

COUNCIL MEETING**16TH JULY 2018****QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR ORAL REPLY****1. From Sarah Phillips to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder**

How much money does the Council hold from funds raised by the good people of Beckenham and Bromley for the restoration of the bandstand in Croydon Road Recreation Ground and can the Council provide a breakdown of those funds by source i.e. Friends of the Park, Bowie Beckenham Oddity, brick sales, commercial pledges etc?

Reply:

Please find below the figures for the bandstand as we currently have them . These are based on updates provided by Finance as of the 9th July 2018. These are the total sums sitting within the dedicated Council cost-codes for the bandstand - there may be other sums in addition currently held by the Friends etc. which have not been transferred over to us yet and of which we are therefore not aware.

Collector of funds	Amount
Friends group (community fundraising activities, funds from first fundraising concert held)	£19,350.65
Memory of a Free Festival (two fundraising concerts)	£28,512.00
LB Bromley (Bandstand Bricks, Launch Party Tickets, on-line donations, raffles, Walking in Ziggy's Footsteps tour donations, collecting tins, £5k match funding towards Project Management fees previously committed)	£18,836.95
Total match-funding to date	£66,699.60

Supplementary Question:

Will the Council offer any match-funding given that so much, £66,000, has been raised by people in Beckenham for what is a Council owned asset?

Reply:

I am not in a position to make policy in answer to a question, but it would be consistent with past actions that we have made to look to match-fund or partially match-fund the funds raised by Friends Groups, but that would have to go through due process.

2. From Peter Zieminski to the Renewal, Recreation and Housing Portfolio Holder

Alternative Route to Runway 03: The increase in operating hours at the airport has caused a dramatic increase in large, low-flying aircraft. Yet the condition requesting a new route to alleviate residents North and West of the Airport has not been complied with. What are the Council's plans to provide the promised relief to residents?

Reply:

The Council has always accepted it is not in the Airport's power to unilaterally introduce an alternative route to runway 03. We are optimistic that this change will happen and know that the Airport have worked very hard to overcome technical difficulties and continue to liaise with the CAA even in recent weeks and months.

Supplementary Question:

How can it be acceptable to Council Members that the Airport has been enjoying the longer hours for over a year but the residents are still awaiting the promised mitigation? Who has really got a grip of this?

Reply:

The only people who have a grip of it, sadly, are the CAA. It is not within our power, as I said before - I wish it were. We continue ourselves to press the CAA, as do the Airport, we know that is the case and I feel sure that we will have decision within the next few weeks. It is the Civil Service that we are dealing with. An interesting fact that you might like to know is that the increase in movements in the extra hours that the Council has granted have been, in the period 1st April to 30th June this year, a total of 68 movements in approximately 100 days - fewer than one extra movement in the morning every day, sometimes more, sometimes less.

3. From David Clapham to the Renewal, Recreation and Housing Portfolio Holder

The Consultative Minutes (18th January 2018) record... "In answer to a question from the Chairman, Richard Parry advised that the Sub-Committee only upheld complaints which related to breaches of noise restrictions. Tracking deviations were picked up automatically by the NMTKS."

The NAP stated the NMTKS would provide members of the public with more than now reported in the Consultative Committee Minutes. Residents in Keston (Designated Noise Sensitive Area) are getting fed up with large jets visually approaching runway 03 flying low over their homes. The Committee is apparently in violation of Government Guidelines, The Aviation Policy Framework and in breach of the agreement with Bromley Council. Do you agree?

Reply:

The Noise Monitoring Track Keeping System (NMTKS) does provide members of the public with more than now reported in the Consultative Committee Minutes in the sense that it is a virtually live system, which also allows retrospective examination of individual aircraft flights. I am sure you are aware but I was actually present at this meeting and noted some of the welcome developments to better manage noise associated with the airport. I am supportive of the Airport focussing residents' attention on noise nuisance rather than aircraft being off-track as surely this is the primary concern of residents. That is not to say that track-keeping is not important and I welcome the fact that these are picked up automatically and that pilot behaviour is being focussed on, which the minutes make clear. I am not immediately clear which part of the 86 page aviation Policy Framework is being breached, but if you would like to advise me perhaps by email after the meeting I am happy to look at that in more detail.

