

COUNCIL MEETING

8th December 2014

QUESTIONS FOR WRITTEN REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

1. From Cllr Russell Mellor to the Chairman of the Pensions Investment Sub-Committee

HM Government undertook to grant Scotland powers to determine their own taxation levels during the devolution referendum. In view of the fact that two of our Pension Fund Managers are located in Scotland, can you advise me of any adverse effects our funds would suffer as a result of the change in the tax regime, particularly cross border investments.

Reply:

The Director of Finance has received advice from the two Fund managers currently located in Scotland and from the Fund's independent adviser and all three parties share the view that, in a unified UK, there are no issues that would arise from employing a manager based in Scotland. They feel it is very unlikely that new taxation powers would be introduced that would directly affect our portfolio, such as a Scottish stamp duty or transaction tax – this would be infeasible practically and does not appear to be on the agenda of any influential party or body. VAT is a European tax and it is not possible to vary its level within the UK.

With regard to cross-border investments, there could be a tax risk if Scotland became independent, but this would apply more to Scottish company pension funds rather than English, as investments would be listed as overseas. The view is that the Scottish government's ability to change the tax regime would be limited to income tax and, whatever happens in this context, our managers say they will continue to have an absolute commitment to hiring and retaining the best staff and will continue to put clients' interests first.

2. From Cllr Russell Mellor to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment.

Can the Portfolio holder advise me as to the number of claims entered against the Council for injuries sustained by Residents due to accidents caused by damaged pavements?

In addition, can the Portfolio holder advise me of the number of claims, which have been settled together with the total amount of costs paid?

Reply:

Financial Year	Total no of footway claims	Total no of claims paid	Total value of payments made
			£
2010/11	82	14	263,413
2011/12	98	9	109,735
2012/13	79	13	74,899
2013/14	75	6	25,246
2014/15 (to date)	49	0	0

3. From Cllr Simon Fawthrop to the Portfolio Holder for Education

In each of the last 4 years how many (in numbers) of Bromley's looked after Children were entered into entrance exams for selective schools?

- a) 2010
- b) 2011
- c) 2012
- d) 2013

Reply:

None, however, one young person sat the 11+ in Kent and the entrance exam to St Olave's in autumn 2014.

Cohorts of Looked After Children at Key Stage 2 are very small, with disproportionately high incidence of SEN, at School Action, School Action Plus and with Statements. Early neglect and poor school attendance before becoming LAC frequently mean that these children have emotional and behavioural difficulties that are barriers to learning as well as having learning difficulties that may have gone undiagnosed for some time.

Children who are accommodated by the local authority in Early Years or KS1 frequently make more than expected progress between key stage one and key stage 2. Those who become LAC later in key stage 2 are less likely to make good progress and often have more difficulties in the classroom, though there are always some who have done and continue to do well.

The Virtual School supports foster carers and social workers to identify the best possible school at secondary transfer. No child is placed in a school that is not Ofsted rated good or better. If a looked after child has potential to do well at a grammar school, additional support is provided for tuition at home and the carers are required to visit schools and enter the child for entry examinations. The Virtual School is developing a programme in partnership with St Olave's Grammar School for Boys, which will identify pupils in years 4 and 5 who have potential to achieve at least a good level 4 at age 11, and invite them to visit the school with their carers. These pupils will then be given additional support to prepare for entry examinations and secondary transfer.

The table below shows the numbers and percentages of children achieving National expectation (level 4) and the incidence of Special Educational Need at the end of Key Stage 2.

Year	Reading	Writing	Maths	SEN
2014	55% (6 of 11 pupils)	55% (6 of 11 pupils)	55% (6 of 11 pupils)	5 pupils (64%) with identified SEN (Statements 2)
2013	76% (6 of 9 pupils)	44% (4 of 9 pupils)	76% (6 of 9 pupils)	6 pupils (76%) with identified SEN (Statements 5)
2012	57% (4 of 7 pupils)	57% (4 of 7 pupils)	42% (3 of 7 pupils)	6 pupils (86%) With identified SEN (Statements 5)
2011	50% (5 of 10 pupils)		40% (4 of 10 pupil)	8 pupils (80%) with identified SEN (Statements 6)
2010	English 100% (5 of 5 pupils)		80% (4 of 5 pupils)	2 pupils with identified SEN (Statements 2)

4. From Cllr Simon Fawthrop to the Portfolio Holder for Education

In each of the last 4 years how many looked after children (in numbers) were successful in gaining a place at a Russell Group University?

