

**QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ORAL  
REPLY**

**From Councillor Ian Dunn**

Can the Portfolio Holder please provide the current timetable for the Environmental Services Procurement in the format of Appendix 2 to the Procurement Strategy paper which came to the PDS in January 2017? Can he also describe what measures are being taken to mitigate the risk of a delay to the contract start date, given that the date for the issue of the OJEU notice has slipped from 1 April 2017 to September 2017.

**Reply**

At this point in time no I can't. Whilst there has been a delay in issuing the OJEU notice, it is unclear what impact, if any, that will have on the target dates which follow on from it.

Procurement colleagues will determine what mitigation measures might prove helpful, once we are all in possession of the known facts.

As I have advised Cllr Dunn previously on such matters, I would far rather any procurement process takes slightly longer to achieve to get matters absolutely right, than prematurely to meet a movable timetable.

**Supplementary Question**

In his supplementary question Cllr Dunn referred to previous procurements and highlighted that it was three months since the OJEU notice was to have been issued and sometime since the former commissioning officer (former Head of Waste Services) had left the Council's employment. Cllr Dunn considered Cllr Smith's reply to be a poor answer.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder noted Cllr Dunn's opinion and referred to the forthcoming 2018 local government elections.

-----

**From Mr Mark Dempsey, Chairman, Shortlands Residents' Association**

1. Is there a Bromley Council policy that no new parking controls will be introduced in roads where residents have off-street parking? If so when was the policy introduced? May we have a copy of the wording of the policy?

## **Reply**

The Council report most pertinent to the issue raised here is “Parking Controls in Residential Areas” which was endorsed by Environment PDS Committee on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2014 and later approved by myself as Portfolio Holder (report no. ES14057). Section 5.3 states “The Council seeks to maximise the efficient use of on-street parking across the borough to benefit residents and other users of these roads”. Sections 3.10 to 3.18 of this report are also relevant to the design principles the Council employs in respect to parking controls. ( <http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/documents/s50022160/Parking%20Controls%20in%20Residential%20Areas%2001072014%20Environment%20Policy%20Development%20and%20Scrutiny%20Commit.pdf> )

A statement of the Council’s specific approach to CPZs is available on the Council website ( [http://www.bromley.gov.uk/info/474/street\\_parking\\_-\\_permits/347/parking\\_permits\\_and\\_visitors\\_vouchers/2](http://www.bromley.gov.uk/info/474/street_parking_-_permits/347/parking_permits_and_visitors_vouchers/2) ) under the heading “Parking permits and visitors vouchers”. It is stated here that for a CPZ to be considered “off-street parking must be unavailable for the majority of residents.

## **Supplementary Question**

Mr Dempsey felt that his question was not answered and that his understanding of comments made by the Portfolio Holder was that parking will not be provided where there is off-street parking. Mr Dempsey added that it was necessary to see the policy on this.

## **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder referred to the Council’s policy being covered, with the Council’s specific approach to CPZ’s included on the Council website. What is included in the document is what is permitted subject to problems not being caused for residents or other road users. To have parking vouchers it was necessary to be in a CPZ.

-----

2. There are parking controls around many railway stations in Bromley, but not Shortlands. These are in areas where residents have off-street parking. If such a policy exists (see question 1) does the Portfolio Holder agree that the policy is being inconsistently and inflexibly implemented leading to inequity and unfairness?

## **Reply**

There are similar situations adjacent to a good number of Railway Stations across the Borough, Bickley in my own Ward to name but one.

Where residents living adjacent to stations have no off street parking available to them, a Controlled Parking Zone is offered to provide local home owners with an opportunity to park somewhere near to their own homes.

Where off street parking is available to local homeowners, on street parking is regulated to ensure good use is made of valuable parking stock to support misc travellers wishing to access the station in pursuit of their legal business.

### **Supplementary Question**

With reference to Shortlands, Mr Dempsey asked whether such a policy is being applied consistently and flexibly.

Mr Dempsey understood that some arrangements are given to discourage commuter parking but it was not the best balance between resident and commuter parking interests around Shortlands.

### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder respectfully disagreed and considered the policy to be applied fairly. For people at home during the day the Portfolio Holder was not unsympathetic to cars being parked outside of their homes and accepted that some people didn't like to see it; however, commuter parking could also benefit all residents across the borough in terms of accessibility to London and the prosperity that provides for the borough and its families.

