

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 1 July 2014

Present

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)
Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kevin Brooks, Samaris Huntington-Thresher,
Terence Nathan, Angela Page, Sarah Phillips,
Catherine Rideout, Richard Scoates and Melanie Stevens

Also Present

Councillor Colin Smith and Councillor Russell Mellor

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no apologies.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman declared a personal interest in item 6i as a nomination for membership of the Countryside Consultative Panel, and at item 7b as a member of the Chelsfield Park Residents Association.

The Vice-Chairman and Councillor Sarah Phillips also each declared a personal interest at item 6i as further nominations for membership of the Countryside Consultative Panel.

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

There were no questions to the Committee.

4 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 25TH MARCH 2014

The minutes were agreed.

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

Four questions had been received for written reply – one from Chloe-Jane Ross, Chair, Copers Cope Area Residents' Association, and three from Mr Colin Willetts. Details of the questions and replies are at **Appendix A**.

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

A) PROVISIONAL OUTTURN 2013/14

Report FSD14038

The provisional 2013/14 final outturn position for the Environment Portfolio showed an underspend of £82k against a controllable budget of £41.136m, representing a 0.2% variation.

Report FSD14038 also highlighted 2013/14 expenditure for the three portfolio related projects within the Member Priority Initiatives earmarked reserve.

Referring to the cost of remedial works at Keston Dam, Councillor Scoates enquired whether the cost could be covered by insurance.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) endorse the 2013/14 provisional outturn position for the Environment Portfolio;

(2) note the outturn position in respect of the Environment projects within the Member Priority Initiatives programme; and

(3) approve draw-down of the carry forward sum of £65k held in Central Contingency, to be used to fund works required at Keston Dam.

B) BUDGET MONITORING 2014/15

Report FSD14037

Members received the latest budget monitoring position for the Portfolio.

Based on expenditure and activity levels to 31st May 2014, the 2014/15 controllable budget for the Environment Portfolio was projected to balance at year-end.

In noting a projected net surplus from the issue of Penalty Charge Notices Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher was advised that that there had been no change in enforcement practice.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the latest 2014/15 budget projection for the Environment Portfolio.

C) FUTURE DLR AND RAIL LINKS TO BROMLEY

Report ES14048

Following recent discussions and work with Transport for London, an update was provided on the latest position regarding potential public transport extensions to Bromley.

TfL had undertaken feasibility work over the previous 12-18 months to develop a business case for an extension of the DLR from Lewisham to Bromley. Simultaneously, TfL had also undertaken feasibility work for extending the Bakerloo line from Elephant and Castle and the Overground from New Cross to Bromley North. Tramlink proposals had been previously developed and more recently, the Tramlink development team had been working to refine route options and alignments.

Potential benefits were highlighted from investment in the rail options outlined in the report along with the latest update on each of the potential options. For a DLR extension to Bromley, the report advised that the overall Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) represented insufficient value for money, as defined by TfL's business case methodology and the DfT's transport scheme appraisal guidance. This took account of the total cost of an extension, the direct transport benefits that would be realised, and the development and growth potential. On 20th March 2014, the Mayor of London instructed TfL to cease further work on the DLR business case.

The Council had subsequently asked TfL to undertake further work on a London Overground extension from New Cross to Bromley North, using the existing rail corridor, to provide improved rail connectivity between Bromley and Canary Wharf.

In discussion a number of comments were made. In response to a suggestion that existing capacity and service frequencies be increased (e.g. platforms lengthened) instead of a new extension, particularly for the Orpington/Lewisham route, it was indicated that the Council had made representations to TfL on route structure. The Council had also lobbied for increased capacity as existing rail routes to central London – including Orpington to Lewisham – were already operating at maximum capacity during peak periods. As such, there were feasibility studies on extending the London Overground between existing national rail services.

Referring to a Bakerloo line extension to Hayes, Councillor Phillips suggested that TfL ask more questions on the advantages of the existing line e.g. any cost advantage to passengers of travelling solely by national rail to Central London.