- a) 2010
- b) 2011
- c) 2012
- d) 2013

Reply:

We have 16 care leavers on undergraduate courses at university this year and one post graduate (PGCE). Many of our young people enter university later than their peers, having settled in education after periods of disruption. The average starting age is 22 and a proportion of the young people do not get awarded university places through the usual, A level, route, but through vocational qualifications at level 3 (BTec/NVQ). At this stage, most Care Leavers will have bid for a flat and will have created homes for themselves. Some have young families.

Of the current group of sixteen young people, 10 are in their own accommodation, which they would be required to forfeit if they went to a university further from home and were required to pay for halls of residence. For these young people, going to university away from home and giving up their flats also means that they have limited choices for the holidays. The remaining young people are living in, or returning home to, long term foster placements or to extended family members in holidays.

5. From Cllr Vanessa Allen to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Will the Portfolio Holder provide a schedule of street cleaning for Clock House Ward?

Reply:
Officers from the Street Scene Division will make this information available in a suitable format.

6. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Please advise the annual revenue and cost of operation for each of the Borough’s car parks in the Penge and Cator ward. Which of those are full to capacity on a regular basis?

Reply:

Total Income:

Location	Total Income £	Total Costs £	Net Income £
Penge East	16,758.23	10,035.65	6,722.58
Lennard Road	21,202.17	8,055.65	13,146.52

Penge East is usually about 70 per cent full during the week, low usage on Saturdays but is at full capacity when there are major events in London eg the Lord Mayors Show. Lennard Road is at full capacity on weekdays but has little use at weekends.

7. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Education

With the forecast cut to education and youth budget from city hall of up to 90% will Bromley Council be in a position to support our current youth services and continue to support any maintained schools we may still have responsibility for?

Reply:

The education budget (dedicated schools grant, DSG) is a separate funding stream from the broader budget that maintains all other Council services (revenue support grant, RSG). The Council's school improvement policy is focussed on ensuring that schools in an Ofsted category, or judged as 'Requiring Improvement', receive direct support from staff within the school improvement team. Where a school is judged as being 'Good' or 'Outstanding' but our intelligence tells us that intervention is necessary, such a school would also receive appropriate support from the team. It is not anticipated that this offer will diminish until such time as all schools are academies.

The youth services budget is funded via RSG and, along with all Council services, is currently undergoing a degree of scrutiny given the need to make significant savings. However, no decisions have as yet been made as to how the service may be cut or delivered differently.

8. From Cllr Kathy Bance MBE to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

There is a GLA survey ongoing called "Join the Dots". What has been the Borough's involvement in this and what impact might its final report and recommendations have on plans for the communities of Penge, Anerley and Crystal Palace? Has there been any financial cost to the Borough?

Reply:

Architects 00 were appointed by the Greater London Authority (GLA) to provide a regeneration overview to support the designation of Crystal Place as a Strategic Outer London Development Centre in the revised London Plan. The project has been financed and managed by GLA officers. This Council along with the four other Councils that border Crystal Place Park were consulted on the brief for the work and officers have provided background information into the study. Outside of this limited officer time there has been no financial cost of this study to the Council. The Council has yet to receive a copy of the completed study and therefore is not in position to comment on the recommendations and potential implications for the Borough.

9. From Cllr Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Will the Portfolio Holder provide a schedule of street cleaning for Penge & Cator Ward?

Reply:

Officers from the Street Scene Division will make this information available in a suitable format.

10. From Cllr Kevin Brooks to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

To what extent will the Council consider and evaluate the environmental performance of those contractors who may enter future tendering processes? What progress has been made and is expected in relation to compliance with ISO 14001?

Reply:

The Council considers, as appropriate, environmental performance matters at various stages of the tender process.

The Council's Contract Procedure Rules identify, at CPR1 a basic principle that to **"Enable a Value for Money, Procurement decisions... (contracting arrangements should be)... based on Whole Life Costing and the consideration of Sustainable Procurement Practice"**.

Whole Life Costing and Sustainable Procurement Practice are defined terms within the Procedures and in this context mean, for Whole Life Costing - **"..The consideration of all costs incurred during the life cycle of the work, goods, service or utility purchased including those identified by adopting good Sustainable Procurement Practice..."**. Sustainable Procurement is defined as **"...a process whereby the organisations meets its needs for goods, services works and utilities in a way that achieves value for money on a whole life basis in terms of generating benefits not only for the organisation but also society and the economy while minimising damage to the environment"**.

Formal consideration is given to this factor as part of any "Gate Reporting" process, as identified in the extract from the Procurement Practice Note below (1); as Part of the Pre-Qualification Process (when used) – a typical example is included below at (2); and at Tender Evaluation (see Tender Evaluation Matrix detailed below at (3)

These are in addition to any Standards which may be specifically included within the Contract Specification where relevant and appropriate.

