

**COUNCIL MEETING**

**11<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2017**

**QUESTIONS FOR ORAL REPLY FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

**1. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services**

Do you have a good reason why this Council should not follow the example of neighbours such as Lewisham and Croydon who are building their own social housing, thereby providing much needed homes for local families and also reducing the costs to the Council of providing temporary accommodation?

**Reply:**

Whilst noting Lewisham and Croydon's chosen methodology, there are many significant and difficult to manage aspects to avoiding temporary accommodation to support Bromley's residents in need. Likewise the associated knock on costs arising to the wider Bromley Council Tax payer.

If there is one thing we can all agree on, it would be that more needs to be done across London to provide local homes for local people and Bromley remains resolutely committed to that principle.

Consultation supporting Bromley's Homelessness Strategy will very shortly be underway following last week's Executive meeting as colleagues may be aware. The outcome of that consultation will directly feed into and closely influence Bromley's overarching and evolving Housing Strategy which is due to come to Members for discussion and approval during Quarter 2, 2018.

**Supplementary Question:**

Have you requested, and if not will you request, officers to provide a report outlining what this Council might do to increase the amount of social housing available, and what financial benefits the Council might gain for so doing?

**Reply:**

I would just like to point out that there are several initiatives that are already under way within this Council. Council officers have been working hard, particularly around the preventative agenda, but there are also certain other things that we are doing, for example expanding More Homes Bromley (the Mears Project), reviewing incentives to landlords and temporary accommodation providers, refurbishment of vacant units, acquiring and designating new sites for new building, refining the affordable housing percentage on new-build sites and out of area moves for those who wish to consider the same. In terms of Bromley, the More Homes Bromley property purchase scheme is a form of housing company venture, and was one of the first such models in the country. Regarding the reference to Lewisham and Croydon in your original question, I would like to mention that at the end of quarter 2017 the last numbers that I have to hand advise that Bromley has fewer residents in temporary accommodation than either of the boroughs you mention.

**Additional Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Angela Wilkins asked for a direct reply to the question, which was did she have a good reason why the Council should not follow the example of neighbours such as Lewisham and Croydon?

**Reply:**

It will be covered in the Homelessness Policy and also the Housing Strategy that comes out after consultation.

**2. From Cllr Vanessa Allen to the Leader of the Council**

What are you going to do to ensure that this Council complies with the needs of Londoners, as identified by the Mayor of London, and doubles the number of new homes built annually in the Borough from 641 to 1,424?

**Reply:**

Bromley Council has recently demonstrated how it will provide 641 dwellings a year across the Borough, every year for the next 10 years, in line with the Borough's statutory housing requirement, by way of our evolving 'Local Development Framework' plan.

Regarding the Mayor for London's stated aspiration to universally impose a 122% increase to Bromley's housing targets, I refer you to my statement dated 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017 ([Appendix 1](#)), laid before you this evening and included within tonight's minutes for your ease of reference.

**Supplementary Question:**

You have provided us with copies of your press statement, which says exactly what I would have expected it to say. I attended the Local Plan hearing last week, and I am quite concerned that the hard work of the officers in the Planning Department is going to be derailed by your limited vision of affordable housing. London's Deputy Mayor for Housing, James Murray, is very keen to see a move away from constructing higher end properties for sale and moving towards affordable and long-term rental. How will Bromley engage with this direction?

**Reply:**

I will refer you to the answer just given by the other Councillor Smith regarding Bromley's evolving Housing Strategy, which is examining all forms and manner of ways of trying to provide more forms of both affordable housing and shared ownership. I do not like the undertone that Bromley is not doing its fair share around the provision of housing in London, as has been suggested in a number of places. You will see from [Appendix 2](#) that in addition to our housing targets that we are given each year by various Mayors past and present, that with the exception of one year Bromley has exceeded our target every year and is very much committed to providing the housing required by Bromley residents moving into the future.

**Additional Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Simon Fawthrop asked whether the Leader agree with him that, as usual, the Mayor was trying to progress a top-down centralisation, one size fits all policy when what was really needed was a communities first policy where local authorities are at the heart of housing policy?

