

COUNCIL MEETING

1st MARCH 2017

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(A) QUESTIONS FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Theo Sweeney to the Environment Portfolio Holder

(Mr Sweeney did not attend the meeting, so a written reply was sent)

I reported a ticket machine (MC:4004 in Orpington High Street) in October 2016, as it was not accepting coins. I was assured that it would be fixed, yet 3 months later it is not. On January 27th 2017 the machine is still not accepting coins. People can book a ticket by phone, but this should be a choice, not forced onto people.

Can the Council explain why this machine has not been fixed?

Reply:

Officers confirm that regular amounts have been collected from the machine each week since the beginning of October, suggesting that it is functioning properly.

I have however asked the Head of the Council's Parking Services to have the machine monitored over coming weeks and months to ensure that this remains the case.

2. From Andrew Viner to the Environment Portfolio Holder

What is the Council's policy with regard to the adoption of newly constructed residential roads in the borough, including those on major estates, and including those where new developments lead off un-adopted roads?

Reply:

When new housing developments are constructed in the borough, the developer can choose whether to have any roads and footways on their site built to a standard suitable for adoption by the local Highway Authority. If this is the case the construction works would be monitored by the Highway Authority and adopted, usually at the end of the guarantee period. The policy also applies to new roads leading off of an existing unadopted highway.

Supplementary Question:

Given that unadopted roads without a physical barrier or obvious prohibition on access are defined as roads by, for example, the case of Cox and White, can the Council confirm that it has implemented a programme to promote road safety and has taken steps to prevent accidents on such roads, as they are required to do under section 39 of the Road Traffic Act?

Reply:

My advice is that the Council is compliant with all aspects of road safety law.

3. From Jane Green to the Chairman of Development Control Committee.

Can you confirm that Items 14 and 15 at the last Renewal and Recreation PDS listed 87 applications in 2013-2016 recommended for permission by officers but overturned and refused by committee which were subsequently allowed on appeal, plus those for which costs totalling £220,300 were awarded against the Council in the same three years?

Reply:

There were about 87 such cases. These 87 overturned applications were drawn from around 8,700 applications determined in the same period which is about 1% of cases to put this in context. There were costs awards of about £220,300 arising from appeal cases including delegated decisions, enforcement and committee cases.

Supplementary Question:

What measures are being taken to ensure that planning committees when overturning officers recommendations for permission, provide substantive planning reasons for refusal to enable officers to make a robust case at appeal so that appellants are less successful in claiming awards of expensive costs against the Council

Reply:

The Council is required to put a robust case, and that is always complied with.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Tony Owen asked whether the Chairman accepted that the officer recommendation was taken into account by planning inspectors, so that planning committees may have shot themselves in the foot. He requested that "Members views" recommendations were brought back, as requested by many Members.

Reply:

I do not agree that an appeal inspector's view is influenced by the recommendation of officer. Furthermore, "Members views" is an option currently available to officers.

4. From Andy Richardson to the Care Services Portfolio Holder (Answered by the Leader of the Council)

Has the Portfolio Holder for Care Services any evidence that recent cuts of £10m in the Social Care Department has had a detrimental effect on Bromley Adult Social Care to help patients in our local hospitals quickly back to their homes and community?

Reply:

No, not really. Social care provides a personal budget based on the assessed eligible unmet need of an individual which is agreed on a daily basis for people ready for discharge to avoid delays by social care. The assessment process involves a joined up approach with colleagues in the CCG and other health providers to ensure effective, timely and safe discharges for those leaving hospital.

Supplementary Question:

Would the Councillor agree with me that one piece of evidence produced by NHS England in their delayed transfers of care statistics - the fact that Bromley has been the worst London

council for delayed hospital stays due to public funding - in November 2016, being 169 days and in December 2016 105 days, are indicative to drastic cuts in Bromley's social care budget.