Examples attached (Appendix 1).

11. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Will the Portfolio Holder provide a breakdown of current Council Tax Support claimants, broken down by working age / pensioner, Council Tax band and whether they are liable for the full charge or eligible for 25% discount?

Reply:

Please find tabled below the information requested in the above question:

Pensionable Age claims

Count of claim_id	Column Labels							Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
25% disregard discount	1	2	14	16	4	2		39
25% SPD	318	1084	1812	1274	353	94	41	4976
50% disregards				1	1			2
Full charge	40	170	651	919	401	137	53	2371
Grand Total	359	1256	2477	2210	759	233	94	7388

Working Age claims

Count of claim_id	Column Labels								Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
25% disregard discount	4	19	90	111	38	9	1		272
25% SPD	278	1819	3150	1569	348	88	25	1	7278
50% disregards						1			1
Full charge	76	319	1308	1327	409	102	50		3591
Grand Total	358	2157	4548	3007	795	200	76	1	11142

Pensionable Age claims

Count of claim_id	Column Labels							Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
25% disregard discount	1	2	14	16	4	2		39
25% SPD	318	1084	1812	1274	353	94	41	4976
50% disregards				1	1			2
Full charge	40	170	651	919	401	137	53	2371
Grand Total	359	1256	2477	2210	759	233	94	7388

Working Age claims

Count of claim_id	Column Labels								Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
25% disregard discount	4	19	90	111	38	9	1		272
25% SPD	278	1819	3150	1569	348	88	25	1	7278
50% disregards						1			1
Full charge	76	319	1308	1327	409	102	50		3591
Grand Total	358	2157	4548	3007	795	200	76	1	11142

12. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

Will the Portfolio holder provide statistics on how much housing benefit was paid during 2013/14 to each Housing Association and to private landlords? How many individual cases do each of these represent?

Reply:

In 2013/14 £73,684,292 was paid to 53 different housing associations. This represented 14,303 different claims.

The attached list shows the amounts paid to the each housing association.

In 2013/14 £11,540,268 was paid to 1293 different private landlords. This represented 1978 individual claims.

Name	amount_paid	no_of_claims
AFFINITY SUTTON HOMES LTD	£44,931,636.00	8919
A2 DOMINION GROUP	£4,195,817.34	781
HYDE HOUSING ASSOCIATION GROUP	£3,633,898.76	706

AMICUS HORIZON HOUSING GROUP	£3,555,863.33	656
RIVERSIDE HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£2,176,674.88	460
LONDON & QUADRANT HOUSING TRUST	£2,407,756.35	427
VIRIDIAN HOUSING	£2,086,225.50	339
KENISTON HOUSING ASSOCH. LTD	£978,706.01	209
TOWN & COUNTRY HOUSING GROUP	£1,287,620.13	195
MOAT HOMES LTD	£978,649.02	187
SANCTUARY HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£1,100,211.15	185
PENGE CHURCH HOUSING ASSOCH.	£740,120.32	165
HANOVER HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£1,110,004.53	131
RADCLIFFE HOUSING SOCIETY LTD.	£508,422.57	104
BROMLEY WOMENS AID (BR)	£350,173.18	96
HELIX HOUSING ASSOCIATION LTD	£441,210.48	92
RAGLAN HOUSING ASSOCIATION LTD	£467,986.52	78
FAMILY MOSAIC	£337,565.12	70
COMMUNITY OPTIONS LIMITED	£312,334.92	63
CHISLEHURST & SIDCUP HSG ASSOC	£309,777.84	57
WANDLE HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£200,194.42	46
GORDON MOODY ASSOCIATION	£78,672.57	39
ONE HOUSING GROUP	£94,531.77	34
ANCHOR TRUST	£115,142.22	24
CEDARMORE HOUSING ASSOC	£141,749.57	24
BEAVER HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£107,677.63	22
PHOENIX COMMUNITY HA LTD	£98,304.65	21
NOTTING HILL HOUSING TRUST	£77,286.49	17
SOUTHERN HOUSING GROUP	£66,059.16	17
STONHAM HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£70,505.21	17
LOOK AHEAD HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£78,348.64	16
EKAYA HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£71,031.50	12
HOMEGROUP - WARDEN HA	£50,956.50	11
GOLDEN LANE HOUSING LTD	£85,122.74	10
RESIDE HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£129,193.70	10
METROPOLITAN HOUSING PARTNERSHIP	£41,937.63	9
GUINNESS TRUST	£41,397.42	8
HOUSING CARE ASSOCIATION LTD	£18,892.69	7
CRYSTAL PALACE HOUSING ASSOC	£15,721.67	5
Hexagon Housing Association Ltd	£24,375.46	4
BIRNBECK HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£54,920.55	4
ADVANCE HOUSING & SUPPORT LTD	£26,568.06	4
ENGLISH CHURCHES HOUSING GROUP	£6,641.11	3
BOURNE HOUSING	£10,990.22	3
CROWN HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£7,165.12	2
WESTMINSTER HOUSING	£1,348.55	2

