

COUNCIL MEETING

22nd FEBRUARY 2016

(A) QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY

- (1) From Tom Crispin to the Environment Portfolio Holder** (Mr Crispin did not attend the meeting so a written reply was sent)

Winn Road is in three London Boroughs: Bromley, Greenwich and Lewisham. The road is maintained by Lewisham, but all three boroughs have a responsibility for the safety of road users.

Following recent incidents on the road, what pressure will Bromley assert on Lewisham to review the signage and traffic calming measures on Winn Road including at the entrance to Hadlow College in Bromley and Horn Park in Greenwich?

Reply:

Lewisham Council remain the Highway Authority with sole responsibility for road safety along Winn Road.

LBB Officers did offer on 15th January to pass your concerns on to Lewisham, but you did not respond to their offer at that time.

I would be happy to request Bromley officers to still do this for you now, should you find it helpful.

If you could please clarify what aspect(s) of signage, if any, give you cause for concern approaching the entrance to Hadlow College from the Mottingham Hall direction, LBB officers will very pleased to fully investigate that enquiry for you as well.

- (2) From Robert Pattullo to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder**

The proposed installation of a GPS at the southern end of the 03 runway and NAP at a cost of £3M to BHAL is for the sole benefit of the Airport. Why are you saying it is for residents benefit when it increases the sale value for BHAL?

Reply:

The proposal to install GPS at the southern end of the runway will mean an immediate fall in the numbers of aircraft arriving over Farnborough and the Hospital of at least 30%. Biggin Hill Airport have indicated that the figure may be closer to 40% as the new procedure will encourage more pilots to use the new Runway 03 approach than is currently the case. Also, to note that is likely to result in a reduction in noise from individual aircraft using this approach. BHAL point out that the new procedure has been designed, flight tested and submitted to the regulatory authorities by means of a formal 7 step Airspace Change Proposal (ACP). The

program is currently at stage 4 of the 6 stages required prior to its full implementation. The project is indicated as being on track for autumn 2016 implementation, subject to CAA approval.

(3) From Robert Pattullo to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

Why has the opinion of the Council's Senior Solicitor (expressed in 2000 and 2011 in regard to Clause 2.11 of the Lease) been ignored by Councillors in the 25th November decision?

Reply:

Without further information from the questioner to identify the specific advice he is referring to it is not possible to comment on the specific point. However, if you can provide that information we can engage in further correspondence with you on that point. However, Members make their decisions based on the information provided in the reports before them, and in this case (25th November decision) the report contained all relevant advice.

(4) From Robert Pattullo to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

Has the Council yet prepared a business case for the infrastructure costs required to support all the improvements necessary to access the Airport, the Hotel and the College such as CPO's, roads, services etc.?

Reply:

Any future development proposals from the Airport or anyone else which require Council approval will have to demonstrate their necessary infrastructure requirements. Proposals will be considered on their merits in the normal way including where appropriate the funding of necessary infrastructure improvements. Developers are expected to contribute towards infrastructure as part of the planning approval process, through Section 106 payments and through the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Supplementary Question:

Mr Pattullo asked where, if developers provided some of the funds for infrastructure, the remainder of the funding would come from?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that as far as he was concerned all the funding would be from developers.

(5) From David Clapham to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

The BHAL Lease currently allows home based aircraft to use the 'shoulder hours'. A whistleblower provided recordings of 9 planes which had taken off or landed outside the 'normal' hours. I provided the detail to the Councils Solicitor on 6th November and have sought specific details about these instances on four occasions and have been told there is nothing 'untoward'. I asked at the Executive Council meeting on the 13th January 2016 if LBB had a list of home based aircraft and was told it doesn't.

I request the individual specific details of these apparent contraventions of the BHAL Lease in writing please.

In addition, Mr Clapham referred to a list of out of hours flights he had received, with the designation "home base" alongside a number of these planes. He had investigated these "home base" claims and found two of them appeared to be false. He asked whether the Portfolio Holder agreed these claims were indeed false.

Reply:

Cllr Morgan responded that he had seen the correspondence and he was as concerned as Mr Clapham. He stated that the Council was investigating this as a matter of urgency and would do whatever it took to rectify the matter.

Supplementary Question:

If these are proven to be falsehoods, does the Portfolio Holder agree that this will be a contravention of the lease between the Council and the Airport?

Reply:

Yes, I do.

(6) From David Clapham to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

It is claimed that the noise will not be higher than 50% of the UDP map. Do Councillors realise that this actually means a 50% increase compared to the current levels by 2020?

Reply:

The Noise Action Plan (NAP) identifies that absolute noise, as defined by the 57dB contours, is forecast to increase in 2020 compared to the current low levels, with the mapping showing that the increase in noise will be largely over uninhabited fields. The contour does not extend as far as Farnborough and Petts Wood. Whilst the 50% reduction in noise compared to the UDP lines is welcome, the reality of the UDP contour was that this was to guide development rather than as a noise limit with which Airport had to comply, with none of this in the operating criteria. For the first time, we will have an absolute limit set out which will be set out in the operating criteria, with the lease as it stands allowing 125,000 movements at substantially higher noise levels than anything we can imagine. That will now be significantly reduced.

(7) From David Clapham to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

At the Executive meeting on the 10th February, the Leader said that he had met Sir Lister a few times to obtain a commitment by the GLA to invest funds in the SOLDC. What business case did the Leader present to Sir Lister to justify the expense of taxpayers' money predominantly into a small private enterprise?

Reply:

It is my belief that the Leader did not present a business case himself but simply put the case (lobbied on behalf of Local Residents) for the very real potential that

investment could provide for the Borough. It is then for the GLA and their officers to pursue new investment opportunities based on a proper business case at that time.

(B) QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR WRITTEN REPLY

(1) From Mrs Andrea Stevens, planning representative for the Petts Wood & District Residents' Association (PWDRA) to the Chairman of Development Control Committee

Does Bromley Council's Planning department send out notifications about non-householder appeals that have been made following refusal of planning permission, and when and to whom are such notifications sent? What quality assurance checks are made to ensure that all interested parties are notified?

Reply:

The Council's Planning service sends out notifications of all appeals received following refusal of planning application in line with national requirements.

The planning inspectorate issue a start letter following validation of the appeal documents received. The appeals team receive the start letter and have either 5 days for a householder appeal or 7 working days for all other appeals to notify residents of the appeal.

A list of residents to be notified about the appeal is generated using the same notification list as the planning application and in addition, other parties that send in a representation about the planning application.

Quality assurance is provided by the working methods (e.g. starting from the same list of neighbour notifications for the planning application and appeals) and by office practices.

(2) From Callie Foster to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Following a productive meeting between residents of Moorfield Road, Orpington and Council representatives held on 16 November 2015 we, the residents, have been waiting for a response from the Council in relation to our petition requesting a residents parking scheme. Please could the Council update us on progress made and the next steps required to move this process forward?

Reply:

I can confirm that this request is currently advancing within a queue for such works and that an outline proposition will be placed before local residents early in the new financial year.