Reply:

I do challenge the premise of the question. Exceptional amounts of work have been done at my request as a result of conversations I have had with Dr Andrew Parsons at the CCG and with the Chief Executive, who has been particularly helpful in that in addressing some of the issues that were brought before us in the later part of last year and over Christmas. The numbers that we hear quoted today we believe are an exaggeration and confused about some of those delayed discharges that may effectively have been as a result of insufficient work being put in by some of our neighbouring boroughs. I take the issue very seriously and we want to do all we can to help the CCG and the acute sector come back within balance and we will do as much as we can to ensure that these things do not happen in future.

5. From Dr John Courtneidge to the Care Services Portfolio Holder
(Answered by the Leader of the Council)

Please supply details as to how the 2016 Adult Social Care Precept was spent and how the same 2017 is to be spent; including details of any funds that were released, as a result of such Precepts, to General Funds, along with details as to how any such-released funds were spent.

Reply:

In 2016/17 the precept has protected social care from cost pressures and the need to make further efficiencies in 16/17. For example, we have not made the reductions in spending on day opportunities for older people or people with learning disabilities in 2016/17, which was one of the options brought before Members some time ago.

In 2017/18 the precept will be used to cover the additional costs of the national living wage, inflation and protecting services from further reductions. Looking at our Section 151 Officer, regarding the second part of your question, there was no such funds returned – that is correct.

Supplementary Question:

I have it on reliable information, confirmed by telephone at 6pm this evening, that the direction of local government funding is away from the receipt of grants from central government towards a position where local authorities are required to make payments to central government. Is Bromley aware of this direction of travel, and are they planning for it?

Reply:

We have been aware of it for some time and we are making very serious preparations to deal with it.

6. From Richard Gibbons to the Care Services Portfolio Holder
(Answered by the Environment Portfolio Holder)

“Are cars the new tobacco?” posited the Journal of Public Health six years ago, concluding that “the public health community should advocate strongly for effective policies that reduce car use and increase active travel”. Given the level of car use in Bromley and rising health costs associated with inactivity, how has the Portfolio Holder responded to the warnings?

Reply:

Councillor Colin Smith, Environment Portfolio Holder, read out the following answer on behalf of the Care Services Portfolio Holder -

Although the transport aspects of this answer might be more fully answered by my colleague, the Portfolio Holder for Environment, I can state that Bromley has an excellent record of providing cycle training and continues to improve cycling and walking routes through in the Borough.

I am aware that he will be pleased to address any supplementary question that you might have.

Supplementary Question:

This was a public health question, not an environment question. Can the Portfolio Holder afford to ignore the savings that could be made by reducing car dependency and embracing active travel on public transport to achieve the recommended twenty minutes exercise per day? I say this quoting from the JSNA report 2016 which says “Increasing rates of obesity present a major challenge to the health of local people and failure to tackle this will have a significant impact on the Council, NHS and other public service providers and budgets.”

Reply:

I am advised that we in Bromley have one of the highest proportions of the twenty minutes activity across the entire country. Also, many of our citizens do stay mobile into their old age as we know around the cost of Freedom Passes – some 65,000 adults. In terms of the walking and cycling agendas, everything is centralised through the Environment with feed-in from other silos, and not the other way round.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Simon Fawthrop asked whether the Portfolio Holder would comment on the fact that when the buses were on strike London had one of its best air quality days for years, and whether any conclusions could be drawn from that, and whether all cars are bad? For example, if electric cars are used presumably the effect is zero, so it is not all cars that are bad, but the type of cars, such as diesels.

Reply:

Councillor Fawthrop will appreciate one of the answers coming up on this subject. I believe there is a necessary healthy balance between the use of public transport, cars, walking and cycling. There is a place for all and all must learn to share and work with each other.

(The Mayor noted that the 15 minutes allotted to public questions had expired, but he announced that he would allow the questions to continue.)

7. From Andrew Viner to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Given that the Council's Road Safety Team is not responsible for private roads and offers no advice in respect of them, does the Council have any concerns regarding the safety of road users, including pedestrians, on un-adopted residential roads in the borough?