COOPERATIVE		
GLEBE HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£9,562.30	2
ORBIT HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£3,762.23	2
SLFHA LTD	£8,820.51	2
HABINTEG HOUSING ASSOCIATION LTD	£12,017.39	2
METROPOLITAN HOUSING TRUST	£9,600.36	2
HORIZON HOUSING GROUP	£5,034.14	1
WESTGATE (2) HOUSING ASSOCIATION	£10,106.20	1
Total	£73,684,292.33	14303

13. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Leader of the Council

The November meeting of E&R PDS had been scheduled for several weeks previously to receive a report on the future of Anerley Town Hall.

The report was not published until a matter of hours before the meeting at which it was to be discussed. The report incorrectly stated that local members had been consulted.

I am grateful to Cllr Carr for his intervention which postponed this extremely important discussion and decision about the future of the building and the community and business activities it facilitates.

However, what action can be taken to ensure that in future, reports and other documents are made available to members in good time and that local members are in fact consulted where appropriate?

Reply:

Thank you for your question regarding the recently deferred report on Anerley Town Hall. It is of course regrettable that this report was circulated late for Members' consideration. The Chief Executive/Directors seek to ensure that late reports are kept to an absolute minimum and are only considered when there is a compelling justification. In this case officers were aware that Community groups in Anerley were very keen to have the position of the Town Hall clarified as soon as possible. For this reason Mr. Hume had urged his officers to do all they could to get the report to the Executive meeting in December. Unfortunately the report took longer to prepare than originally anticipated and this was the reason for the late notice.

As you know, and as requested, this report will be considered at the R&R PDS Committee in January, prior to consideration at the E&R PDS Committee and Executive. In so doing both community impacts and Property matters can be fully considered.

14. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Resources

In relation to Anerley Town Hall, could you please provide details of both those works identified and those works carried out since 2005 in terms of the planned programme, reactive maintenance and cyclical maintenance programmes?

Reply:

Since 2005 £996,106 has been spent on Cyclical, Reactive and Planned Maintenance at Anerley Town Hall.

Future Works have been identified at a cost of £ 1.273 m, which are detailed in the Executive Report DRR14/094 on the future of the site, withdrawn from November Executive meeting.

15. From Cllr Richard Williams to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Will the Portfolio Holder provide a schedule of street cleaning for Crystal Palace Ward?

Reply:

Officers from the Street Scene Division will make this information available in a suitable format.

16. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

Will he give priority to clearing leaves in and around primary schools, ie, the state of Malcolm Rd in Penge on Saturday 29th November?

Reply:

I am afraid not.

All roads across the Borough are dealt with strictly on a 'most need' basis at this time of year, over which period the regular sweeping patterns can become disrupted.

You have however given me a splendid idea in terms of a junior citizenship project which I will discuss over coming weeks with senior officers in Education and Road Safety.

17. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

When will all the bins at 120 Oakfield Rd, Penge be emptied as one has not been emptied for nearly a year?

Reply:

Waste collection at this location has proved difficult for some time due to the unsanitary manner in which it was being presented for collection by the relevant homeowner(s).

Those living at the address have today been written to, explaining what needs to be done to bring themselves into compliance with the relevant requirements.

18. From Cllr Peter Fookes to the Portfolio Holder for the Environment

When will the trees adjacent to Homebase in Oakfield Rd be pruned?

Reply:

The trees were inspected in July 2014 and found not to present a nuisance.

A further examination will be undertaken in due course and should the trees present hazards or other H&S defects, they will be placed in our contractors work programme at that time.

19. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

If he will provide the following information in table format for each London Borough and for Sevenoaks, and Tatsfield District Councils and Dartford Borough Council for latest period for which statistics are available;

- i. number of planning committees in each authority;
- ii. whether the committees meet in the evening or daytime;
- iii. the number of applications received annually;
- iv. percentage of applications dealt with by committee;
- v. the percentage of the authority area in the Green Belt?

