

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PDS COMMITTEE

29TH JANUARY 2020

(A) Questions from Councillors to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder for oral reply

(1) From Cllr Nicholas Bennett MA JP

What specifications were set out in the design brief for the Red Lodge Road/Station Road/Beckenham Road/Ravenswood Crescent junction in West Wickham to prevent motorists driving on and parking on the pavements outside the shops on each of these four roads at this junction and what action has been taken to meet these specifications?

Reply:

Part of the design brief for this scheme was to prevent, as far as is possible, drivers crossing the footway to park on private forecourts. This is to be achieved with the use of strategically placed benches, trees and cycle racks, which are now in place. These will be supplemented by the use of a few bollards, if required once further observations are made of driver behaviour.

Supplementary Question:

In general the Ward Members are very happy with the improvements that have been made to the junction. However, a visit to the junction this morning showed several cars parked on the pavement having driven down the pavement to get there, it also showed a cycle lane which is blocked by a car suggesting it should be a double yellow line rather than a single yellow line, and lastly the junction of Red Lodge Road - where we did ask for there to be planters so people couldn't park on the pavement - you can drive straight on to the pavement at the moment. So, could the Portfolio Holder assure the Ward Members that we will have suitable planters placed so that people can't drive onto the pavement? There also a double yellow line and a slight gap where the cycle lane is and you'll get the odd motorist try to park in that gap so perhaps the double yellow line should go all the way along as well.

Reply:

We will obviously review post implementation which is just about to finish and do things as necessary to make sure it achieves the expectations of the scheme. I suspect we can't put a double yellow line across a cycle lane as we have to conform with regulations in terms of lines but I'm sure one way or another we can ensure miscreants are enforced if they don't demonstrate common sense.

(B) Questions from members of the public to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder for oral reply (on the Hayes Village Local Neighbourhood Improvements)

(1) From Carole Wells

Can the Portfolio Holder confirm that the Hayes Village Local Neighbourhood Scheme will be passed now and that he would consider subsequently extending the 20mph limit to:

- (1) the junction of Five Elms Road (a known dangerous crossing) and
- (2) Pickhurst Lane as far as the Zebra Crossing beyond the garage (to safeguard children crossing over from The Knoll and Hayes Garden en route to Hayes Primary School)?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

Supplementary Question:

Hayes residents did a face-to-face survey of 70 of local neighbours of which 77% told us of problems with speeding traffic on our streets around Hayes. Also talked to businesses around Hayes, all of whom were in favour of the 20mph speed limit. In addition the Hayes Village Committee voted 18 to 2 in favour of the original scheme reported in November 2019. Can the Committee explain why they have drastically reduced the scheme and not extended the 20mph scheme around the village as the majority of Hayes residents want and what consultation with residents was undertaken prior to making the decision?

(The Chairman clarified that the Committee had made no decision on the Scheme, that it was for the Portfolio Holder to agree to take forward the Scheme that the Committee recommends.)

Reply:

This scheme has gone through a number of revisions largely to make sure it is the most effective possible for the budget available. We will, as usual, consult on the bits that we would normally consult on particularly in this case the School Street.

(2) From Susy Bramer

When I cross Ridgeway with my 4 and 6 year olds on our way to Hayes Primary School we have to step out onto Ridgeway before we can see cars coming along Ridgeway and from both directions on West Common Road. Parked cars make it impossible to see any vehicles driving up Ridgeway and the Stevenson building means it is impossible to see cars come along West Common Road from Baston Road.

As well as serving Hayes residents who attend both primary and secondary schools, a crossing here would serve Hayes School students who have to cross Ridgeway en-route from the bus stops and train station.

Could a crossing be considered at the top of Ridgeway, at the junction with West Common Road?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

Supplementary Question:

Could a crossing be considered at the top of Ridgeway, at the junction with West Common Road?

Reply:

I have already answered that. That junction will be reviewed rather than delay the scheme.