Reply:

The Council's road safety team investigates and takes action, where deemed appropriate, in respect to collision clusters on all highways in the Borough, be they adopted or un-adopted, apart from on the TLRN, which is the responsibility of TfL.

8. From Mrs Jane Green to the Chairman of Development Control Committee.

Can you provide data in table format for the years 2013-2016 and broken down by committee, showing those applications with officers' recommendation for refusal but which were overturned and granted permission in committee?

Reply:

A table has been circulated showing these cases. There were 16 out of a total of over 1,300 cases considered by committee in this period (FY 13-14 to FY15-16).

(See Appendix 1 attached)

Supplementary Question:

There was one application that I was expecting to see on the list, but I will take this up with officers.

9. From Dr John Courtneidge to the Resources Portfolio Holder

Please supply details of the number of LB Bromley households that have been in receipt of Council Tax Benefit/Support over the past ten years and are planned to be so served in the next three Financial Years, including the number of households in such receipt: analysed by Ward and Council Tax Band.

Reply:

The answering of this question would involve me reading out pages of statistics which would seriously eat into the time allocated for this meeting. I have therefore produced a paper containing as much of the requested information as is available. The Council Tax and Benefits system does not record the Council ward and I have therefore broken down the information by post code. *(See Appendix 2 attached)*

Unfortunately, there are too many variables to provide estimated numbers of claimant households for future years, with some such as possible legislative change being outside of the authority's control.

Supplementary Question:

We know that Council Tax is a deeply iniquitous tax because it is not based on ability to pay; the question arises of whether the Council is considering either a re-banding and re-valuation of properties within Bromley, or an alternative which might be a local income tax as a more equitable approach to raising Council funds?

Reply:

The two suggestions you make are totally beyond our control, in terms of local income tax or re-valuation, which would be a national concern. What we do do is identify as many initiatives as we can to avoid pain and suffering for our residents and taking them to a point where they have to face as homeless. Some 90% of the people who present as potentially homeless are able to avoid that by the initiatives that we take. We are well aware of the initiatives, and the need for them. If you look at the statistics over the last ten years they are very consistent in terms of their spread across postcodes and they are also pretty consistent in terms of their numbers, if anything it is a slightly reducing total number.

10. From Richard Gibbons to the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder

Less than 1 mile in 2016 - the proximity distance average of 45 Primary Schools in Bromley. Notwithstanding School Travel Plans, walk/scoot/cycle initiatives and sterling work of Road Safety Unit, what barriers prevent 20-30% children travelling to school by car from adopting active travel and/or public transport modes for their journey?

Reply:

This Council has no powers to compel children or parents to use means of transport other than the car to travel to school, and that is regardless of the proximity. However, the fact that proximity distances have generally fallen in the borough makes it easier for primary pupils to walk or cycle to school.

Parents have freedom of choice over how they transport their children to school. Some may have practical reasons for using the car - for example work commitments, or a place of residence that makes it more difficult for pupils to utilise other travel options.

This Council continues to do all it can to encourage parents to use alternative transport methods to the car where it is practicable and for the health benefits it can bring. This includes free public transport for all primary age pupils, most without the need for an Oyster card or similar; and it includes supporting all schools to put in place accredited School Travel Plans.

The Council also supports a range of Road Safety initiatives to encourage children and families to take up more active travel for school journeys, including reward schemes and safety training for bicycles and scooters.

Supplementary question:

What reductions in the 20-30% can we expect in the next few years from those strategies?

Reply:

The Portfolio Holder responded that, in terms of the road safety initiative, this was a question more properly handled by the Environment Portfolio Holder. Councillor Colin Smith added that nobody could say – it was a function of how many houses were built in the borough and how many schools were built, and where they might go.

11. From Mrs Jane Green to the Chairman of Development Control Committee.

As there is no right of appeal for third party objectors for permitted applications, residents have to accept the consequences of these overturned decisions. Why, contrary to the 2006 Planning Code of Conduct, are the reasons for overturning officers' recommendation for refusal by granting permission not always recorded in committee minutes?