There continued to be a significant amount of work in developing proposals. TfL had drafted further staff to address some of the Council's concerns. It was necessary to know the proportion of Hayes line passengers who would be

adversely affected by a Bakerloo line extension. Current data was not comprehensive.

TfL had recently written confirming that work on proposals for a DLR extension to Bromley would cease. The Portfolio Holder reminded Members that this was contrary to the Mayor of London's election pledge and the Council would write in the strongest terms that this would not be accepted as the final position. The Portfolio Holder referred to the additional cost of a Bakerloo line extension which was not wanted by local residents. Solid financial evidence was needed of why a DLR extension should not be pursued. A London Overground link to Bromley North would be a second preference. With a potential expansion of Crystal Palace, transport improvements were also considered necessary to the area. Tramlink proposals were highlighted in this regard and would be in addition to further transport to the centre of the borough.

Councillor Catherine Rideout supported a DLR extension, highlighting advantages it would create for future residents of high street accommodation in Bromley town centre.

It was thought that Overground services would use existing rail track and operate between national rail services (which were operating to capacity). Challenges, such as rolling stock breakdown, could arise with inter-operation of services. However, issues were being worked through. There were no firm proposals as yet for crossing the fast lines at Grove Park but it was considered that either a flyover or fly-under option would be necessary. A loss of scheduled services was not considered a risk with an Overground extension.

The Chairman highlighted that passengers from Orpington would still need to change with an Overground extension. It was confirmed that Hither Green was intended to be the interchange station rather than Grove Park – Lewisham possibly having a further station, Lewisham South (near Ladywell), solely for the Overground route.

Visiting the meeting for this item, Councillor Russell Mellor (Copers Cope Ward) was invited to address the Committee. He referred to the question to the Portfolio Holder on the future of rail services from Beckenham Junction, Kent House, and Penge to St Pancras and beyond (and to Blackfriars from 2018). Councillor Mellor referred to strategic priorities and concern for existing rail services to Bromley being inadequate. He supported efforts to improve the strategy for services into Bromley, improving links to the City, and improvements to Thameslink services. In this regard, Councillor Mellor referred to Thameslink services towards Herne Hill/ Beckenham Junction, advocating an improvement on the position of services to Beckenham and Bromley South for the future (i.e. to see the services permanently secured and maintained beyond December 2017).

The Chairman expressed concern at the loss of the DLR option, particularly in view of the Mayor of London's manifesto pledge in 2012 to "*work to extend*

the DLR from Lewisham to Bromley". He also had an aspiration to see a DLR extension proceed further into the borough beyond Bromley North. He felt the Overground option did not lend itself to this and therefore the benefit to the commercial centre of Bromley was substantially reduced. He also questioned an assertion that a Bakerloo extension would bring reduced journey times to Charing Cross and highlighted that there would be no potential economic benefit from such an extension to Bromley. The Portfolio Holder felt there should be a full feasibility study of the DLR extension option before a decision is taken on an Overground extension to Bromley North.

In view of comments made, it was agreed that Recommendation 2.2 of Report ES14048 should be amended and it was **RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:**

- (1) consider the key strategic transport priorities for the Borough;**
- (2) support an extension of London Overground to Bromley North, subject to further investigation; and**
- (3) support the priorities of residents for improved rail services into and through London particularly in relation to Thameslink services.**

D) ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2014/17

Report ES14029

Members considered the draft Environment Portfolio Plan for 2014/17.

The Vice-Chairman offered her congratulations on progress made against priorities in the Plan.

In respect of street cleaning and some roads having tightly parked cars during the week, the Portfolio Holder highlighted that such roads could be cleaned at weekends. Officers were looking to improve the weekend service and Members were encouraged to liaise with the Portfolio Holder and officers on this. The Chairman highlighted the Committee's intention to review street cleaning performance again at its January meeting.