(3) From Robert Clark

As a Hayes resident, I know of traffic issues around school times. Descending Baston Road from the 40mph limit, traffic is usually too fast considering it travels past two schools, Baston and Hayes. What provisions are the Council making to improve health and safety amongst those travelling to and from school?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(4) From J Palmer

The Hayes Liveable Neighbourhood Scheme improves the safety and health of children, students and residents. As you know, it includes ideas on traffic speed, road crossings, and cycle lanes, etc. What measures are the Council intending to help in these specific areas? And what are the timescales on these improvements?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(5) From Bob Clegg, Greener and Cleaner Bromley, (and Beyond)

What were the specific concerns of the Ward member mentioned in the 13/11 PDS Committee Notes and why was the proposed 20mph area considered “too large” when many residents consider it should be extended further. We trust that changes have not been made to the original HVLNS plan shared in November without consultation of the local community?

NB For context, at the Nov PDS, Members were advised that Ward Members generally support the scheme but a recent Ward Member comment indicated that the 20mph zone limit is considered too large.

<https://cde.bromley.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=63081>

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

Supplementary Question:

What form will any future consultation take? How wide will it be and what consideration will be given to the results of the consultation?

Reply:

Whether it is felt that it needs to come back to the PDS Committee depends on the outcome of the consultation. Letters will be delivered to those affected households. The results of that will be considered and then action will be taken dependent on what the PDS recommend and what the outcome of the consultation is.

(6) From Laura Vogel

Amendments to the Hayes scheme brought to this Committee will render Bromley's first School Street ineffective, as it is advisory not enforceable, and term-time only. How can you justify this, given that 5 pedestrians died in the Borough in 2019 and LIP3 commits Bromley to improving roads for pedestrians and cyclists?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(7) From Norman Wells

The Hayes Local Neighbourhood Scheme meets Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 of the Councils LIP3. School streets are acknowledged in LIP3 to be important. The Councillors for Hayes, the HVA and many local residents support the Scheme in its entirety put forward in November.

Why are some Councillors on the Committee opposed to the Hayes Scheme when it meets the Council's own LIP3 Outcomes?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

Supplementary Question:

What has the cost gone up and the value gone down?

Reply:

We do not feel the value has gone down. We have seen that the highly visible signage is the most effective in terms of affecting driver behaviour. The highly visible signage will highlight the proximity of the school and it is hoped this will have a positive impact on driver behaviour.

2nd Questions

(8) From Robert Clark

In the amendments to the Hayes Village Local Neighbourhood Improvement Scheme the proposed 20mph in Hayes Village is being restricted to 2 roads around Hayes Secondary and not the village itself where most pupils travelling to Hayes Primary need to cross the roads. The limit is also marked as time restricted and advisory. All of these diminish drastically the point of restrictions. Why are the limits not permanent and enforceable especially as they are of use to all vulnerable people using Hayes Village?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(9) From Bob Clegg, Greener and Cleaner Bromley, (and Beyond)

Do you share the concerns of local residents and groups that the scope, integrity and LIP3 compatibility of the HVLNS 2019 plan, with its permanent 20mph speed restrictions, pedestrian crossings and “school street” vastly improving active transport and pedestrian safety, must be protected so any changes to that original November plan will be widely consulted on before being considered?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(C) Questions from members of the public to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder for oral reply (on the 2029 Net Zero Carbon Strategy)

(1) From Diana Hurd, Bromley Friends of the Earth

The Government has recently pledged to plant 30 million new trees per year (30,000 ha annually) between 2020 and 2025. What part does the Council intend to play in meeting this target on a local level? How many more trees (over and above the current average of 550 trees per annum) will the Council commit to planting on an annual basis?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(2) From Dr Brendan Donegan, Bromley Living Streets

The Greenhouse Gas Protocol (GHG) Corporate Standard classifies an organisation’s GHG emissions into 3 scopes: (1) direct emissions from owned sources, (2) indirect emissions from purchased energy, and (3) all indirect emissions in the organisation’s value chain. Which scope is Bromley Council committing to in relation to becoming carbon neutral by 2029?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

Supplementary Question:

Would the Portfolio Holder undertake to review the decision to exclude Scope 3?