Reply:

Between 2003 and 2013, there was a duty on local planning authorities to give reasons for the grant of planning permission. From 6 December 2003, article 22(1)(b)(i) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (SI 1995/419) and subsequently article 31(1)(a)(i) and (ii) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (SI 2010/2184) provided this new statutory duty. That is why we did do it. However, this was effectively repealed in 2013 and currently article 35(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, provides that reasons are only required if permission is refused. If granted subject to conditions, then reasons are required in relation to each such condition. We will in any event keep this under review.

12. From Dr John Courtneidge to the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder

Does the LB Bromley have a statutory duty to provide and plan the number of Infant, Junior, Primary, Secondary and any other school and college places within the LB Bromley; if so, is there at present and, over a five-year plan, any shortfall, and of what sizes, if any, in terms of numbers and by forms of entry, as compared to the present provision, of such provision?

Reply:

Yes, the Council does have a statutory duty to provide sufficient school places in its area for primary and secondary education as well as securing diversity in the provision of schools, and increasing opportunities for parental choice.

We publish both a Primary School and Secondary School Development Plan annually that reviews the need for school places up to 2031 and identifies options for meeting this need. Currently, following the addition of 700 permanent school places since 2010 through school expansions and Free School developments, there are sufficient places in the primary school sector. However, there are additional forms of entry which will be required in the secondary sector for future years and it is proposed this demand will be met through a combination of expansions and Free Schools, the first of which, Eden Park High School, is opening in 2017. There are initial discussions beginning around options elsewhere with a view to meeting and matching a defined educational need.

13. From Richard Gibbons to the Environment Portfolio Holder

An inactivity crisis affecting the health of children and adults is highlighted in TfL's Healthy Streets for London document. Does the Portfolio Holder acknowledge the negative impacts of car use and will he embrace the Healthy Streets Approach prioritising walking, cycling and public transport to reduce congestion, improve air quality, and help create a healthier Bromley?

Reply:

There remains a valid place for walking, cycling, the use of public transport and of private motor vehicles across Bromley.

I have long since encouraged anybody minded to walk, cycle or use public transport to do so, but it ultimately remains a fundamental matter of personal choice and I personally wouldn't seek to coerce or unreasonably restrict anybody from using a private vehicle who prefers to do so.

Supplementary Question:

Does the Portfolio Holder agree with the chair of the London Council's Transport and Environment Committee, of which he is a member, that most car trips made by Londoners could be walked or cycled and that as London boroughs are responsible for 95% of London's roads, the boroughs will need to be at the forefront of the Healthy Streets initiative?

Reply:

No, I do not. The head of the London Councils Transport and Environment Committee fails, like so many inner London politicians, to understand the distinct and different needs of outer London compared to inner London. Until inner London politicians begin to grasp this, unfortunately this particular subject matter is going to go round in circles without getting anywhere positive.

Point of Order

Councillor Nicholas Bennett suggested that public questioners should not have to read their questions, in the same way that for Councillor questions the relevant Portfolio Holder went straight into the reply. The Mayor responded that he understood the point, and this had been considered, but he felt that it was important for people to be able to exercise their democratic right to ask their questions.

Additional Supplementary Question:

Councillor Tony Owen asked whether the London Councils Transport and Environment Committee had considered that 20mph zones caused journeys to take 50% longer, so that cars were on the road longer and in a lower gear spewing out nasty substances, and did he think that 20mph zones were as clever as people made them out to be?

Reply:

Councillor Smith responded that this was a difficult question. In inner London where there are many 20mph zones, drivers would do very well to be able to drive at 20mph, because everyone is driving much more slowly already. It could be suggested that the sign-posts and signs are a complete waste of taxpayers' money. In outer London, where we have generally bigger, wider roads, you would actually be encouraging some vehicles to slow down unnecessarily and use lower gears and perhaps produce excessive particulates that they might not otherwise need to. Everything has to be evaluated on a case by case basis, rather than as one size fits all, which always leads to differences and difficulties to negotiate.