**Reply:**

I broadly agree with that. I think what is important is to remember is that London is not a one-size fits all location. We do need various strategies for various parts of the capital. To me, the tragedy of this is that we could provide more houses in certain locations, and we know this from talking to senior developers, if the affordable aspect

of any location was less. It would give them more incentive to build houses, that could then provide CIL moneys, Section 106 as well, to actually build affordable housing where it is probably more in direct need. To me the biggest frustration is that the affordable housing targets, as well-intentioned as they are, is actually having the reverse effect and resulting in having fewer greenfield sites, fewer brownfield sites and fewer land banks owned by developers forward for development because the developers cannot make a profit from developing them.

**3. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection & Safety**

The Borough Fire Commander has stated that, whilst there are no Council-owned tower blocks that put Bromley residents at risk by having cladding similar to Grenfell Towers, there are numerous other residential blocks that do. What steps is this Council taking to protect these residents?

**Reply:**

All of the Housing Association Tall Buildings and most of the privately owned buildings have been found not to have cladding and/or not cladding that causes concern. We are following guidance offered by DCLG and will be making a report to the Renewal and Recreation Policy Department and Scrutiny Committee in January 2018.

**Supplementary Question:**

That does not answer my question. The Borough Commander is quite clear that these properties exist, and telling me that most properties do not have this cladding is not really the answer. My question is what is being done about those that do, that do exist because of the Borough Commander.

**Reply:**

I think the answer is quite clear, that these properties will be in reports going to Renewal and Recreation PDS Committee in January.

**4. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder**

If he will make a statement on the progress being made to convert all schools to academies?

**Reply:**

In September 2017, three primary schools (Churchfields, Bromley Road and Blenheim) converted to academy status as did Glebe School. The remaining five primary schools (St Paul's Cray, Bickley, Southborough, Edgebury, Poverest and Downe) have submitted proposals for conversion to Dominic Harrington, the Regional Schools Commissioner. We anticipate that a decision will be made in the new year.

The two special schools (Riverside and Marjorie McClure) remain community schools and there are currently no plans to convert. The one remaining secondary school, which has other issues at this time, has no plans currently.

Of the 102 schools, now that we have just approved a recent secondary school, 90% of them have converted to academy status.

Equally importantly, “stand alone” academies are beginning to form multi-academy trusts (MATs) which is enabling them to collaborate and to develop shared services for school improvement and, increasingly, inclusion support for children with additional needs.

**Supplementary Question:**

Would the Portfolio Holder not agree that now we have a new Chairman of Governors at St Olave’s and a new governing body with a new local authority representative, the time is right now to encourage that school to become an academy.

**Reply:**

There are some on-going issues with St Olave’s so I’ll leave that subject alone for now and we will maybe pick that issue up when we get the report back from the school.

**5. From Councillor Tony Owen to the Chairman of Development Control Committee**

What plans do you have to introduce a basement planning policy?

**Reply:**

The Council’s planning policies include design criteria that should be applied to all aspects of a residential development, including at basement level. There are no specific plans, as far as I am aware, to introduce a separate basement level policy at present but this will be kept under review and could be further investigated. I would add that if Members of this Council wish for that policy to be developed

**Supplementary Question:**

We have had a number cases to Planning Committee where it is clear that we will need to go along with other London boroughs to have a policy. My question has been answered, that we will look at it seriously.

**6. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Leader of the Council** (Councillor Fookes was not present so a written response was provided)

Why is Bromley being described as fantastic in publicity material that was put out for the public meeting re the budget for 2018/19?

**Reply:**

Because Bromley is a fantastic place to live, work, go to school, do business, enjoy leisure and rejoice in our open green spaces.

The best place to live in ‘London’ by far in both my own and many others opinion.

Why would even the Labour party in the run up to a local election choose to talk the Borough down and pretend otherwise?

**7. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Portfolio Holder for Care Services**

Do you feel that this Council is providing or facilitating sufficient sheltered housing and care home places to meet the needs of our growing elderly population?

**Reply:**

Yes I do.

**Supplementary Question:**

How do you square that answer with the comments by the Planning Inspector from the Queen Mary House appeal from about this time last year who said that the Queen Mary House proposal would contribute to the London Plan target for Bromley of 205 units of specialised housing for older people per annum, a target which is well short of being met.

**Reply:**

We are constantly evaluating the need so that we are able to respond and meet the needs of vulnerable people. Our data shows that there is a year on year reduction of people in placements, which is mostly due to the commitment of the Council, in conjunction with our health partners, of keeping people at home under revised care pathways including frailty pathways and those sorts of new health initiatives, enabling people to remain in their own homes with care and support or to live in a supported living environment.