Reply:

We will at some point review where we want to be on Scope 3. At the moment it is not going to be our immediate concern, we will focus on achieving what we said we would achieve on Scope 1 and 2 because we want to make a good start on that rather than distract ourselves with something that we, by definition, have less control over. It is not going to be ignored, there is a recommendation that when it comes to future procurement decisions, each future procurement decision has a Gateway 0 report, and that comes to a scrutiny committee, detailing what that impact is, and the

committee at that time can consider whether we need to be more ambitious at that point.

(3) From Sheila Grace

Agenda item 7f – 2029 Net Zero Carbon Strategy: With regard to your intention to reduce some of the council's organisational greenhouse gas emissions to net zero by 2029 (3.7, page 3), specifically, what percentage of the total emissions from the borough as a whole are covered by this plan?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

Supplementary Question:

Will Bromley seek carbon neutral suppliers as contracts come up for renewal and be prepared to consider the cost of those contracts in terms of people's lives/children's lives as well as in finance?

Reply:

When those decisions come forward the appropriate scrutiny at the Committee will consider the options it feels are appropriate. Unfortunately I cannot predict the future in terms of exactly what they will take into account at that time.

(4) From Andrew Ruck

Given LB Bromley is aiming to be a global beacon for carbon reduction through its most welcome 2029 net zero carbon target, does the Council not consider it a little contradictory to then exclude scope 3 emissions from its inventory and target, particularly when they account for the vast majority of the carbon emissions over which LBB has significant influence through policy, as well as through its management of infrastructure such as our highways?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

Supplementary Question:

Does the Council not consider it a little contradictory to then exclude scope 3 emissions from its inventory and target, particularly when they account for the vast majority of the carbon emissions over which LBB has significant influence through policy, as well as through its management of infrastructure such as our highways?

Reply:

Scope 3 is not 99% of the Borough; I think it's only another 1.5%. Scope 3 is those services we contract and each organisation will have their own carbon emissions and be paying their own carbon taxes in many cases. I believe it also includes residents' waste. We can generally see how we can deliver Scope 1 and Scope 2 net zero by 2029 we did not feel that we were in a position to be able to see how we can deliver Scope 3 within that similar timescale as we get further along in Scope 1 and Scope 2 I would expect us to be able to set a suitable ambition for Scope 3 which will require a combination of public and personal actions.

(5) From Lisa Warren

Given we are in a climate emergency and time is of the essence, will the Council work swiftly to grant the Carbon Management Team the additional resources it needs?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

Supplementary Question:

Delighted to read the Carbon Strategy Report, it's a very important step. Within Section 3.2 there's a clause that says there's only going to be 1.6 FTEs assigned to the Carbon Management Team and that this is going to achieve what is possible to do. Given we're in a climate emergency and time is of the essence will the Council work swiftly to grant the team additional resources?

Reply:

The Carbon Management Team is only one part, this is now a Council Policy and every single member of staff across the Council will be involved in the delivery of the strategy. As projects come and go the Team will flex in size to deliver the projects we need. We are as efficient as possible and have a "front line first" policy – in the case of carbon that's planting new trees rather than back office staff

(6) From Peter Holyoake

As the 2029 Zero Carbon target is less than a decade away, does ECS agree that targets addressing total Borough carbon emissions (council contractors, schools, offices, retail and residential) should now also be included in the CMP3 (2019/20 – 2028/29) programme?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

Supplementary Question:

We have 97% of the Borough's carbon emissions that won't be addressed through Scope 1, 2 or 3. What do we do about this remainder? In this instance can the Council not provide some facilitation for Members of the public to take their own responsibility to help reduce their carbon foot print?