(B) QUESTIONS FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. From Sam Webber to the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder

What progress has been made on reopening the Bell Hotel pub in Central Bromley either as a new venue or for community purposes whilst permanent paying tenants are sought? Could the Council update residents on talks with the freeholders and leaseholders of the building? It is shameful that this building in the centre of our town is boarded up and has been by my count since before the 2012 Bromley Town by-election when residents first raised this issue with me.

Reply:

The Council originally supported a community led option with the Bromley Arts & Community Group, this originally looked for funding from the Heritage Enterprise scheme run by the Heritage Lottery Fund, which has had some success in other locations around the country although ultimately this was not successful. As Green King are relatively new owners the Council is writing directly to their estates department to ask what their plans are for the building, including immediate maintenance, and to draw their attention to this source of possible funding.

2. From Sam Webber to the Education and Children's Services Portfolio Holder

What contact have councillors or council staff had with the Home Office or other Government departments and agencies about taking in any unaccompanied refugee children under the so-called Dubs Amendment since it was accepted by the Government in 2016? If so how many will be rehoused by the borough?

Reply:

LB Bromley has signed up to the Dubs Amendment and to date no children have been placed under this agreement.

3. From Dr Juliet Corbett to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Could you please provide figures for the amount of waste collected by Bromley Council which is successfully recycled as a percentage of the total collected, and what is rejected because it is unfit for recycling?

Reply:

During the most recent full year period in 2015/16, we recycled 48 % of all waste collected, from which ~5% was rejected as being contaminated.

4. From Dr Juliet Corbett to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Does the Council derive any income from recycled waste or what is the net cost involved in its collection?

Reply:

Yes it does.

5. From Dr Juliet Corbett to the Environment Portfolio Holder

Has the Council considered whether the adoption of "wheelie bins" for the collection of recyclables, paper and compostable waste, as well as better management of local recycling centres, would keep all materials clean and dry and increase the volume of waste successfully recycled?

Reply:

Yes it has, as recently September 2016, when an independent survey, 'Examining opportunities for greater consistency in household waste and recycling collections – South East London' commissioned by WRAP and Resource London, confirmed that Bromley's current collection methodology ensured the best value for money service of other comparator Boroughs was already being achieved locally.

Semi recent design improvements at both Churchfields and Waldo Road have contributed to a 56% recycling rate across the two sites.

**Appendix 1
(Question 8)**

Application Number	Address	Overtured?	Method of Decision	Decision	Date of Decision	Date of Appeal Lodged	Appeal Status
13/01097/FULL3	Land South West Side Of Chislehurst Railway Station Bickley Park Road Bickley Bromley	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	08.07.2013		
13/01392/FULL2	15 Moorfield Road Orpington BR6 0XD	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	25.09.2013		
13/02719/FULL6	4 Weller Place High Elms Road Downe Orpington BR6 7JW	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	21.11.2013		
13/03805/FULL6	The Lodge The Drive Scadbury Chislehurst BR7 6PP	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	15.01.2014		
14/00848/FULL3	43 High Street Chislehurst BR7 5AF	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	05.08.2014		
14/02447/FULL1	51 - 53 High Street Chislehurst BR7 5AF	O - Overtured	Delegated Decision	Application Permitted	28.10.2014		
14/04315/FULL1	4 - 5 Market Square Bromley BR1 1NA	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	22.12.2014		
14/04487/FULL6	14 Pickhurst Park Bromley BR2 0UF	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	02.03.2015		
14/04955/FULL6	Uplands Single Street Berrys Green Westerham TN16 3AA	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	25.03.2015		
15/03298/FULL1	228 Main Road Biggin Hill TN16 3BD	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	27.10.2015		
16/01330/FULL1	Jacanda Lodge North Drive Beckenham BR3 3XQ	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	10.10.2016		
16/03539/FULL6	23 Perry Hall Road Orpington BR6 0HT	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	25.10.2016		
16/03842/FULL5	Land Adjacent St Marys Church Hall St Mary's Avenue Shortlands Bromley	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	25.10.2016		
16/04100/FULL1	Unit 5A Lagoon Road Orpington BR5 3QX	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Application Permitted	23.11.2016		
15/03053/FULL1	Flamingo Park Club Sidcup By Pass Road Chislehurst BR7 6HL	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Called in by Secretary of State	29.06.2016	04.07.2016	Appeal In Progress
16/02685/FULL1	Land Adjacent 2 (demolished) Main Road Biggin Hill	O - Overtured	Committee Decision	Permission Subject to Legal Agreement	05.01.2017		