**8. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection & Safety**

Given the recent FSA audit of Bromley's food hygiene service which found the Council was not complying with statutory minimum staffing, and that the Council now has to find £125k to fund new posts, will she agree that this Labour group was correct in 2015 when we opposed cuts to this budget back in 2015?

**Reply:**

No. As I have already stated publicly elsewhere it has only been because of the Council's careful approach to financial management that has made this necessary additional investment possible. The Food Standards Agency report is publicly available if anyone wants to read it and this report recognises our "commitment to providing a good quality service" and for the avoidance of doubt, providing a good quality service remains our commitment.

**Supplementary Question:**

It was only because the Food Standards Agency found that this Council was not complying with its statutory requirements that we appointed these officers that the Members opposite decided to get rid of in 2015. This article, "Cutting the Mustard", is this political spin or is it just being economic with the truth?

**Reply:**

For the second part, that is important safety information, concerning the newsletter, that it is useful for all residents to learn from. Concerning the first part, concerning the part about only because the FSA came we are putting this information in. Yes, that is correct, however, up until this point they had been happy with what we had been doing. Every year we send them returns and we have told them every year what we have been doing. They have been content – it is just that a few months ago they came and they wanted us to do some more inspections on low risk premises

**Additional Supplementary Question**

Councillor Ian Dunn suggested that the Council had been warned in an officer's report in January 2016 that there were issues with Food Standards inspections and something should have been done then.

**Reply:**

Yes, that is correct, and we did do something about it. We immediately hired some contractors who have made significant progress on the backlog. We have had one doing it full time and one doing it part time, and they have continued to do that until the recent FSA visit.

**9. From Cllr Vanessa Allen to the Portfolio Holder for Environment**

We only find out about gaps and vacancies in our Neighbourhood Team when we try to contact previously helpful officers and discover they have left. This contributes to the poor contract management and lack of monitoring. Please provide an update on staffing in the West Neighbourhood Team including vacancies and what recruitment is taking place.

**Reply:**

Interviews were held on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> December for the vacant Neighbourhood Officer post. It is expected that the new officer will commence work in January 2018. Contract management and performance monitoring continues. I encourage Councillors and members of the public to use Fix my Street and Report It on the LBB website to report issues, rather than direct to officers. I can also confirm that the level of monitoring is not de-graded in areas with a vacancy for a Neighbourhood Officer or where there is holiday or sickness cover required. Managers step down to cover operational monitoring and other Neighbourhood Officers have picked up additional work to cover the vacancy.

**Supplementary Question:**

We do encourage people to use Fix my Street, but that is not the total answer to the question. What would be much appreciated would be if, when there are staff changes, such as when people leave and new officers are recruited, is that we are told when it happens rather than email someone who has previously been helpful and finding that they have disappeared so that we are not wasting our time and other officers' time.

**Reply:**

I cannot guarantee that everybody can be emailed when staff change, however, I will ask IT to make sure that an out of office or a suitable other response is provided.

**Additional Supplementary Question**

Councillor Angela Wilkins stated that surely it made sense for ward members to know when one of their Neighbourhood Team had been replaced?

**Reply:**

I was referring to the general case, rather than the specific case. I would hope that ward members in a particular area would be notified, but I certainly cannot say that in the general case, particularly where members of the public are corresponding with particular officers.

**10. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP to the Education, Children and Families Portfolio Holder**

If he will support a joint letter with me to the Prime Minister asking her to ensure that the Government honour their manifesto promise to remove the 50% cap on admissions to Faith Schools?

**Reply:**

Yes, we have already made the commitment in a Select Committee meeting to write to the Prime Minister and Lord Agnew as well to get clarity on the commitment to raise the cap on schools.

**11. From Councillor Tony Owen to the Resources Portfolio Holder**

How much has LBB paid to Cushman & Wakefield?

**Reply:**

The total amount paid to Cushman and Wakefield so far is £538,716. This comprised of three parts.

The first part are the fixed fees. So far we have paid Amey fixed fees of £303,000 in relation to Cushman and Wakefield. This is in line with the cost profile reported to members at the decision to award the TFM contract. The actual cost of running the department would have been approximately £353,000 for the period 1/12/16 to 30/12/17, When compared to the actual contract cost for the same period of £303,000 excluding any one-off LRB work there is a saving of £50,000.