Reply:

The London Plan, which is expected to be approved shortly, will require carbon zero for future domestic and commercial buildings. We have a number of cycling and walking schemes to make access to cycling and walking, and equally access to public transport, as attractive as possible so the need to drive is minimised. We also have initiatives around electric vehicle points so more people can transition to electric cars. There are other aspects which, in my view, are delivered on a national scale – such as insulation provision. We are doing things and in other cases we will be looking to signpost people to the national schemes. We also do an element of

campaigning where we would like to see a change in the approach by government and where it is appropriate we will continue to do that.

2nd Questions

(7) From Dr Brendan Donegan, Bromley Living Streets

When will the Council incorporate its 2029 carbon neutral target into its Carbon Management Plan?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(8) From Sheila Grace

Agenda item 7f – 2029 Net Zero Carbon Strategy: In appendix B item 3 (page 10), you state that addressing borough-wide emissions will require urgent government policies, and increased powers and funding to the council. If you agree we are in a climate emergency what urgent steps will you take to press the government to make these changes?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(9) From Andrew Ruck

Will the Council commit to developing a plan to help achieve a quantifiable carbon reduction through borough transport modal shift, consistent with the net zero carbon target?

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(10) From Peter Holyoake

What initiatives will the Council support to start the transition of all life in the Borough to lower carbon? Examples include: insulation grants for households in energy poverty, preferential planning approval for zero carbon new-builds and replacements, support and encouragement for installation of micro-generation – solar panels and small wind turbines, free electric bus services, etc.

Reply:

Please refer to the statement to be given by the Portfolio Holder.

(D) Questions from members of the public to the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder for oral reply on other issues

(1) From Richard Gibbons

Nine months and counting after reporting a damaged water tap in one of Bromley borough's parks on FixMyStreet, does the Portfolio Holder consider it reasonable for his Council to take so long to effect a relatively simple repair? Yes or No?

Reply:

Please accept our sincere apologies for the delay in addressing this matter. Unfortunately, this is due to a lack of isolation point within the pipework and even with the assistance of the Parks Team and Thames Water, we are yet to establish a point whereby the water can be turned off to replace the tap. A lead Amey engineer was due to attend the site on 24th January 2020 and we will do our very best to progress this as a matter of urgency.

If it were within our powers to do the work I would not consider it a reasonable delay but in this case there are unique circumstances that explain the delay.

Supplementary Question:

As a member of the volunteer gardening group we have an excellent relationship with our idverde Community Manager, and are directed to use Fix My Street for any issues in Priory Gardens. My initial question is just one example of a range of issues that we and other Friends Groups in the Borough encounter. Paragraph 3.14 in the Parks, Countryside and Greenspaces Report does not entirely accord with Friends Groups' experience indeed it could be described as "Greenwash". What steps will you take to prevent more dither and delay and improve the communications between stakeholders, including the many friends groups, on these minor repair matters?

Reply:

We do have a continued focus on driving down any delayed response and indeed resolution to matters reported on Fix My Street and will deliver resources to ensure issues can be rectified within the budget that has been set for that service.

(2) From Carolyn Heitmeyer

The Council webpage for the Shortlands Friendly Village scheme states that after the January public co-design workshops, the council will collate comments and propose a final design for formal consultation. Will there be any other opportunities for public involvement in preparation of the final design, i.e. between the co-design workshops and the consultation?

Reply:

Ward members and appointees from resident/business groups will be involved in a Stakeholder Group as part of this project. Whilst we do want to design a successful scheme we also want to maintain an element of pace for the project.

(3) From Alisa Igoe, Coordinator of Ashfield Lane Road Safety Group,

Elmstead Lane/Mottingham Road Junction Improvement: Could the Portfolio Holder please confirm the timing of the pedestrian crossing lights at this junction will be

extended to allow for the width added by the new car lane, as it makes the crossing far wider for those wanting to cross, particularly for wheelchair users and those with disabilities?