On waste, the level of recycling in the borough had plateaued with the quantity of waste having increased. Initiatives had been planned around Green Garden Waste (GGW) and textile collections to increase recycling. However, paper quantities for recycling had reduced but improved recycling of other materials and the new initiatives had so far compensated for this. A decreasing level of paper could be attributed to an increasing use of digital media, a trend which was unlikely to reverse.

Councillor Brooks suggested that a number of residents in housing blocks might be unclear on where to place different categories of material for recycling. He also recommended that the "Fix My Street" facility on the Council website be more widely advertised.

It was confirmed that a 2013/14 return on the percentage of children travelling to school by car would be in the half-year performance report to Members. For a 2013/14 performance return on (i) principal roads condition, (ii) non-principal classified roads, and (iii) town centre footway surfaces, a percentage return would be provided when figures were available hopefully next month. Footnotes were suggested in the Plan to explain these points. The Chairman indicated that the details would also be circulated to Committee Members.

In view of the particularly difficult budget position faced by the Council, the Chairman suggested that Council communications convey the cost and value of services and public facilities e.g. parks.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the aims, activities, outcome measures and service expectations proposed in the draft Portfolio Plan, taking into consideration the budget for 2014/15 which has already been agreed.

E) SHARED PARKING SERVICES CONTRACT: Commencement of Procurement Gateway Review

Report ES14034

Highlighting that L B Bromley's current parking operations and enforcement contract with Vinci Park Services expires in September 2016, coinciding with the planned end date for L B Bexley's parking contract with NSL, Report ES 14034 proposed that a Procurement Gateway Review be undertaken of the options for a single shared parking contract for both boroughs from October 2016. The review would assess options for the future delivery of the services and the packaging of the shared contract. It would take into account:

- the current state of the market for enforcement services;
- developments in parking management and enforcement nationally; and
- consideration of options for inclusion in the new contract.

The Chairman suggested a PDS Working Group to oversee the proposed Gateway Review Team. The Working Group's consideration of the parking services contract would include consideration of the proposals on parking enforcement announced by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). Although future changes were expected, a contract in the order of ten years would enable a contractor to invest in the service. A break clause could also be included e.g. after a period of five years.

Proposed changes on parking enforcement related primarily to the use of CCTV. It would be necessary to understand the practical implications of any changes and whether more enforcement would be necessary by foot patrols. Some exceptions were expected from any CCTV ban e.g. around schools and bus lanes. Clarity on the detail of changes should be provided during the review and their implications for the parking service provided in a further report to Members next March. The Portfolio Holder expressed concern for

any ban on CCTV parking enforcement. It would adversely affect the range of areas enforced; the number of fines imposed for infringements and therefore the level of deterrent for unsafe and inconsiderate parking. It was unclear where parking officers currently employed on CCTV enforcement could be deployed. The Portfolio Holder suggested that road safety around schools could also be jeopardised as the cost of the fleet of CCTV cars could not be covered by use outside schools alone. Local MPs had been lobbied and London Councils were briefing Parliament on the proposals.

It was confirmed there would be a variable budget element for the shared service contract. As part of the review, consideration would be given to how enforcement costs are apportioned between the two boroughs.

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

- (1) a Procurement Gateway review of options for the shared parking services contract be undertaken, and a further report brought to Members in March 2015;**
- (2) specific consideration be given to options for the Key Performance Indicators to be used for managing the contract; and**
- (3) the length of the contract be for a 10 year period with a potential break clause after 5 years.**

F) STATION ACCESS PROGRAMME: IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS

Report ES14041

Local Investment Plan (LIP) funding, of the order of £150k over each of the next three years, has been earmarked for station access improvements across the borough.

Improvements for all modes of travel to and from stations can be considered: walking; cycling; public transport interchange; parking; drop off and pick up; and disabled access to the station buildings themselves. However, with insufficient funding to implement schemes at every station, a priority methodology was proposed to progress works.

