, it was proposed to reduce the existing Monday to Saturday 8.00am-6.30pm from 20m to 10m from the junction of the High Street as shown in Plan ESD-10880-1A.

Concerning the latest consultation results as tabled and in view of only one response received from Newlands Park which was opposed to the scheme with Pay and Display bays outside the shops, Councillor Bance expressed a wish for further consultation, indicating her support for some quick turnaround parking at the location. Councillor Bance also felt that there was a lot of restricted parking in Lyndon Grove in view of the number of houses. The Portfolio Holder was supportive of working with local ward Members to achieve the maximum amount of parking spaces.

In conclusion, it was agreed to support the scheme at plan ESD-10855-1A (Option 1b) but only (in view of comments above) if this was the desired outcome following a finalisation and evaluation of the consultation.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree that:**

- (1) the scheme shown in plan ESD-10855-1A be implemented (Option 1b) for Zone 3 provided this was the desired outcome following a finalisation and evaluation of the consultation;**
- (2) the proposed disabled parking bay in Cottingham Road is implemented as per plan ESD-11017-1 (Option 2 – see Para 3.6 of Report ES12035).**
- (3) the length of the yellow lines in Kingswood Road near the junction with High Street be reduced as shown in plan ESD-10880-1A (Option 3 – see Para 3.11 of Report ES12035).**
- (4) authority to make further minor modifications, which might arise as a result of any further consultations or considerations, be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder and Ward Councillors.**

**G) CLOCK HOUSE - CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE - PROPOSED EXTENSION**

**Report ES12039**

A decision was sought from the Portfolio Holder on proposed amendments to the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Clock House area.

The main concern related to parking connected with the local hospital following its recent extension. Although an agreement was being negotiated between the hospital and a local superstore to provide parking for hospital staff and visitors, this had yet to be finalised. Consequently, additional parking pressure had been applied to local roads. Consultation with residents demonstrated support for extending the existing CPZ now rather than wait for the agreement/changes between the hospital and superstore to be implemented.

In discussion, Councillor Adams highlighted a need for parking provision for staff at Balgowan Primary School and suggested that a business permit be considered for the staff. Councillor Adams also felt that there was a lot of proposed free parking which he suspected could be used by local car traders. He was prepared to see how the arrangements worked out but suggested that a review be carried out in six months. Councillor Adams also referred to access being denied to garages in Hampden Avenue (i.e. a set of lock-up garages on the "odds-side" of the road, opposite Nos. 4-28) prior to school starting and following school finishing time. He also referred to the delay in implementing the proposed agreement for hospital staff to use part of the superstore car park. Members were advised that the matter was with five sets of lawyers, four of whom were understood to have reached agreement with the final set expected to follow suit. The supermarket would then be expected to sign the agreement and spaces for 80 hospital staff would be provided at the top of the car park.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:**

**(1) confirm that the existing Controlled Parking Zone be extended with amendments to Clock House Road in Zone 1 and to Belmont Road, Cromwell Road, Colesburg Road, Hampden Avenue, Hampden Road and Balgowan Road all added to Zone 3 of the existing Controlled Parking Zone; and**

**(2) agree that detail design be progressed, with a decision on the final design delegated to the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with the Ward Members and the Environment Portfolio Holder.**

## **H) BECKENHAM PARKING REVIEW**

### **Report ES12034**

Proposals were outlined in Report ES12034 to introduce a new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Beckenham town centre.

In June 2011, a consultation in the Beckenham and Eden Park area aimed to help clarify which roads were experiencing parking difficulties and to gauge what residents felt to be a suitable solution. The outcomes revealed difficulties around Beckenham town centre and Eden Park Station and it was decided to look at the two areas separately. Report ES12034 focused on the proposals for Beckenham town centre and proposals for Eden Park would be addressed at a later date.

The original proposed designs for a CPZ near Beckenham town centre included Downs Road, Manor Grove, Bevington Close, Bevington Road, Manor Road, Kelsey Park Road, Stanmore Terrace, Burnhill Road, Lea Road and Fairfield Road. The Beckenham Town Centre CPZ Perimeter area was shown in drawing ESD-10858-4. A second consultation was carried out with residents of these roads in December 2011. This indicated that the roads around Stanmore Terrace, shown in drawing ESD-10858-5-01 (scheme 1), supported the proposed introduction of a CPZ but that residents of Bevington Road, Manor Grove and Downs Road were not supportive. Consequently it was proposed to install the CPZ in the Stanmore Terrace area. However, due to the risk of displaced parking, further consultation was carried out in February 2012 with residents of Bevington Road, Manor Grove and Downs Road. The consultation asked residents if they would like to reconsider being included within a new CPZ given the risk of displacement.