Appendix 2 (Question 9)

2006/2007	Band									
Count of account_ref	Column Labels									
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total	
BR1	103	429	1,194	423	308	87	29	3	2,576	
BR2	158	322	852	936	219	104	33	1	2,625	
BR3	74	397	961	715	342	66	33		2,588	
BR4	38	54	172	106	142	53	8		573	
BR5	164	1,016	1,882	1,950	236	56	16		5,320	
BR6	70	188	479	832	282	92	23	2	1,968	
BR7	7	54	225	253	108	30	29		706	
BR8				4	1				5	
CR6					1				1	
DA14	13		3	9	1				26	
SE19	22	196	283	39	11	2			553	
SE20	167	1,202	1,310	869	82	17	2		3,649	
SE26	5	160	234	38	16	8	2		463	
SE9	2	386	970	73	31	3	3		1,468	
TN14	1	1	2	5	6	1	3		19	
TN16	24	28	108	138	83	26	9		416	
Grand Total	848	4,433	8,675	6,390	1,869	545	190	6	22,956	

2007/2008

Band

Count of account_ref	Column Labels								Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	118	425	1,184	431	288	84	30	3	2,563
BR2	168	322	841	913	210	97	30	1	2,582
BR3	73	394	968	705	338	60	25		2,563
BR4	42	57	161	117	137	46	8		568
BR5	178	1,022	1,931	1,935	214	53	15		5,348
BR6	62	191	480	823	278	103	19	1	1,957
BR7	10	54	236	254	107	33	22		716
BR8				4	2				6
CR6					1				1
DA14	12		3	7	1				23
SE19	19	195	277	36	12	2			541
SE20	161	1,205	1,290	828	76	14	2		3,576
SE26	5	152	237	34	15	8	2		453
SE9	3	392	946	72	31	3	2		1,449
TN14	1	1	3	3	5	1	3		17
TN16	25	30	120	141	90	31	8		445
Grand Total	877	4,440	8,677	6,303	1,805	535	166	5	22,808

2008/2009

Band

Count of account_ref	Column Labels								Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	115	433	1,237	448	293	94	37	1	2,658
BR2	163	338	880	986	227	102	36		2,732
BR3	71	412	1,017	772	343	63	33		2,711
BR4	39	60	167	119	156	50	7		598
BR5	168	990	2,017	1,986	231	53	16		5,461
BR6	60	189	523	859	291	109	22		2,053
BR7	9	61	239	273	117	31	26		756
BR8	1			4	2		1		8
CR6					1				1
DA14	11		3	7	1	1			23
SE19	20	206	278	46	14	1			565
SE20	161	1,231	1,329	838	81	16			3,656
SE26	6	155	231	35	19	7	2		455
SE9	3	425	991	73	29	5	3		1,529
TN14		2	3	3	8	3	3		22
TN16	26	29	130	164	103	43	7		502
Grand Total	853	4,531	9,045	6,613	1,916	578	193	1	23,730