-----

3. Parking around Shortlands Station has increased to unacceptable levels in recent years reflecting social, planning and transportation changes. Will the Portfolio Holder agree to flexibility in the policy to allow for changing circumstances to be considered in areas detrimentally affected such as roads in the vicinity of Shortlands Station?

### **Reply**

Whatever flexibility that can be entertained around junction protection and preventing traffic blockage in narrow road scenarios is.

The general principle that excessive yellow lineage should be avoided and that parking should be permitted where it causes no obvious impediment to neighbouring homeowners or other road users remains a Borough-wide template from which all such requests are evaluated.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Dempsey felt that a borough-wide template is understandable but a template applied inflexibly presents problems. Mr Dempsey asked whether there was scope to apply (the template) more flexibly for local circumstances.

## **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that there was already flexibility in application (of the template).

-----

## **Questions submitted by Gill Slater, Unite, and asked at the meeting by Kathy Smith, Unite Branch Secretary**

1. The report of 24<sup>th</sup> Jan (para 4.11, and Appendix C) which assesses the idverde contract omits and / or lacks clarity in respect of several points and information relating to any penalty sums withheld. [e.g. of omissions / lack of clarity include data for 6 months Oct 15 - March 16. KPI summaries for each ward do not indicate any fails but the statistics below the summaries suggest 164 features failed]. Can the full detail on which these summaries and the report were based be made available?

## **Reply**

The performance management systems comprise three components, each contributing a percentage of the annual 5% retention sum paid over two equal parts. Those percentages are, 50% for the joint monitoring feature quality assessment (Appendix C), 25% for parks user surveys to be carried out and 25% for performance against annual contract objectives and KPI's.

For periods October 2015 to March 2016, 92% of one part of the retention sum was released and a total of 46 defaults and rectifications issued to secure further redress.

For periods April 2016 to September 2016 96% of the other part of the retention sum was released and a total of 76 defaults and rectifications issued to secure further redress.

## **Supplementary Question**

In relation to the 24<sup>th</sup> January report and customer and stakeholder satisfaction with parks and the idverde contract, Kathy Smith asked how many were satisfied and the outcome.

## **Reply**

It was indicated that from the 2016 stakeholder survey, 48.276% believed the quality of parks to have improved in the year, with 48.276% believing the quality of the parks to remain the same and 3.448% believing the quality had weakened.

-----

2. How did the report of 24<sup>th</sup> Jan conclude that the contact was satisfactory when the key measures of the 'Outcome' contract (points 2.5 and 2.6 of the Performance Management Matrix Appendix B) relating to both customer and stakeholder satisfaction are "TBC" (no default charges indicated)?

**Reply**

Park user surveys are conducted periodically against an annual target of 3.5. The score for Oct 15 – March 16 was 3.3 and for April 16 – Sept 16 was 3.2. The scores release a percentage of the retention sum against the 3.5 target score. The 2016 stakeholder survey affirmed that 48.276% believe the quality of parks improved in the year, 48.276% believe parks remained the same and 3.448% believe it weakened.

I personally believe those figures represent a strikingly impressive recognition of idverde's performance.

There is no redress for the stakeholder surveys, which deliberately set hard to reach stretch targets to ensure ongoing improvements to service delivery.

**Supplementary Question**

Referring to assessing against benchmark for future assessment, Kathy Smith suggested that performance be benchmarked against the level of the former in-house team.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder believed the current arrangements to be suitable and indicated that he would be happy for Kathy Smith to meet officers from the Environment team to discuss the matter further if she wished to.

-----

**From Jonathan Coulter**

1. Would the Portfolio Holder confirm that the Council aims to provide a less congested, healthy and pleasant environment for its citizens, in line with the 2018/2019 LIP guidance?

**Reply**

Yes

**Supplementary Question**

In his supplementary question Mr Coulter referred to the Mayor's Local Transport Plan (LTP) strategy and asked (amongst other things) whether the Portfolio Holder would confirm that the strategy is welcomed by the Council.

## **Reply**

Not particularly. Although clearly not without some merit I believe the document is far too one size fits all / zone one centric and doesn't recognise the competing priorities and needs of inner versus outer London Boroughs. To that end I believe the document offers us something of an a la carte menu to choose from to utilize anything useful which assists Bromley's local priorities and objectives.