Taking all factors into account, the proposed first priority stations in the Borough were listed as Elmstead Woods, Penge East, Petts Wood and Shortlands. Individual schemes would be reported to Members with details of design and implementation costs, along with details of any potential on-going costs and funding.

Suggesting that Kent House station might benefit from pedestrian access improvements, Councillor Phillips asked whether more stations might similarly benefit if improvements were of a lower scale and at reduced cost. It was

confirmed that the access road leading to Kent House Station was unadopted, although officers could look at the possibility of adoption next year when developing a further round of station access improvements.

Rather than have a number of minor improvements with minimal impact, it was intended to have a rolling programme of larger access improvements for a small number of stations in each the next three years. There would be an in-depth review of station access across the borough. Priorities could then be investigated one year and improvements implemented the next at a small number of stations. It was confirmed that it would be for Network Rail to take forward access improvements on land it owned, and officers had met Network Rail representatives.

Individual schemes for station access improvement would be taken forward via Ward Members and the Portfolio Holder. The Chairman suggested that Ward Members be consulted on the demand for access projects at the proposed stations. Councillor Brookes confirmed that he had received suggestions from residents on access improvements for Penge East station.

The Chairman also expected Network Rail to provide measures for disabled access at stations and highlighted the forthcoming Public Transport Liaison meeting (scheduled for 24th July 2014).

Referring to Orpington, the Chairman highlighted local support for improved means to link Orpington High Street and Orpington Station. In this context, he referred to having effective way-finding for the High Street and station.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to confirm:

(1) the suggested priority rationale set out in Paragraph 3.2 and Appendix 1 of Report ES14041; and

(2) Elmstead Woods, Penge East, Petts Wood and Shortlands as the first priority stations in the borough for station access improvements.

G) A222 CHISLEHURST COMMON IMPROVEMENTS

Report ES14040

The Portfolio Holder was asked to approve funding for the development of a proposal to improve the A222 across Chislehurst Common. The Congestion Working Group had referred to the Chislehurst Common section of the A222 as a congestion pinch point, with congestion particularly occurring during morning and afternoon peaks.

Anecdotal evidence suggested that many drivers cut through the Common using either Ashfield Lane/Prince Imperial Road or Royal Parade/Watts Lane, to avoid the War Memorial junction in particular.

To address the issue, a “land swap” was proposed with a single carriageway road between Heathfield Lane and Prince Imperial Road/Centre Common Road, replacing lesser used roads across the common. Land could be returned to the Common significantly improving its amenity. The precise location of the replacement road and any designs would be subject to discussion with the Commons Conservators and other stakeholders.

Four junctions on the A222 with the worst congestion were being considered for improvement subject to a traffic survey before decisions are taken on which (if any) junctions should be improved. It was necessary to undertake origin-destination surveys as well as volume and turning counts.

Informal discussions had taken place with Ward Members, Commons Conservators and the Chislehurst Society. All were supportive of the plans being developed further.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the allocation of up to £60k of LIP funding to develop the proposals for improvements on the A222.

H) PARKING CONTROLS IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Report ES14057

Members considered the Council’s approach to requests for various parking controls, including waiting restrictions (yellow lines). Report ES14057 proposed criteria for determining where parking should and should not be permitted, outlining design considerations for parking controls in residential areas (including minor changes to the highway) and incorporating:

- Waiting Restrictions (yellow lines)
- Flank Boundary Parking
- Footway Parking
- White Bar Access Markings
- Disabled Persons Parking Bays

The report also sought to reaffirm the Council’s position on trying to provide suitable on-street parking places.