Supplementary question:

The Biggin Hill Managing Director has acknowledged the incorrect data emanating from the NMTKS. Monitoring Biggin Hill's performance for impact on residents is vital. Is the Council aware that the data is wrong, and when will it be accurate? The Government requires open and effective communication with local communities - this is not happening.

Reply:

I was not aware that there was any inaccuracy and I will urgently investigate that and report back to you.

Additional Supplementary question:

Councillor Simon Fawthrop asked whether the Portfolio Holder was aware that the Noise Monitoring system was a deterrent for residents reporting because there was the best part of an hour's delay between being able to spot something and then report it. In this day and age of instantaneous communication will he agree with me that such a delay is not proper and should be revised?

Reply:

I fail to understand why that is a deterrent from reporting, though I do understand that it is less than wholly satisfactory. There has to be some delay for terrorism and safety concerns, but not perhaps an hour and I will look into that and report back.

4. From Dr Mike Roddis, co-chair Kings Hall Safety Action Group (KHSAG) to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder

Could you please explain why we have not received a reply from you to our letter of 30th April 2018 despite numerous attempts to follow it up on our part?

Reply:

I am sorry that you do not feel that you have been kept up to date. The situation has not changed since my meeting with you, so there is nothing to add. We are expecting the results of the traffic survey imminently. The parking scheme that was discussed with you is being designed and once it has been designed it will be shared. We are currently trying to increase the use of the pay and display spaces around Kent House Station. As we develop the Quietway plans further aspects are being considered, this includes the possibility of a zebra crossing in Kings Hall Road. At the moment all of those are under consideration and are being developed before we can come to any conclusions.

Supplementary question:

I see the Council's motto before me that enjoins you "To serve the people." When exactly will you give us the response that we require to our question?

Reply:

As I indicated, there are things in progress; when the drawings are finished and have been reviewed they will be shared with you. When we have the data and it has been analysed and we have reviewed it then we will be sharing conclusions with you.

5. From James Pattullo to the Renewal, Recreation and Housing Portfolio Holder

Many residents have been adversely impacted by the increase in larger noisy jet aircraft resulting from the increased operational hours. The annual income from

BHAL to LBB is over £150,000 short of the forecast when the extra hours were sanctioned. Why are the figures not published openly for all to see?

Reply:

The Council does not routinely publish individual income figures for specific properties that we own, and that includes Biggin Hill Airport. As you know though, because it has already been shared with you, the rental income the Council receives from the Airport is not a secret. For the record, in 2016/17, the Council received a total of £239,627, an increase of 9% from the previous year and 15% from the year before (2014/15), which represents a welcome increase.

Supplementary question:

Considering that income to the Council is not based on objective turnover at the airport, but on a certificate produced by the airport itself after making certain deductions, when was the last time that the Council had these certificates audited, which is allowed by the lease?

Reply:

Had I had notice of that question I would have discovered the answer. Now I have the question I will discover the answer and I will let you know.

6. From Julie Ireland to the Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management Portfolio Holder

In the elections on 3rd May 2018 how many people attended a polling station but were unable to vote because they did not have valid ID with them? Please provide the data broken down by polling station. ([Appendix 1](#))

Reply:

In total 154 electors who were recorded as having attended polling stations with either no ID or incorrect ID and they did not return to vote. Rather than read out details for all our polling stations which would take up most of the available time for public questions I have made copies of the individual polling station data available in the Chamber.

Supplementary question:

Could you please describe the method used for recording people who could not vote given that I personally and several of my colleagues were in attendance at all the polling stations that day to make a note of what method was used?

Reply:

There is a large sheet which details that information which is certainly going to be made available by the Returning Officer.

I just wanted to mention that, of that 154, that is considerably less than the number of people who spoiled their votes, to try to get that into context. Interestingly, if every one of those 154 who chose not to come back if they had come back and voted for the highest losing candidate it would not have affected any result at all at any of the elections right across the borough.

That information will be made available by the Returning Officer.

(At this point the time allowed for public questions expired, and the remainder of the questions received written replies.)

7. From Sarah Phillips to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder

Can the Portfolio Holder explain/outline the timeline over the last 5 years, involved in issuing tender documents to obtain quotes for the cost of restoration work at the Croydon Road Recreation Ground and give details of the current state of play?

Reply:

The original tender cost was obtained in 2015, unfortunately that is no longer valid. We have recently retendered the work and received rather higher costs for the works. The prices though have been secured until summer 2019. A HLF bid would require community outcomes and additions to the costs but with the potential benefit of a grant.