-----

2. Bromley's Cycling Strategy says only 1.1% of all Bromley trips are made by cycle, but also shows cycling to account for 10% of all road casualties. Does the Portfolio Holder consider this is a satisfactory state of affairs, and if not, how will he proceed to remedy it?

## **Reply**

I am advised that the current percentage of Borough trips made by bicycle is 1.7%.

LBB works on a wide range of schemes to improve road safety for all Groups of Road Users across the Borough; in the case of cyclists, the cycle routes proposed in items 6e and 6f of this evening's agenda are an example of how we attempt to improve safety for cyclists using them further still.

In addition to infrastructure measures our award winning road safety team continues to work hard and earn significant recognition around cycle training and the relationship it has nurtured over road safety across the Borough's school network.

## **Supplementary Question**

Given the high casualty rate, Mr Coulter asked whether the Portfolio Holder still thought the Council provided excellent cycle links across the borough.

## **Reply**

Given the advice that the cycling figure now stood at 1.7%, I believe the suggestion that cyclists represented 10% of Bromley Road casualties probably needs be checked and recalculated. I do believe that Bromley provides excellent cycling links across the Borough, as well that all road user groups need to show respect for each other, which includes cyclists being aware of other user groups too.

-----

3. With regard to the Bromley South-Shortlands route, can the Portfolio Holder assure us that:

(a) the original plan that Bromley Cyclists submitted to Mr Baldwin Smith was passed to AECOM for assessment?

(b) the route and specially the Aylesbury Road-Queen Anne Avenue section will be for shared use and not “cyclist-dismount”?

**Reply**

(a) Yes

(b) Yes - although I do need to make it absolutely clear this answer is conditional upon the cycling fraternity treating pedestrians with full consideration at all times in the area of the sharp dog leg section of the route.

-----

**From Richard Gibbons**

1. Please share briefs relating to Agenda Items 6e and 6f given to AECOM, including specific aims and objectives for each scheme; provide names of officers and committee members who have cycled each route; and average journey times for cycling each of three proposed routes end to end compared to current on-road equivalents?

**Reply**

LBB Staff and Aecom employees have undertaken site visits to assess the feasibility of both routes.

I frankly have no idea and neither do I propose to waste Council Officer or Councillors time investigating what their average journey times might be were they to cycle the route.

The ‘average time’ will clearly vary cohort by cohort studied, dependent on the average speed that any given cyclist(s) chooses to cycle at.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Gibbons commended improvements to Orpington cycling and highlighted that most cyclists are also car drivers.

For commuting along Crofton Road, Mr Gibbons suggested that cyclists want a quick route and Crofton Road meanders.

**Reply**

I believe it is fundamentally a matter of providing a choice to cyclists, after weighing the merits of cycling on faster, more direct and busier roads versus quieter, less direct routes.

I believe you may find the agenda item on Crofton Road later on this evening's agenda of some interest in this regard.

-----

2. Reports for Agenda Items 6e and 6f state one of Borough's key transport objectives is to reduce congestion and, by implication, increase traffic flow. How many collisions and near misses involving vehicles (resulting in personal injury or not) have there been during (a) 2014, (b) 2015, (c) 2016 along roads adjacent to proposed routes?

### **Reply**

I wouldn't necessarily accept your premise concerning "increased" traffic flow; I would suggest "improved" is a better description.

The full figures for 2016 have still to be finalised, but I am advised that the nearest year on year stats available to your request are:

#### Crofton Road cycle route

	Sep13-Aug14	Sep14-Aug15	Sep15-Aug16
Slight	12	16	10
Serious	1	1	0
Fatal	1	0	0

#### Orpington- GSG cycle route

	Sep13-Aug14	Sep14-Aug15	Sep15-Aug16
Slight	6	16	11
Serious	1	0	1
Fatal	0	0	0

#### Bromley South- Shortlands cycle route

	Sep13-Aug14	Sep14-Aug15	Sep15-Aug16
Slight	11	9	7
Serious	0	0	1
Fatal	0	0	0

'Near misses' and non-injury accidents are not recorded.

### **Supplementary Question**

Referring to the draft TfL funded Work Programme 2017/18, considered by the Committee on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2016, Mr Gibbons highlighted reference in the report to new cycle routes being delivered in 2017/18 between Bromley South and Shortlands and Green Street Green and Orpington.