2009/2010

Band

Count of account_ref	Column Labels								Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	126	474	1,321	510	334	101	42	3	2,911
BR2	159	337	950	1,037	240	111	37		2,871
BR3	81	463	1,095	860	403	74	38	2	3,016
BR4	37	58	177	128	171	57	11		639
BR5	169	1,036	2,091	2,087	262	64	17		5,726
BR6	64	205	593	946	340	116	28	1	2,293
BR7	9	66	257	280	138	33	28		811
BR8	1			4	3		1		9
CR0	1								1
CR6					1				1
DA14	16		3	8	1	1			29
SE19	26	246	293	44	10	1			620
SE20	168	1,351	1,418	911	83	17	2		3,950
SE26	8	167	259	53	19	8	2		516
SE9	3	441	1,050	78	29	5	5		1,611
TN14		2	3	5	7	3	2		22
TN16	27	32	146	186	115	44	9		559
Grand Total	895	4,878	9,656	7,137	2,156	635	222	6	25,585

2010/2011

Band

Count of account_ref	Column Labels								Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	127	472	1,361	502	354	110	39	2	2,967
BR2	158	322	980	1,046	273	118	41		2,938
BR3	80	457	1,123	890	412	69	34	1	3,066
BR4	43	52	195	137	156	64	10		657
BR5	183	1,021	2,109	2,098	265	60	17		5,753
BR6	68	202	610	969	325	113	33	1	2,321
BR7	9	63	271	290	137	31	29		830
BR8	1			4	2				7
CR0	2								2
CR6				1	1				2
DA14	17		2	8	1				28
SE19	30	262	306	48	12				658
SE20	170	1,357	1,405	930	83	18	1		3,964
SE25					1				1
SE26	5	163	273	53	21	8	1		524
SE9	4	430	1,072	77	30	4	5		1,622
TN14	1	2	3	3	7	2	2		20
TN16	26	28	143	197	120	42	8		564
Grand Total	924	4,831	9,853	7,253	2,200	639	220	4	25,924

2011/2012

Band

Count of account_ref	Column Labels								Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	128	505	1,377	532	339	112	40	1	3,034
BR2	151	298	1,072	1,068	303	132	39		3,063
BR3	90	455	1,141	890	415	66	34		3,091
BR4	46	56	195	136	166	65	12		676
BR5	173	973	2,129	2,144	273	63	17		5,772
BR6	67	216	613	967	352	108	33		2,356
BR7	13	64	259	293	147	30	36	3	845
BR8	1			5	1				7
CR0	2								2
CR6				1	1				2
DA14	18		2	9	1	1			31
SE19	30	253	297	47	11	1			639
SE20	170	1,392	1,484	921	80	18	1		4,066
SE25					2				2
SE26	8	171	257	47	21	9	2		515
SE9	6	444	1,101	69	28	1	7		1,656
TN14	1	2	3	3	7	3	4		23
TN16	21	31	150	218	138	41	9		608
Grand Total	925	4,860	10,080	7,350	2,285	650	234	4	26,388

2012/2013

Band

Count of account_ref

Column Labels

Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	124	470	1,385	523	332	101	36	1	2,972
BR2	144	288	1,074	1,098	300	130	39	2	3,075
BR3	92	472	1,169	882	394	64	38	1	3,112
BR4	45	58	198	127	156	61	7		652
BR5	179	961	2,100	2,081	273	63	20		5,677
BR6	69	204	651	964	330	103	29	1	2,351
BR7	12	59	260	288	152	36	40	2	849
BR8	1			6	1				8
CRO	1								1
CR6				1	1				2
DA14	17		5	11	1	2			36
SE12					1				1
SE19	35	242	284	46	12	1			620
SE20	180	1,372	1,448	928	80	18	1		4,027
SE25					1				1
SE26	11	166	222	35	15	9	1		459
SE9	5	438	1,085	76	31	2	8		1,645
TN14	1	2	3	3	6	2			17
TN16	21	34	144	208	147	43	9		606
Grand Total	937	4,766	10,028	7,277	2,233	635	228	7	26,111