The outcome of this last consultation was reported at the meeting. The residents of Bevington Road indicated that they wished to be included within the new CPZ but as there was no consensus amongst residents in Manor Grove and that the residents of Downs Road voted against being included in the CPZ, it was proposed to exclude these roads from the zone. In responses to this consultation from some Bevington Road residents, further changes were requested to the layout outside their properties and in the final design there would be some further refinements following the changes requested.

The proposal had been developed based on a new CPZ operating Monday to Saturday 8am to 6:30pm. However, discussions were ongoing with local resident groups and the hours might be extended as a result of the evening trade in Beckenham Town Centre and the traffic that this attracts. Any such changes would be addressed during the detailed design stage.

In discussion, Councillor Michael Tickner spoke on this item as a Member representing Copers Cope ward.

Concerning the proposal to exclude Manor Grove and Downs Road from the CPZ, it was indicated to Members that displacement was anticipated to these

roads and their position could be reviewed in six months when it was proposed to review both schemes 1 and 2 (as described below).

The Portfolio Holder referred to a possibility of including Manor Grove and Downs Road in a Traffic Management Order but not to progress it unless residents opt in. Councillors Samaris Huntington-Thresher and Reg Adams supported this approach.

In concluding it was also agreed that a six month review could also review any need for a Beckenham Business Parking Permit. Councillor Tickner indicated that any views on this from the Beckenham Business Association to the R&R PDS Beckenham and West Wickham Town Centre Working Party could be taken account of in the six month review.

**RESOVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree that:**

- (1) the CPZ shown in drawing number ESD-10858-5-01 (scheme 1) be introduced;**
- (2) the extension to the CPZ shown in drawing number ESD-10858-5-02 (scheme 2) be introduced but subject to the following changes arising from the latest consultation carried out in February 2012 –**
  - (a) residents of Bevington Road be included within the new CPZ and in the final design the residents' bay to stretch down to include the frontages of numbers 16 and 18 and the yellow lines outside properties 1 and 2 be cut back slightly to create longer parking bays – the yellow lines around the junction with Manor Road to be converted to double yellow lines for a distance of 10 metres**
  - (b) Manor Grove and Downs Road to be excluded from the zone but the length of yellow lines at both road junctions with Manor Road be cut back to 10 metres and the lines be converted to double yellow lines to help create some additional parking space in these roads adjacent to flank fencing whilst maintaining safety at the junctions;**
- (3) authority to make any minor modifications which might arise as a result of any considerations be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder and Ward Members;**
- (4) the outworking of Scheme 1 and Scheme 2 (as amended above) be reviewed in a further six months and this review to include consideration of any displacement to Manor Grove and Downs Road that might have occurred along with the consideration of any need for a Beckenham Business Parking Permit; and**
- (5) Manor Grove and Downs Road, although currently excluded from the CPZ, be nevertheless included in the draft Traffic Management Order**

**should it be necessary to include these roads for the CPZ in the future – however no action be taken to implement road markings for these two roads until after the six month review recommended at (4) above.**

**I) UPDATE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FLOODING AND WATER ACT 2010**

**Report ES12031**

Members received a report: (i) reviewing progress of the Council's first year of operation as a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA); (ii) considering responsibilities and work streams for the coming year; and (iii) advising of the DEFRA consultation on the implementation of the LLFA role of the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) Approving Body.

The Government had provided grant monies for the remainder of the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) period to cover the cost of implementing the Flooding and Water Act 2010.

The Environment Portfolio Holder was asked to (i) approve the proposals for Sustainable Urban Drainage and the SUDS Approval Body (SAB) and (ii) approve the draft response to the DEFRA Consultation on the implementation of the Sustainable Drainage Systems provisions of the Flooding and Water Management Act. The Executive was also asked to release a sum of £220,000 from the 2012/13 Central Contingency Sum to implement the proposals detailed in Report ES12031.