It was recommended that existing practice be confirmed across the borough with the following approach to be taken:

- the standard length of junction treatment restrictions to be 10 metres, with authority to vary in special circumstances depending on individual site circumstances or for engineering / road safety issues;
- where road widths permit, as described at paragraph 3.17 of Report ES14057, to allow flank boundary parking without restrictions;
- for any new scheme promoted, or existing scheme reviewed, to assess locations where flank boundary parking can be provided and where restrictions can be removed to provide additional parking places; and

- footway parking to only be introduced in special circumstances and where sufficient footway widths as described at paragraph 3.24 of Report ES14057 can be retained - this only applying where footways are deemed sufficiently robust, or can be upgraded, to withstand the weight of vehicles without excessive damage.

Report ES14057 also gave notice of certain parking controls to be reviewed.

Officers considered that a new approach was needed for implementing White Bar Access markings, including agreed criteria, to allow a consistent approach borough-wide. A further report would outline such issues and recommend a new process for implementation. No fee was currently charged to applicants for White Bar markings.

On Disabled Persons Parking Bays, the number of bays across the Borough had increased over the years, along with the Council's costs to install, maintain and process applications for such bays. With the existing process and criteria having been in place for a number of years, a review of the current process was considered necessary. As such, a further report would be compiled to examine the processes involved in implementing disabled drivers' bays, along with ways to address escalating costs and the time involved in assessing and implementing such schemes.

The Chairman supported measures in Report ES14057 for footway parking. He suggested that footway parking exemptions, in the circumstances outlined, might be helpful to allow emergency vehicles to pass. Permission for footway and carriageway parking should take account of street furniture and trees, so emergency vehicles could if necessary mount the pavement to reach their destination; it would be beneficial if posts holding signs showing the parking restrictions could be set back from the carriageway. Removing unnecessary street furniture could also enable footway parking on both sides of a road. For consistency, the Chairman asked that the policy outlined in Report ES14057 correspond with footway parking criteria outlined in a further policy document published by the Council, particularly in regard to available footway width.

Concerning disabled parking bays, it was confirmed that officers were not routinely informed of a disabled parking bay no longer being required. The issue would be looked at by officers and would feature in a further report to Members following a review of procedures for Disabled Parking Bays.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to adopt the policies on parking controls outlined at Section 3 of Report ES14057.

**I) APPOINTMENTS TO THE COUNTRYSIDE CONSULTATIVE
PANEL AND THE LEISURE GARDENS AND ALLOTMENTS
PANEL 2014/15**

Report CSD14093

Members supported nominations to the Countryside Consultative Panel and the Leisure Gardens and Allotments Panel for 2014/15.

RESOLVED that:

(1) Councillors Lydia Buttinger, Ian Dunn, William Huntington-Thresher, Sarah Phillips, and Colin Smith be appointed to the Countryside Consultative Panel for 2014/15; and

(2) Councillors Vanessa Allen, Mary Cooke, Ellie Harmer, Alexa Michael, and Michael Turner be appointed to the Leisure Gardens and Allotments Panel for 2014/15.

7 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE

**A) LEAD LOCAL FLOOD AUTHORITY FLOODING AND WATER
MANAGEMENT ACT 2010**

Report ES14042

Report ES14042 provided an update on the Council's role as Lead Local Flood Authority. It considered the impact of recent groundwater flood events and sought the Portfolio Holder's views on the Council's involvement in future events.

It also sought Executive agreement to the release of dedicated Central Contingency funding (£250k) to fund works detailed in the report and to ensure the Council meets its statutory duties as Lead Local Flood Authority.

Members were advised that pumping downstream from the gardens of Courtfield Rise, West Wickham had ceased ten days previously.

Concerning the Council's role in any future groundwater flooding event, the Chairman suggested that the Council's role should focus on facilitating works on behalf of residents i.e. working with and helping residents make suitable arrangements.

The Portfolio Holder briefly outlined the Council's position during the recent groundwater flood events. Although the Council has no direct responsibility for pumping arrangements to remove groundwater, the Council assisted with this to help residents stay in their homes. However, in so doing it became unnecessary for insurance companies to act/provide compensation. Ministers would be lobbied on the position.