Reply:

- (i) Number of planning committees in each authority &**
- (ii) Whether the committees meet in the evening or daytime**

[source: each Local Planning Authority]

No of planning Committees

Barking and Dagenham	12 a year	Evening-
Barnet	12 a year	Evening
Bexley	12 a year	Evening
Brent	12 a year	Evening
Bromley	26* a year	Evening
Camden	12 a year	Evening
Croydon	17 a year	Evening
Ealing	12 a year	Evening
Enfield	12 a year	Evening
Greenwich	12 a year	Evening
Hackney	12 a year	Evening-
Hammersmith & Fulham	12 a year	Evening
Haringey	12 a year	Evening
Harrow	12 a year	Evening

Havering	12 a year	Evening
Hillingdon	12 a year	Evening
Hounslow	12 a year	Evening
Islington	12 a year	Evening
Kensington and Chelsea	12 a year	Evening
Kingston upon Thames	12 a year	Evening-
Lambeth	12 a year	Evening
Lewisham	12 a year	Evening-
Merton	12 a year	Evening
Newham	12 a year	Evening-
Redbridge	12 a year	Evening-
Richmond upon Thames	12 a year	Evening
Southwark	12 a year	Evening
Sutton	12 a year	Evening-
Tower Hamlets	12 a year	Evening
Waltham Forest	12 a year	Evening
Wandsworth	12 a year	Evening
Westminster	12 a year	Evening-
Sevenoaks		
Sevenoaks	12 a year	Evening-
Tandridge	12 a year	Evening-
Dartford	12 a year	Evening

*excludes DCC (of which there are 5 a year). Not all Councils have directly comparable arrangements


(iii) The number of applications received annually in January to March 2014

[source: DCLG website <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-planning-application-statistics>]

Applications received

England, January to March 2014

Barking and Dagenham	151
Barnet	1,147
Bexley	425
Brent	814
Bromley	871

Camden	1,070
Croydon	646
Ealing	830
Enfield	612
Greenwich	470
Hackney	604
Hammersmith and Fulham	774
Haringey	540
Harrow	589
Havering	499
Hillingdon	736
Hounslow	654
Islington	638
Kensington and Chelsea	1,297
Kingston upon Thames	482
Lambeth	861
Lewisham	616
Merton	478
Newham	369
Redbridge	661
Richmond upon Thames	1,186
Southwark	601
Sutton	344
Tower Hamlets	453
Waltham Forest	507
Wandsworth	1,180
Westminster	2,061
	
Sevenoaks	583
Tandridge	359
Dartford	146

(iv) Percentage of applications dealt with by committee

**% of applications dealt with by
Committee**

England, January to March 2014

Barking and Dagenham	2
Barnet	4
Bexley	4
Brent	2
Bromley	15
Camden	3
Croydon	3
Ealing	4
Enfield	4
Greenwich	6
Hackney	6
Hammersmith and Fulham	3
Haringey	2
Harrow	3
Havering	11
Hillingdon	11
Hounslow	3
Islington	5
Kensington and Chelsea	11
Kingston upon Thames	8
Lambeth	5
Lewisham	4
Merton	11
Newham	5
Redbridge	11
Richmond upon Thames	3
Southwark	5
Sutton	7
Tower Hamlets	87
Waltham Forest	5

Wandsworth	12
Westminster	6
[REDACTED]	
Sevenoaks	3
Tandridge	3
Dartford	11

(v) The percentage of the authority area in the Green Belt

[source: Bromley Planning Policy Department]

% of authority area in the Green Belt

Barking and Dagenham	14.67%
Barnet	27.43%
Bexley	18.46%
Brent	Information unavailable
Bromley	51.48%
Camden	Information unavailable
Croydon	26.71%
Ealing	5.94%
Enfield	37.62%
Greenwich	Minimal
Hackney	Information unavailable
Hammersmith & Fulham	Information unavailable
Haringey	2.03%
Harrow	21.59%
Havering	53.49%
Hillingdon	42.95%
Hounslow	21.79%
Islington	Information unavailable
Kensington and Chelsea	Information unavailable
Kingston upon Thames	17.18%
Lambeth	Information unavailable
Lewisham	Information unavailable
Merton	Information unavailable
Newham	2.21%

Redbridge	36.50%
Richmond upon Thames	2.44%
Southwark	Information unavailable
Sutton	14.14%
Tower Hamlets	Information unavailable
Waltham Forest	21.63%
Wandsworth	Information unavailable
Westminster	Information unavailable

Sevenoaks	Information unavailable
Tandridge	Information unavailable
Dartford	Information unavailable

Reply:

- (i) number of planning committees in each authority &**
(ii) whether the committees meet in the evening or daytime

[source: each Local Planning Authority]