### **Reply**

In his reply, the Portfolio Holder included reference to programme delay and mentioned routing through Jubilee Park to Orpington to give connectivity to other cycle routes in the area. At the Portfolio Holder's invitation, the Transport Planner added that officers consider and work on a wide range of schemes and feasibility cases and the best value for money scheme was considered to be Bromley South to Shortlands rather than the Orpington/Green Street Green route (the first phase of work for the Locksbottom to Orpington Station route also being proposed for delivery). Benefit was being provided and for the Orpington/Green Street Green route, it was preferential to delay until later to get a better scheme and officers were seeking improved funding options.

-----

3. Priory Gardens was purchased to create a WW2 Garden of Remembrance. Why is the area of parkland indicated for release in Agenda Item 7c somewhat larger than indicated in sale particulars, and what assurances can you give Orpington residents that the gardens, including Ivy Millichamp and WW2 commemorative plaque and tree, will remain sacrosanct for the term of the lease?

### **Reply**

The Priory will be leased to V22 Plc as an arts centre; it is proposed that the lease will include the car park and part of the gardens. The Lease as proposed will allow for continued public access across the land (including the Ivy Millichamp and WW2 Commemorative Plaque and tree). The proposed lease will expressly further oblige V22 to maintain the land to the same standard as the rest of the park and not to make any alterations to the premises and land without first obtaining the Council's consent. The land in question is somewhat larger than indicated in the sales particulars so as to ensure that the boundary of the area in question took a pragmatic line and did not interfere with tree roots – and furthermore as V22 are continuing to provide public access to the land, to facilitate part of their community based offering. It is also understood that V22 have been invited and accepted to be on the Committee of the Friends of the Orpington Priory Gardens. This proposal is still subject to pre-decision scrutiny.

With respect to the tree it is not the intention for it to be affected by this lease; unfortunately, as it is subject to weather and husbandry it is not possible to provide assurances for the full 125 year term of the lease.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Gibbons asked whether it would be possible to clarify the car parking arrangement in front of the car park which he considered to be haphazard and what plans there might be to improve the situation.

### **Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that if it was necessary to go into detail, advice would need to be sought from the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder and supporting officers.

-----

## **QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

### **From Mr Hugh Lazarus**

Can you explain how an application for road closures and indiscriminate towing can be used as justification for double yellow lines to be painted, and how the Council can refuse Freedom of Information Act requests for the applications and justifications for same?

### **Reply**

I am advised that the temporary parking restrictions in Witham Road were arranged to allow access to the development site for heavy plant, and will be removed once the ongoing project has been completed.

I am further advised that the contractor has confirmed that it was not necessary to tow any vehicles away when the lining works were undertaken.

Finally, that all Freedom of Information requests have been responded to within the required timescale and all available information regarding traffic orders and related advertisements have been provided previously.

If any of the above do not accord with your personal beliefs or record keeping, please by all means contact me again after this evening's meeting and we can happily discuss the matter further.

-----

### **From John Wood**

1. Can the Portfolio Holder give an assurance that the original plan as submitted to Mr Baldwin Smith by Bromley Cyclists for the Bromley South to Shortlands route was passed to AECOM for assessment?

### **Reply**

Yes.

-----

2. In relation to the Bromley South to Shortlands route and specifically the section between Aylesbury Road and Queen Anne Avenue can the

Portfolio Holder give an assurance that this will be shared use walking and cycling and not a cyclist dismount route?

**Reply**

Yes - although I do need to make it absolutely clear this answer is conditional upon the cycling fraternity treating pedestrians with full consideration at all times in the area of the sharp dog leg section of the route.

-----

**From Pauline Sheehy**

As a resident of Witham Road I have been advised through one of our neighbours who has been in contact with Ben Howard traffic officer, transport and highways, environmental & community services that the double yellow lines that have been implemented in Witham Road are being changed to single yellow lines. This information was given by Ben Howard on 21st April 2017. I have been told that this could take up to six weeks. We are being told each time this has been chased up that we have to wait another six weeks. What is the reason for the delay?

**Reply**

I am advised that the delay has been mainly due to the need to amend the necessary legal Traffic Order in question for which those responsible can only apologise.

On a more positive note, I am advised that the changes in question have now been set in place and very much hope that they are assisting to ease parking conditions locally for all affected residents.

If I can help further in any way, I look forward to hearing from you.

-----