The Vice-Chairman suggested that it was difficult to assess whether the Council should similarly assist in future flood events without being able to predict the scale of flooding. However, it was necessary for the Council's website to outline the Council's responsibilities during a flood event, including the Council's policy and legal position in such events.

Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher saw the Council's role as linking agencies together to work in a timely manner. She felt the Council had a moral responsibility to assist in encouraging agencies to work together. It was also important to understand the reasons for flooding at Borkwood Court and to make sure that funds invested are worthwhile.

The Chairman felt the Council should support residents make their own flood protection arrangements for their property, with the Council providing a facilitating role with relevant agencies. It was necessary to be clear on the Council's responsibilities. In the event of a flooding event, emergency services e.g. London Fire Brigade/Thames water should be expected to take initial action to remove excess water.

Referring to funding from the Repair and Renewal Grant scheme (which could be pooled to provide infrastructure protecting a whole site rather than individual properties), and a proposal that L B Bromley match funds this with a contribution of up to £30k towards the cost of infrastructure at Borkwood Court and Courtfield Rise, it was suggested that further consideration might be necessary should the match funding have to be directed to one specific area. It was suggested that proposals related to Borkwood Court be referred in the first instance to Ward Members for consideration.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Executive be recommended to agree to a sum of £250k being released from the dedicated 2014/15 Central Contingency budget to implement the proposals detailed in Report ES14042;

(2) the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to consider the L B Bromley's role in any future groundwater flooding events; and

(3) the Committee recommend that:

- the Council should support residents to make their own flood protection arrangements for their property with the Council taking a facilitating role with relevant agencies;**
- emergency services, e.g. London Fire Brigade/Thames Water, should be expected to take initial action in a flooding event to remove excess water; and**
- the responsibilities of residents for any future groundwater flood event are made clear and recorded on the Council's website.**

8 REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER NOT REQUIRING PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY

A) EDWARD ROAD - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

Report ES14043

Members considered a proposal for the introduction of waiting restrictions at Edward Road, near Sundridge Park railway station. The road experienced heavy parking at its southern end nearest its junction with Plaistow Lane.

The proposed scheme (drawing number 11588-01) sought to balance the various parking needs of residents, visitors and commuters. It was subject to formal consultation with residents, the outcome of which was outlined in Report ES14043.

Noting a number of walls and fences along Edward Road, the Chairman highlighted the importance of the scheme complying with the Flank Boundary Parking policy outlined in Report ES14057 "*Parking Controls in Residential Areas*". The Portfolio Holder considered that the scheme did not protect the Flank Boundary policy and, as such, would support the scheme being looked at again. The Chairman recommended that the report be referred back to officers for further consideration.

RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to refer the scheme back to officers for further consideration, to ensure that it fully complies with the Flank Boundary Policy outlined in Report ES14057 "*Parking Controls in Residential Areas*"

B) CHELSFIELD PARKING REVIEW

Report ES14020

Complaints had been received about parking problems in the residential area around Chelsfield Station, possibly aggravated by an increased number of commuters using the station (a decision by Sevenoaks Council to introduce parking charges at Knockholt Station may have displaced commuters to Chelsfield).

Report ES14020 detailed the outcome of consultation to determine the views of residents on proposed changes to local parking restrictions. The changes were outlined in a revised parking scheme detailed in drawings 11051-101 to 11051-111 appended to Report ES14020.

RESOLVED that the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) agree the proposed changes to the current parking arrangements as detailed in drawings 11051-101 to 11051-111 attached to Report ES14020; and

(2) agree that authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Environment and Community Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Ward Members, to approve any specification changes to the scheme considered necessary at the detailed design stage.

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

Report ES14036

In considering Working Groups for 2014/15, Members agreed to establish two Working Groups on Waste and Parking. The need for a Transport Strategy Working Group would be considered at the next PDS pending clarification of the likely terms of reference.

Further Member investigation was also considered necessary on highway maintenance and a decision would be taken at the next meeting on how best to take this forward.