No of planning Committees

Barking and Dagenham	12 a year	Evening-
Barnet	12 a year	Evening
Bexley	12 a year	Evening
Brent	12 a year	Evening
Bromley	26* a year	Evening
Camden	12 a year	Evening
Croydon	17 a year	Evening
Ealing	12 a year	Evening
Enfield	12 a year	Evening
Greenwich	12 a year	Evening
Hackney	12 a year	Evening-
Hammersmith & Fulham	12 a year	Evening
Haringey	12 a year	Evening
Harrow	12 a year	Evening
Havering	12 a year	Evening
Hillingdon	12 a year	Evening
Hounslow	12 a year	Evening

Islington	12 a year	Evening
Kensington and Chelsea	12 a year	Evening
Kingston upon Thames	12 a year	Evening-
Lambeth	12 a year	Evening
Lewisham	12 a year	Evening-
Merton	12 a year	Evening
Newham	12 a year	Evening-
Redbridge	12 a year	Evening-
Richmond upon Thames	12 a year	Evening
Southwark	12 a year	Evening
Sutton	12 a year	Evening-
Tower Hamlets	12 a year	Evening
Waltham Forest	12 a year	Evening
Wandsworth	12 a year	Evening
Westminster	12 a year	Evening-

Sevenoaks	12 a year	Evening-
Tandridge	12 a year	Evening-
Dartford	12 a year	Evening

*excludes DCC (of which there are 5 a year). Not all Councils have directly comparable arrangements

(iii) the number of applications received annually in January to March 2014

[source: DCLG website <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-planning-application-statistics>]

Applications received

England, January to March 2014

Barking and Dagenham	151
Barnet	1,147
Bexley	425
Brent	814
Bromley	871
Camden	1,070
Croydon	646
Ealing	830

Enfield	612
Greenwich	470
Hackney	604
Hammersmith and Fulham	774
Haringey	540
Harrow	589
Havering	499
Hillingdon	736
Hounslow	654
Islington	638
Kensington and Chelsea	1,297
Kingston upon Thames	482
Lambeth	861
Lewisham	616
Merton	478
Newham	369
Redbridge	661
Richmond upon Thames	1,186
Southwark	601
Sutton	344
Tower Hamlets	453
Waltham Forest	507
Wandsworth	1,180
Westminster	2,061
[REDACTED]	
Sevenoaks	583
Tandridge	359
Dartford	146

(iv) percentage of applications dealt with by committee

% of applications dealt with by Committee

England, January to March 2014

Barking and Dagenham	2
----------------------	---

Barnet	4
Bexley	4
Brent	2
Bromley	15
Camden	3
Croydon	3
Ealing	4
Enfield	4
Greenwich	6
Hackney	6
Hammersmith and Fulham	3
Haringey	2
Harrow	3
Havering	11
Hillingdon	11
Hounslow	3
Islington	5
Kensington and Chelsea	11
Kingston upon Thames	8
Lambeth	5
Lewisham	4
Merton	11
Newham	5
Redbridge	11
Richmond upon Thames	3
Southwark	5
Sutton	7
Tower Hamlets	87
Waltham Forest	5
Wandsworth	12
Westminster	6
	
Sevenoaks	3
Tandridge	3

(v) the percentage of the authority area in the Green Belt

[source: Bromley Planning Policy Department]

<u>% of authority area in the Green Belt</u>	
Barking and Dagenham	14.67%
Barnet	27.43%
Bexley	18.46%
Brent	Information unavailable
Bromley	51.48%
Camden	Information unavailable
Croydon	26.71%
Ealing	5.94%
Enfield	37.62%
Greenwich	Minimal
Hackney	Information unavailable
Hammersmith & Fulham	Information unavailable
Haringey	2.03%
Harrow	21.59%
Havering	53.49%
Hillingdon	42.95%
Hounslow	21.79%
Islington	Information unavailable
Kensington and Chelsea	Information unavailable
Kingston upon Thames	17.18%
Lambeth	Information unavailable
Lewisham	Information unavailable
Merton	Information unavailable
Newham	2.21%
Redbridge	36.50%
Richmond upon Thames	2.44%
Southwark	Information unavailable
Sutton	14.14%
Tower Hamlets	Information unavailable

Waltham Forest	21.63%
Wandsworth	Information unavailable
Westminster	Information unavailable
Sevenoaks	Information unavailable
Tandridge	Information unavailable
Dartford	Information unavailable

20. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

If he will list the number of 'call ins' by ward for each of the past three years (including the current year), and the number called in and refused and the number subsequently allowed on appeal?

