

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

From Richard Gibbons

1. Agenda 6c: would the Chair note that the junction is on a popular cycle route (evidenced by Strava heatmap and TfL's Local Cycle Guide), that roundabouts are generally considered hazardous for cyclists and pedestrians, and ensure that detailed design provides safe and efficient crossings for vulnerable road users on carriageway and shared-use path?

Reply

I would be interested in seeing the information you have as it does not correspond to my personal observations. The principal of the scheme is to reduce speeds at this junction which will benefit the safety of all road users. During the detailed design stage officers will most certainly be considering the needs of cyclists and pedestrians at this location, in respect to both routes (Warren Road and Court Road), and in respect to the shared path that the Council previously introduced along Court Road.

Supplementary Question

In his supplementary question, Mr Gibbons highlighted correspondence he had emailed to the Committee Chairman earlier in the day which included comments on the proposed Warren Road/Court Road scheme. Mr Gibbons referred to vehicle speed contributing to accidents and that soft warnings are ignored by flagrant speeders.

Reply

The Portfolio Holder highlighted that the junction has visibility issues. In the vicinity of the Church Road junction where there had also been accidents, speed activated signage had been installed and the Portfolio Holder thought that accidents had reduced (as a result). A combination of factors such as site layout lines also contributes to safety.

2. Agenda 7a: would the Chair note that Priory Gardens Depot (formerly The Priory kitchen garden) is included in Historic England's Register of Historic Parks & Gardens Grade II listing for Priory Gardens, and borders the Orpington Priory Conservation Area; and therefore ensure that any works undertaken are subject to aesthetic and planning considerations?

Reply

Any works or changes undertaken will take into consideration Historic England's Register and planning considerations detailed in the report.

3. Agenda 6d: would the Portfolio Holder agree that prioritising safe and attractive walking and cycling routes to stations would induce more people to choose active travel as part of their commute, and in so doing reduce car dependency, congestion and pollution?

Reply

As your question implies where economically viable we look to provide options for residents and visitors to choose between, whether commuting or for leisure. The Council already has a number of projects to improve and introduce new cycling and walking routes to stations in a number of areas of the Borough. We will continue to develop these routes alongside high quality cycle parking at key stations.

Supplementary Question

Referring to the cycle hubs in the borough, serving different levels of cycling, Mr Gibbons suggested they were located next to poor quality cycle routes and he referred to public Sustrans information supporting cycle lanes.

Reply

The Portfolio Holder highlighted that space is limited on the borough's roads. Hubs were the beginning of the Council's approach to cycling in the borough and the Council would do what it can (to support cycling) where economically viable. It would look to prioritise routes across the borough based on where people want to go. In this regard (quieter) residential areas were not such a high priority. The Council also encouraged greenways as well.

QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR WRITTEN REPLY

From Colin Willetts

1. With regard 3rd question 5/10/17, are you now in a position to clarify i) the public right of way issue?, leading onto ii) the repair of insitu cycle barriers at both ends of alley? to include iii) issuing an Enforcement notice to cutback branch overhang to alley from 45 Ravensbury Road?

Reply

i) This alleyway and area of land is privately owned and appropriate action will be taken by officers.

ii) Officers have confirmed that these barriers have been vandalised on several occasions in the past, and are currently consulting Ward Councillors as to whether these should be repaired again or removed completely.

iii) A letter will be sent to the resident of No 45 Ravensbury Road.

2. Could you address the ongoing noise disturbance to local residents via drumming manhole covers outside 251 Chipperfield Road, 74 Leasons Hill & Station Approach SMC(inc trip hazard - adjacent recycling banks) & pass onto the relevant body for urgent rectification?

Reply

These are the responsibility of Thames Water, who have been informed of the issue.

3. Due to vehicle parking bang on frontage of box lane(299 Chipperfield Road) bus manoeuvrability hampered hence pulling up short of insitu tarmac, could you remove this small section of grass(5'long) over to tarmac (outside 297 Chipperfield Road) to allow residents 'sure footing' on/off bus services?

Reply

We are happy to consider the improvement of this bus stop and once the necessary site investigation has taken place we will ensure that you are updated along with Ward Councillors; if it is possible to proceed, we will formally request that we consult with the local residents as there may be a potential impact on car parking.