For the meeting on 20th January 2015, the Chairman requested an item to review performance on street cleansing and leaf removal in the borough. As part of the Committee's scrutiny work it was also possible to look at the performance of a partner organisation e.g. TfL, road traffic police etc. The Chairman asked for Member views on a preferred partner organisation to invite to a future meeting.

Members also agreed to revert back to a 7.30pm start time for meetings.

A Public Transport Liaison meeting would be held at the Civic Centre on 24th July 2014 at 6.30pm.

RESOLVED that:

(1) the Committee's rolling 2014/15 Work Programme be agreed, subject to an item on street cleansing and leaf removal at the Committee's meeting on 20th January 2015;

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

(3) the summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio be noted;

(4) the following Working Groups and memberships be established for 2014/15 –

<u>Working Group</u>	<u>Membership</u>
Waste (to consider further measures aimed at minimising waste and encouraging recycling, thereby reducing budget pressures)	Councillor Kevin Brooks Councillor Lydia Buttinger Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher Councillor William Huntington-Thresher Councillor Terence Nathan Councillor Catherine Rideout
Parking	Councillor William Huntington-Thresher Councillor Angela Page Councillor Melanie Stevens

Democratic Services note: following the meeting, Councillor Catherine Rideout asked to be moved from the Waste Working Group to the Parking Group. This would increase membership of the Parking Working Group and was agreed by the Chairman.

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

11 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF A PART 2 REPORT TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

A) GOSSHILL ROAD - FIRST RESOLUTION

Report ES14038

Members considered a report concerning the adoption and making up of Gosshill Road, Chislehurst, to create a new cycle path and general highway improvements. As such the report sought an approval of the proposed approach and a first resolution under the Private Street Works Code (Highways Act 1980).

The Meeting ended at 9.20 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

QUESTION FROM CHLOE-JANE ROSS, CHAIR, COPERS COPE AREA RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION, FOR WRITTEN REPLY

What action is Bromley Council going to take to secure the future of Thameslink services from Beckenham Junction, Kent House, Penge to St Pancras and beyond, to Blackfriars from 2018, and to lobby for improved/additional commuter rail links from Beckenham Junction onwards?

Reply

I thank Ms Ross for her question.

The Council, along with Southeastern Railways and other south east London boroughs, were surprised by the then rail minister's announcement in January 2013 safeguarding services from Wimbledon Loop through central London ahead of those services from the south east including Beckenham Junction, against the recommendation of Network Rail.

I understand from one of your local Ward Councillors that you had sight of the Council's advice (dd 29th May) on related matters. Both Southeastern and Govia (the new operator of the TSGN franchise) have yet to set out the services from 2018 although we note that the Department for Transport's service specification does include services through to St Pancras and beyond.

If there is any suggested detrimental change to the current provision for local services be it either part of the TSGN or South Eastern franchise from 2018, the Council will of course involve itself in opposing such measures, I am hopeful supported by our four local MPs.

QUESTIONS FROM MR COLIN WILLETTS FOR WRITTEN REPLY

Question 1

With regard to your reply 25/3/14, what was the outcome following a shortly to be arranged meeting with the directly affected residents to various possibilities, which broadly amounted to widening the turn and to provide additional safe parking around Robin Hood Green?

Reply

Following two local changes at the 2014 Local Election, the views of the two new Ward Councillors have been sought for consideration.

Question 2

Dear Portfolio Holder following a complaint received from the proprietor of The Shoe Doctor in Orpington High Street regarding a trip hazard (redundant pit on the footway outside the shop), could you have this made safe with rectification at the earliest opportunity?

Reply

This matter will be picked up as a standard operation issue.

Question 3

Dear Portfolio Holder, could you instigate the removal of a large pile of aggregate spoil including broken glass from the amenity grass area to the flank of 19 Robin Way?

Reply

This matter will be picked up as a standard operation issue.