The second element, works out of the TFM contract specification, is £147,462. These are works in relation to the Democratic Hub, Chipperfield Road Regeneration, York Rise, Depot Strategy, The Glades, Orpington Town Centre and the Old Town Hall.

The third element of £88,254 is related to acquisition and disposal fees - Trinity House, Ashford and sale of the Metro Bank site.

**Supplementary question:**

How do we measure value for money and also the quality of the advice we receive?

**Reply:**

The contract with Cushman and Wakefield is administered by our officers but overseen by myself and also Councillor Morgan who is able to add a high degree of professional advice into the mix. The majority of this pay, so far, is precisely as the contract that we entered into at the time of signing the TFM contract with Amey.

**12. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Environment Portfolio Holder (Councillor Fookes was not present so a written response was provided)**

Why does it take the Council two weeks to remove a burnt out motorbike from the footway?

**Reply:**

Where burnt out vehicles are reported they should be inspected and removed promptly if on public land. If the member is referring to a recent burnt out motorbike

in Chipperfield Road the delay was due to uncertainty over landownership and responsibility.

**13. From Cllr Ian Dunn to the Leader of the Council**

In the spirit of the motion passed at the September Council meeting confirming our commitment to the maximum possible levels of openness and transparency at all times, can the Leader provide the membership of the “Extended Cabinet” and where I can find the minutes of its meetings?

**Reply:**

“Extended Cabinet” comprises of the other six members of the Executive and myself, plus any other Committee chairmen or members by invitation.

These are meetings of Conservative Group members and are not a part of the Council meeting structure. Although notes are taken they are not disclosable in the same way that any notes taken at meetings of the Labour Group aren't.

**Supplementary Question:**

Which officers attend this meeting?

**Reply:**

Generally speaking, no officers attend Cabinet per se. If Councillor Dunn is referring to Extended Cabinet/Chief Officers Executive, that committee comprises of the other six members of the Executive and myself, other invited chairmen or general members, the Council's Chief Executive and his Directors. The Member/Officer Protocol in the Constitution recognises the need for specific briefings for the Leader, Portfolio Holders and Committee Chairmen and these meetings fulfil that purpose. Formal minutes are not kept, but if they were they would be exempt from disclosure.

**14. From Cllr Vanessa Allen to the Portfolio Holder for Environment**

Requests for 20 mph zones are the subject of regular emails from residents, and information is being provided to the Portfolio Holder on the benefits of this policy. For example, research by Transport for London found that 20 mph zones reduced the frequency of road user casualties within the zones by about 45% and reduced the frequency of fatal or serious casualties by about 57%. Surely prevention is infinitely preferable to waiting for serious accidents to push up the numbers of killed and seriously injured, and only then taking action? Please provide the number of primary and secondary schools in the borough which do not have 20 mph zones outside them at present?

**Reply:**

I agree that preventing road accidents is very important and the Council has a proven approach to how it invests in road safety schemes, with funding being prioritised at accident cluster locations on the basis of where the lowest spend is likely to yield the greatest road safety benefit.

Various research information is available on the casualty reduction benefits of area wide 20mph zones. Some research suggests that this approach is money well spent, other research suggests that the case is far from proven. The main research that Bromley will pay close attention to is that being undertaken by the DfT. It is Bromley's

experience that linking an instruction to a hazard is most likely to result in a change in behaviour, rather than area-wide schemes.

Bromley does, and will continue to consider installing localised 20mph limits if there is a good cause for one, such as outside a school, but will not be investing its finite resources in area-wide 20mph limits until such time that more conclusive evidence exists that it is the best way to invest the limited funds to save lives on the roads.

At present in the Borough there are 78 primary schools, 19 secondary schools and 20 independent /SEN/alternative provision schools. This is a total of 117 schools. Of these, 19 are either in a 20mph zone or have a full or part time 20mph limit outside the school. There are a further 2 schools with a part time advisory 20mph limit outside the school.

**Supplementary Question:**

20mph zones coupled with the Healthy Streets Strategy would help encourage safety, reduce pollution, and encourage cycling as well as walking. Would the Portfolio Holder consider a Christmas present of these policies to the people of Bromley?

**Reply:**

If there are specific locations where it is proven that that benefit would exist of course I will consider them. A general borough wide 20mph zone would cost more than our annual budget for road safety and would mean those other areas where more direct intervention is required to improve road safety would not be able to go ahead.