Reply:

Ward	Total calling to committee that have been decided	Number refused	Number allowed on appeal as of 05/12/2014
Bickley			
2012	6	3	
2013	7	2	
2014	3	2	
Biggin Hill			
2012	2	1	1
2013	1		
2014	1		
Bromley Common And Keston			
2012	7	3	1
2013	5	1	
2014	5	1	
Bromley Town			
2012	1	1	
Chelsfield And Pratts Bottom			
2013	3	1	1
2014	2	1	
Clock House			
2012	1	1	
2013	2	2	

Copers Cope			
2012	6	3	
2013	6	1	
2014	4	2	
Cray Valley East			
2014	2	2	1
Darwin			
2013	2	2	
2014	4	2	
Farnborough And Crofton			
2012	4	1	
2013	1	1	1
2014	1	1	
Hayes And Coney Hall			
2013	1	1	
Kelsey And Eden Park			
2012	3	1	1
2014	3	2	
Mottingham &Chislehurst North			
2012	1	0	
Orpington			
2012	2	1	
2013	1		
2014	4	2	
Penge And Cator			
2012	4	1	
Petts Wood And Knoll			
2012	3		
2013	10	6	3
2014	5	5	2
Plaistow And Sundridge			
2013	2	1	
2014	1		
Shortlands			
2012	1		
2013	2	2	
West Wickham			
2012	1		
2013	1	1	
2014	2	1	

21. From Cllr Nicholas Bennett JP to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation

If he will give for the past three years (including the current year) the number and percentage of applications refused by -

(a) delegated authority

(b) by committee

and the number and percentage in each category which were subsequently allowed on appeal?

Reply:

Committee:

Year	Refused (% of total refusals)	Allowed at Appeal (% of total refused at committee)
2012	107 (12%)	30 (8%)
2013	120 (15%)	39 (33%)
2014 (to date)	117 (14%)	21 (18%)

Delegated authority:

	Refused (% of total refusals)	Allowed at Appeal (% of total refused under delegated authority)
2012	755 (88%)	61 (8%)
2013	702 (85%)	69 (10%)
2014 (to date)	740 (86%)	36 (5%)

22. From Cllr Tony Owen to the Chairman of Development Control Committee

Please give a timeline listing all communication (emails, letters and phone calls) relating to the following planning applications from initial application through to appeal decisions.

(a) 18 Oatfield Road, Orpington

(b) 2 Queensway, Petts Wood

Reply:

The timelines don't include any phone calls, which are not routinely logged.

(a) 14/01600/FULL6 - 18 Oatfield Road

29/4/14 – Application received by the Portal

9/5/14 – Invalidity letter sent to agent

15/5/14 – Application validated
 19/5/14 – Neighbour consultation letter sent
 19/5/14 – Acknowledgement letter sent to agent
 4/6/14 – Objection letter received from No.9 Vinson Close
 5/6/14 – On-line comments received from No.11 Vinson Close
 16/7/14 – Committee report
 31/7/14 – Application refused at Plans Sub-Committee and enforcement action authorised
 5/8/14 – Decision notice issued
 12/9/14 – Notification of appeal from Planning Inspectorate (PI)
 12/9/14 – Details of appeal forwarded by email to Cllrs Auld, Fawthrop and Owen
 12/9/14 – Email from Cllr Owen requesting a hearing
 16/9/14 – Email from Appeals team to PI requesting a hearing
 24/9/14 – Email from PI to appellant stating that hearing is requested by the Council, and the views of the appellant are requested by 1st October. States that final decision on the procedure will be made by PI
 14/10/14 – Unaccompanied site visit undertaken under the householder fast track procedure
 22/10/14 – Appeal decision issued – Appeal allowed
 27/10/14 – Email from Appeal section of Council to PI stating that the Council had not been informed that their request for a hearing had not been granted
 3/11/14 – Response from PI stating they are looking into the matter
 24/11/14 – Letter from PI stating that the decision had been made after the deadline for the appellant/agent to comment had passed that a hearing was not appropriate as it was considered that the matters at issue could be clearly understood from an examination of the appeal documents and a site inspection. They noted that enforcement action was pending, but considered that following the Inspector's decision on the appeal, it would be open to the Council to consider enforcement action at that time. The PI did, however, apologise for not informing either of the main parties of the PI's decision that a hearing was not appropriate.