2013/2014

Band

Count of account_ref	Column Labels								Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	122	448	1,307	461	314	90	31		2,773
BR2	146	261	1,040	1,018	285	118	37	2	2,907
BR3	92	459	1,105	805	358	70	38	1	2,928
BR4	47	51	188	120	143	56	7		612
BR5	170	946	1,961	2,030	265	59	16		5,447
BR6	63	207	628	906	289	97	29	2	2,221
BR7	12	56	246	276	140	40	45	1	816
BR8	2			4	1				7
CR0	1								1
CR6				1	1	1			3
DA14	17		4	10	1	1			33
SE19	25	214	274	44	12	1			570
SE20	173	1,318	1,411	881	78	17	2		3,880
SE25					1				1
SE26	6	160	224	32	8	8	2		440
SE9	5	418	1,000	77	31	2	5		1,538
TN14	1	2	3	3	5	2			16
TN16	16	35	137	185	148	43	7		571
Grand Total	898	4,575	9,528	6,853	2,080	605	219	6	24,764

2014/2015

Band

Count of account_ref	Column Labels								
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	116	445	1,212	439	266	83	29		2,590
BR2	142	255	959	932	259	99	36	1	2,683
BR3	95	422	1,028	709	332	63	32		2,681
BR4	45	45	165	100	121	47	9		532
BR5	165	899	1,816	1,874	246	49	14		5,063
BR6	63	188	595	837	254	91	25		2,053
BR7	13	62	231	241	129	47	41		764
BR8	2			4	2				8
CR6				1	2	1			4
DA14	19		3	10		1			33
SE19	22	194	246	36	11				509
SE20	162	1,181	1,267	830	71	14	2		3,527
SE25					1				1
SE26	7	144	202	33	11	6	1		404
SE9	5	405	929	68	29	2	4		1,442
TN14	1	1	3	3	5	2			15
TN16	18	32	133	174	131	33	7		528
Grand Total	875	4,273	8,789	6,291	1,870	538	200	1	22,837

2015/2016

Band

Count of account_ref	Column Labels								Grand Total
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	122	411	1,139	395	246	71	27		2,411
BR2	135	251	886	853	249	86	29	1	2,490
BR3	99	410	976	673	294	57	28		2,537
BR4	48	45	161	88	103	42	6		493
BR5	157	860	1,697	1,755	214	44	13		4,740
BR6	62	181	549	785	232	77	20		1,906
BR7	14	58	209	226	113	41	34		695
BR8	2			3	1				6
CR0	3								3
CR6				1	2	1			4
DA14	19		3	8					30
SE19	15	173	226	37	11				462
SE20	157	1,084	1,181	757	67	12	2		3,260
SE25					1				1
SE26	8	133	196	31	9	4	1		382
SE9	2	399	876	67	27	5	3		1,379
TN14	1	1	3	3	4	3			15
TN16	17	32	127	152	110	33	6		477
Grand Total	861	4,038	8,229	5,834	1,683	476	169	1	21,291

2016/2017

Band

Count of account_ref	Column Labels								
Row Labels	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Grand Total
BR1	111	398	1,027	354	220	64	20		2,194
BR2	135	224	837	783	215	73	21	1	2,289
BR3	80	395	863	622	267	46	18		2,291
BR4	44	48	145	73	93	33	9		445
BR5	199	795	1,563	1,602	193	35	13		4,400
BR6	53	166	511	724	207	72	15		1,748
BR7	13	52	204	210	100	39	28	1	647
BR8	2			3	1				6
CR0	3								3
CR6				1	2	1			4
DA14	14		3	7					24
SE19	14	145	201	34	9				403
SE20	139	977	1,024	693	60	13	2		2,908
SE26	4	127	168	22	10	4	1		336
SE9	4	369	782	64	20	3	2		1,244
TN14	1		3	1	2	2			9
TN16	16	31	119	138	92	29	4		429
Grand Total	832	3,727	7,450	5,331	1,491	414	133	2	19,380