**Additional supplementary question:**

Councillor Simon Fawthrop asked whether the Portfolio Holder agreed that Councillor Allen was falling into the trap of the London Mayor and wanting a top-down, centralisation, one size fits all policy.

**Reply:**

I would agree that it is best to have bespoke arrangements in individual places.

**Additional supplementary question:**

Councillor Michael Tickner asked whether the Portfolio Holder agreed that driving around at 20mph in a big borough like Bromley is going to cause more pollution. Driving in third gear everywhere is going to put a lot of, particularly, diesel particulates into the air and seriously endanger the health of the residents in this borough.

**Reply:**

I would start by saying that in many parts of the borough you cannot go above 20mph anyway, so having such a limit would be of limited effect. Certainly, going at slow speeds can increase pollution, as indeed braking, recent figures have shown that around about 50% of particulant data arises from brake tyre and brake pad dust. Lots of braking and accelerating also increases particulants, so 20mph zones in themselves will not have much effect on particulant data.

**Additional Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Tony Owen asked whether the Portfolio Holder was aware of Manchester council's experience where they abolished their 20mph scheme as they regarded it as a complete waste of £1.7m?

**Reply:**

I cannot say that I am aware of every single Council's experience of 20mph zones. I suspect that we are going to look a bit more in London, but certainly some boroughs have removed 20mph zones as they are finding they are not sufficient. Some boroughs have applied them only in certain areas, such as excluding bus routes, some boroughs have applied it elsewhere. There are many different models – as yet there is no conclusive evidence to suggest that it is of benefit.

**Additional Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Alan Collins asked whether the Portfolio Holder agreed that whilst 20mph limits might be recommended they are not legally enforceable in this country – only Parliament can introduce such a law? They might be helpful, but they are not legally enforceable?

**Reply:**

I am not sure that is correct. Any speed limit is legally enforceable. I think the point is that the Police are not going out of their way to enforce something where the boroughs just change the rules to make what would otherwise normally happen a crime. The Police are quite clear that where the Council introduces a 20mph zone they expect the Council to also change the road layout or do other things in order to make that the natural speed for traffic to travel at, rather than just to change the zone to make members of the public to accidentally commit a crime to make a payment or receive penalty points.

(At this point the time allowed for questions ended, but it was proposed by the Mayor that the remaining questions be taken.)

**15. From Cllr Angela Wilkins to the Portfolio Holder for Environment**

Why was this Council one of only three in London to not take the opportunity to have the responsibility for enforcement of 21 moving vehicle offences transferred from the police to the Council? Do you accept that because of reductions to their funding, the police do not have the capacity to enforce these offences and that drivers in the Borough are free to commit these offences without risk of penalty? Is this not also a 'missed' income stream for the Council?

**Reply:**

Despite the cuts to police budgets I still consider this to be a police function and for them to prioritise accordingly. In the absence of any data to suggest that moving traffic offences in the borough are materially affecting congestion or road safety, Bromley does not believe it right to deliberately target and persecute motorists for relatively minor traffic offences just to raise revenue. It is also worth noting that there are duties associated with taking responsibility for moving traffic offences, so it is not without cost without taking account of any invest to save to install cameras to police things like yellow box junctions.

**16. From Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP to the Environment Portfolio Holder**

What action does the Council take to support bus and rail users?

**Reply:**

The Council works with TfL, Bus companies, Trams, Network Rail and Southeastern to improve the experience of public transport. There is also the Public Transport Liaison Committee for direct engagement. I do not intend to list the wide range of projects related to station access for all users, car and cycle parking, bus accessibility, lobbying for improved capacity of existing and desired services such as the Kent route study etc., but I can provide more details in writing if required.

**Supplementary Question:**

We have talked in the past about the extension of the DLR from Lewisham to Bromley. This is now seen as very expensive and the cheaper alternative of extending London Overground from New Cross to Bromley is one that ought to be pursued. Will he pursue that, and will he also look at bus frequencies. Is he also aware that bus frequencies are being extended, and on route 119 through West Wickham the buses will come less frequently. This is a result of the foolish policy of the Mayor in promising not to increase fares over the years and therefore losing a budget and this is a sly cut which he is trying to hide from the public.