8. From Dr Mike Roddis, co-chair Kings Hall Safety Action Group (KHSAG) to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder

We are aware of an underspend in Bromley Council's environmental budget in the last financial year of £1,831,000 for 2017/18. Why was some of this budget not used for the development of an enforceable parking scheme and measures to combat speeding on Kings Hall Road (section 1-166)?

Reply:

As I have previously mentioned a white line and parking bay scheme is being designed for Kings Hall Road after concerns about bad parking were raised by residents. Schemes such as this have been very effective where used in other streets. All new schemes are monitored and should an indicative scheme be abused and bad parking continue, there is always the option for the Council to install yellow lines in place of the white lines.

A speed survey has been commissioned for Kings Hall Road to assess the suggestion that unusually high speeds are being driven.

Underspends are an indication of good management of the finances and cost pressures of the relevant area. The Council operates a one Council approach to finances and it is for the Council to take a cross Council view to balance the relative priorities of the many calls on its finances.

9. From Julie Ireland to the Children, Education and Families Portfolio Holder

14 academy schools in Bromley have decided not to have their Year 6 Sats moderated in the borough. Please identify these academies and state which authority they have chosen to use for their moderation.

Reply:

Assessment at the end of Key Stage 2 (in Year 6) is subject to two checking processes: moderation of teacher assessment of writing and monitoring of test administration. This year, 15 academy schools with children taking tests at Key Stage 2 chose to have teacher assessment moderated by a different local authority. Nine of these schools had monitoring provided by that authority and 6 used Bromley:

	School	Moderation	Monitoring
1.	Blenheim Primary School	Bexley	Bexley
2.	Castlecombe Primary School	Kent	Bromley
3.	Crofton Junior School	Kent	Bromley
4.	Hayes Primary School	Kent	Bromley
5.	Leesons Primary School	Kent	Bromley
6.	Midfield Primary School	Kent	Bromley
7.	Mottingham Primary School	Bexley	Bexley
8.	Pickhurst Academy	Croydon	Croydon
9.	Raglan Primary School	Greenwich	Greenwich
10.	Red Hill Primary School	Bexley	Bexley
11.	Scotts Park Primary School	Bexley	Bexley
12.	St Mary Cray Primary School	Kent	Bromley
13.	St Peter & St Paul Catholic Primary Academy	Greenwich	Greenwich
14.	Stewart Fleming Primary School	Bexley	Bexley
15.	Valley Primary School	Kent	Kent

10. From Sarah Phillips to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder

What does the Council see as the future for the bandstand in Croydon Road Recreation Ground?

Reply:

We remain committed to working in partnership with the community to secure the funds needed to carry out the restoration works, which will ensure the bandstand is available for use by the local community for generations to come. It has always been our intention to submit a second HLF application based on feedback we received from HLF previously, however this will require a match funding financial commitment from the Council. At the current time we are unable to confirm Council funding and would encourage the community to continue to raise funds in support of the project.

11. From Dr Mike Roddis, co-chair Kings Hall Safety Action Group (KHSAG) to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder

When will the zebra crossings be installed in Kings Hall Road that residents have repeatedly stressed are needed to address the dangers to our children and those

attending nearby schools face when crossing the road and indeed all other pedestrians?

Reply:

We are undertaking an assessment of the feasibility of including a zebra crossing on Kings Hall Road into the final design of the Quietway route.

12. From Julie Ireland to the Resources, Commissioning and Contract Management Portfolio Holder

At the Council meeting on 26 February 2018 the Resources Portfolio Holder said that only 68% of FOI requests between July and December 2017 had been answered within the regulatory 20 working day period.

Please provide further statistics stating the number of FOI requests received between 1/7/17 and 31/3/18, the number that were answered within 20 working days, the number that were answered between 21 and 60 working days, the number refused and the category of refusal, and the number that received no response.

Reply:

The statistics for the nine months up to 31st March 2018 are as follows –

Requests received	1,185
Answered within 20 working days	773
Answered beyond 20 working days	412
Refused	3*
No Response	0

This equates to a rate of about 65% of requests answered within 20 working days.

** The 3 requests refused entirely were on the grounds that it would take in excess of 18 hours to retrieve the information requested. There are other cases where part of the request was refused, but it is not possible to produce further detail without checking hundreds of individual requests.*