(b) 13/01014/FULL1 - 2 Queensway:

5/12/11 – Original application, 11/03638/FULL1 for 2 detached houses received
 24/2/12 – 2011 application made valid
 3/4/12 – 2011 application refused under delegated authority
 5/4/12 – Decision Notice Issued
 17/4/13 – Post application letter received from the Agent regarding reason for refusal. No response provided as the protocol is to use the Council's Pre-application service.
 24/7/12 – Pre-application enquiry received to address above refusal
 7/6/12 – Pre application meeting takes place at Civic Centre
 25/6/12 – Agent emails revised plans to Planner
 28/6/12 – Email from Agent to Planner requesting an update on the matter
 18/7/14 – Further revised plans from Agent received
 26/7/12 – Planner provides formal pre-application response letter to Agent
 26/3/13 – Formal planning application received and validated, ref. 13/01014
 9/4/13 – Invalidity letter sent to agent
 15/4/13 – Acknowledgement letter sent to agent
 18/4/13 – Agent asks for application description to be amended to exclude the words, "Vehicular access to Tudor Way", which is now no longer proposed

19/4/13 – Objection received x 3
22/4/13 – Planner advises Agent that description has been rectified
23/4/13 – Local residents re-notified with amended description
24/4/13 – Objections received / Consultee comment received
25/4/13 – Neighbour comment received
29/4/13 – Consultee comment received
May '13 – Application called into committee by Cllr Owen
7/5/13 – Agent confirm receipt of two site notices; Planner advises that second one probably relates to the amended description
7/5/13 – Planner advises Agent that application has been called in to committee; Agent asks which councillor has called it in
10/5/13 – Planner advises that application was called in by Cllr Owen
17/5/13 – Agent seeks advise from Agent regarding progress update on application
30/5/13 – Planner confirms committee date
31/5/13 – Committee report
13/6/13 – Application considered at committee. Recommendation for permission is overturned and refused
5/7/13 – Appeal received
9/7/13 – Email to Ward Members advising of appeal
10/7/13 – Emails from Ward Members regarding appeal procedure
15/7/13 – Appeal start letter from PINS
18/7/13 – Appeal neighbour notification letter sent
18/7/13 – Appeal questionnaire sent
21/8/13 – Appeal statement sent to PINS
18/10/13 – Letter from appeal agent
23/10/13 – Letter from PINS re Inspector
14/11/13 – Planning Inspector visits site
9/12/13 – Appeal Decision issued granting planning permission for the scheme

Examples for Written Question No. 10

(1) Extract from Procurement Practice Note

“Gate Report - Considerations

14. SUSTAINABILITY / IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

(Sustainability Considerations

Detail here any sustainability issues that have been considered in specifying the works, goods, or services and in the delivery of the contract. For this, you may wish to consult with the Sustainability Manager in Environment and the Sustainability Lead in Procurement

Community and Sustainability Impact Statements /Assessments

The following questions should be addressed:

- *What will be the impact on local people, contractors and SME’s?*
- *Who will be affected by the contract?*
- *Are particular communities/groups likely to be affected differently by the issue?*
- *If there are likely to be adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups, what possible actions could be taken to ameliorate these? Are there any resource implications?*
 - *Where it is possible that the contract will have a disproportionate effect on a particular community or group explain the positive/negative effects. Include within this section any impacts required to be considered under the 2010 Equality Act.*
 - *If the contract will genuinely have no impact on local people or communities the following statement should be included: ‘This decision has been judged to have no or a very small impact on local people and communities’)*
 - ***If not included in the above, for service contracts there must be consideration of the requirements in the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 identifying how what is proposed might improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the relevant area, how this will be aided by the procurement process and considering whether to have a consultation on the potential improvements themselves or how they might be secured. ...”***

(2) Example of Information Requested at PQQ stage

11. Environmental Sustainability		
Question	Applicant Response Please state; Yes / No	

	<i>to each question</i>	
<p>11.1 Does your organisation operate an Environmental Management System (EMS) and if so does the EMS meet the standards in ISO14001, EMAS or equivalent?</p> <p><i>If 'Yes' please enclose FULL examples and a copy of your certification.</i></p> <p><i>If 'No' please provide details of your organisation's own environmental policy / strategy document or provide details of what measures your organisation takes to adhere to good environmental practices.</i></p>		

(3) Example Tender Evaluation Matrix

19.0 STAGE 2 - EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 19.1 Stage 2 will consist of a fresh round of scoring based on Tenderers responses to service specific questions and will include evaluation of the tenderers pricing schedule.
- 19.2 All Stage 2 questions will require method statements using the methodology as noted in Section 17 'Method Statements' above.
- 19.3 All Stage 2 questions will be scored in accordance with the weightings illustrated in Table D below.
- 19.4 The percentage for each question for Stage 2 is detailed in Table D below:

Table D – Stage 2 Scoring Methodology

Question	% of Total Score
Price	60%
Quality Total	40%
Quality Questions are Comprised of:	% Score
1 Approach to Service Delivery	(25%)
2 Service Development & Ongoing Management Arrangements	(20%)
3 Customer Care	(20%)
4 Operation of Quality Management arrangements within Service Delivery	(20%)
Sustainability Issues covering Environmental, Social and Economic factors and benefits	(15%)