**Reply:**

We have looked at what we can see is the best in terms of what TfL expects as investment to be going forward. Neither the DLR as you indicated nor the London Overground into Bromley North is mentioned at all so I think you can take that as the London Mayor is not interested. There is a general move of removing bus routes from central London with the potential to increase them in outer London. I am not sure what our priority would be. Certainly, at the last Public Transport Liaison Committee there was a suggestion that certain routes had changed, there are now changes in where people want to go to, not least the new secondary schools opening in the borough. I am due to have a meeting with TfL in order to discuss more widely buses and bus routes, particularly related to changes to destinations for residents. Within that, I would hope that rather than have a one size fits all in terms of what the frequencies are in the whole day and evening hours we could possibly be more flexible to have the highest frequencies when they are needed, though obviously there is a limited budget that we are likely to receive in this borough.

**17. From Councillor Peter Fookes to the Environment Portfolio Holder (Councillor Fookes was not present so a written response was provided)**

Will he ensure that the leaf clearance schedule for 2017/18 is available on the Bromley Website?

**Reply:**

In previous years we have had a rigid 12 week leafing programme that was straight forward to publicise but not necessarily the most effective way of targeting, responding to nature or the weather and directing our resources to areas that required it most. The lack of flexibility could at times lead to erroneous reports when the schedule was not delivered on the specific date publicised.

This year it was amended slightly so that we build the programme as we progress, a week in advance, thus allowing us to be far more responsive to local needs.

We gather reports from NOs, members of the public/residents and Councillors, information from our contractor, as well as historical and arboricultural data to put the

schedule together. We began the leafing programme by clearing Horse Chestnuts leaves, then through data mapping moved to the next species and so on.

Additionally, we have had extra leafing resources this year compared to previous, and this has allowed us to be even more responsive/reactive to complaints or suggestions. Again, these resources are usually programmed on a weekly basis on the back of intelligence gathering.

Feedback from Neighbourhood Officers and the public is that this approach is working well; as a headline figure, in October and November alone we removed over 770 tonnes of leaves from the borough.

We issued an update for leafing via the website on 16th November ([#http://www.bromley.gov.uk/press/article/1300/annual\\_autumn\\_leaf\\_clearance\\_starts](http://www.bromley.gov.uk/press/article/1300/annual_autumn_leaf_clearance_starts)) that Andrew Rogers helped put together, giving an update on leafing. Subject to disruptions, such as snow or other weather incidents, we expect the main leaf clearance to be complete by the New Year.

## **Mayor's London Plan**

Published Friday, 1 December 2017

### **Council Leader's statement.**

Councillor Colin Smith, Leader of Bromley Council said, "Whilst we will consider the detail of what is being proposed very carefully, before responding formally as part of the Mayor of London's consultation process, at first glance, aspects of his Draft London Plan represent extremely bad news for Bromley.

Whilst the Mayor has made an indicative commitment to protect the Green belt, in line with Bromley Council's long standing policy on the subject, which should in fairness be acknowledged and even applauded, the recent proposal that statutory housing targets should be more than doubled and that 'garden grabbing' should now be legalised and indeed even actively encouraged to facilitate it, raises the very real threat of uncontrollable and inappropriate development of a type and nature which will scar and degrade the look and very soul of neighbourhoods across our borough forever.

All of this with no real thought given or methodology worked through as how to pay for all the necessary infrastructure, schools, doctors' surgeries and dentists, to support so many extra people moving in.

Hopefully what we have before us might yet be scaled back as part of the consultation process and Bromley Council will be actively encouraging the powers that be at City Hall to think in such terms over coming months."

**ENDS**

For media enquiries, please contact Andrew Rogers, Communications Executive, on 020 8461 7670 or email [andrew.rogers@bromley.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.rogers@bromley.gov.uk)

**Appendix 2**  
(Question 2)

Table 1 Completions 2007/08-2016/17

	<b>Small sites</b>	<b>Large Sites</b>	<b>NSC units</b>	<b>Annual target</b>	<b>Cumulative target</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Cumulative total</b>
2007/08	370	343		485	485	713	713
2008/09	369	136		485	970	505	1218
2009/10	245	313		485	1455	558	1776
2010/11	309	446		485	1940	755	2531
2011/12	385	261		500	2440	646	3177
2012/13	235	292		500	2940	527	3704
2013/14	180	515		500	3440	695	4399
2014/15	167	259		500	3940	426	4825
2015/16	315	433	-11	641	4581	737	5562
2016/17	528	330	75	641	5222	933	6495