In discussion and concerning increased staff resource necessary for the work of the SUDS Approving Body, the Chairman suggested that a joint team of varying grades be set up with neighbouring authorities. It was indicated to Members that officers were already working with the London Boroughs of Croydon, Bexley, Lewisham and Greenwich.

Concerning a retrofitting of SUDs and a proposal of using £10k to subsidise the provision of water butts to residents, it was indicated that the use of water butts could help prevent flooding, and officers were looking to procure the butts at the same time as compost bins. It was also explained that officers were looking to take in the water butts for storage at the central depot and then sell them on to residents. The Chairman highlighted a scenario of a number of water butts ordered but not sold on; however, it was indicated to Members that there should be sufficient demand for the butts.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to –**

- (a) approve the proposals for Sustainable Urban Drainage and the SUDS Approval Body (SAB); and**

- (b) approve the draft response to the DEFRA Consultation on the implementation of the Sustainable Drainage Systems provisions of the Flooding and Water Management Act.**

**(2) the Executive be recommended to release a sum of £220,000 from the 2012/13 Central Contingency Sum to implement the proposals detailed in Report ES12031.**

**J) DRAFT LONDON'S DOWNLANDS GREEN GRID FRAMEWORK**

**Report ES12040**

The draft London's Downlands Framework was endorsed by the Development Control Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2012 and the Environment Portfolio Holder was recommended to endorse the Framework and agree in principle to its delivery.

Noting that regionally important geological sites were recommended to be designated in Local Development Frameworks, the Chairman suggested the inclusion of Chislehurst Caves amongst possible sites for Bromley.

Highlighting costs associated with two Phase One projects (one linked to the LB Croydon and another linked to LB Croydon and LB Sutton), Councillor Julian Grainger felt the Portfolio Holder was being asked to endorse something involving significant amounts of money and it was necessary to justify where the funds would come from. In response it was suggested that a possible source of funds could be Heritage Lottery Funding. It was indicated that participation would avoid a risk of missing out on funding for the Council.

Views expressed in support of the work indicated that Bromley's participation would help to provide funding for the borough and opportunities were presented to project Bromley's heritage. Participation, it was suggested, was a worthwhile use of time and reference was made by the Chairman to Londoners being encouraged to visit and value green space. The benefit that could be provided to Crystal Palace Park was also highlighted in discussion as an example of the project's worth.

The Portfolio Holder informed Members that a first meeting of the Crystal Palace Park Executive Project Board had taken place and there was agreement on the need to draw investment in. The Chairman added that the Framework document would help in this regard.

It was agreed to support the recommendation to the Executive in Report ES12040 although Councillor Julian Grainger requested that his opposition to the recommendation be recorded.

**RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the draft London Downlands Framework and to agree in principle to its delivery.**

**77 ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT POST COMPLETION REPORT  
(LPSA REWARD GRANT)**

**Report ES12036**

As a requirement of the LPSA funding agreement, Members received an update on the measured outcome concerning the Environmental Improvements carried out over two years in areas outside of the Borough's main town centres.

As part of the LPSA 1 Reward Fund allocation, £250k was allocated by the Executive in 2006 for Environmental Improvements. The purpose of allocation was to carry out highly visible improvements to the street scene in public areas as examples of good stewardship. Public safety, attractiveness and accessibility were identified as primary goals. A breakdown of the project spend was included in Report ES12036.

**RESOLVED that the outcome of the LPSA 1 funded Environmental Improvement project be noted.**

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

**Report ES12028**

The Committee's work programme, progress on previous Committee requests and a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio were provided.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the draft work programme covering the Committee's next meeting be agreed;**

**(2) progress related to previous Committee requests be noted; and**

**(3) a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio be noted.**

**APPENDIX A**

**QUESTIONS FROM MR COLIN WILLETTS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER  
FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

1. Could the Portfolio Holder tell me the tonnage and the cost of the Borough's salt/grit stockpile?

**Reply**

10,000 tonnes/cost of c.£300,000.00.

-----

2. Would the Portfolio Holder have cleared the assorted dumped rubbish/cardboard etc which has built up over the past fortnight (as of the 10/2/12) at the recycling point at the top of Station Approach SMC and further ensure this site is inspected and cleared of any rubbish build up on a regular basis in future?

**Reply**

I am advised that this site has been cleared. The Area Inspector will continue to keep an eye on the location.

-----

The Meeting ended at 9.43 pm

Chairman