Reply:

The time given to pedestrians will be adjusted to suit the width of the carriageway. The slight increase in delay to traffic created by this added inter-green period will be more than offset by the improvement to traffic flow when the signals are on green for traffic exiting William Barefoot Drive.

Supplementary Question:

Will you ever consider a pedestrian “scoot” system (which enables the adjustment of traffic signal timings automatically to extend the green pedestrian invitation to cross when large numbers of people are waiting) on that junction?

Repy:

I can’t commit at this time but we will look at options and see what is appropriate there as we do not want to cause excessive queuing and the pollution issues that arise from that.

2nd Questions

(4) From Richard Gibbons

Cycling to School (item 7e): TfL has announced “24 [Bromley borough] schools will have 480 new [cycle parking] spaces to enable more pupils to cycle to school, rather than relying on cars for school run”. Please confirm nominated schools; how many have TfL STARS Gold accreditation; how many have 20mph speed limits outside school gates.

Reply:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. Bickley Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 2. Biggin Hill Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 3. Burnt Ash Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 4. Crofton Infant School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 5. Crofton Junior School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 6. Edgebury Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 7. Harris Primary Academy Beckenham | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 8. Highfield Infant School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 9. Leeson Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 10. Marian Vian Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 11. Pratts Bottom Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 12. Southborough Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 13. St James' RC Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 14. St Joseph's RC Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 15. St Mark's CE Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 16. St Paul's Cray CE Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 17. Warren Road Primary School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 18. Worsley Bridge Junior School | Cycle and Scooter Parking |
| 19. Alexandra Infants School | Scooter Parking |
| 20. Hayes Primary School | Scooter Parking |

21. St Philomena's RC Primary School	Scooter Parking
22. Bishop Justus School	Cycle Parking
23. Darrick Wood School	Cycle Parking
24. Unicorn Primary School	Cycle Parking

Schools accredited in 2018/19

14 Gold schools

9 Silver schools

1 Bronze school

3 schools - Advisory Part Time 20

1 school - Full time 20

1 school - Due to become Full time 20 in 19/20

1 school - Part time 20

(5) From Carolyn Heitmeyer

The Borough's latest flood risk assessment (2017) notes that climate change is anticipated to have an impact on all sources of flood risk within the Borough. What assessment has the Portfolio Holder made of proposals to introduce sustainable drainage systems where the Ravensbourne River passes through Queensmead Recreation Ground?

Reply:

We are not aware of any specific/current proposals in relation to sustainable drainage adjacent or on the River Ravensbourne as it passes through Queensmead Recreation Ground.

ENVORINMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PDS COMMITTEE

29TH JANUARY 2020

Statement by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services in response to questions received in respect of the Hayes Scheme

The Hayes Schools Road Safety Scheme has received a considerable degree of scrutiny to ensure that it is effective and that it achieves the most for the budget available. The very visible signage related to the Hayes scheme, which would be more visible than a permanent 20mph, is intended to reinforce the existing school signs to highlight to motorists that they should drive with additional care in the vicinity of these schools. It is not a downgraded scheme. The Traffic Police highlight the importance of road schemes that are, by their nature effective, rather than schemes that rely on enforcement; since enforcement is only ever periodic. This scheme with highly visible signage and texture changes at crossings is considered to have strong self-enforcing features. Data and research appears to suggest that on busy roads, with significant through traffic, such as these roads in Hayes, adherence is most likely if the signage is highly visible and is in close proximity to its justification – i.e. the school entrances.

It is not for me to answer a formal question on other members' views, as this risks them being misconstrued, the previous meetings minutes perhaps do not reflect the context of Ward Cllrs' informal comments. I do know that ward members for Hayes have always considered road safety to be very important and have been behind the many improvements introduced into the Hayes area for road safety and improved walking facilities (i.e. crossings).

Detailed design issues were the issues of debate at the last PDS rather than outright opposition. The LIP does not cover the minutiae of detailed design issues. Consultation with local residents will be conducted in a similar way to other traffic schemes that have a direct impact on road users. In that regard the School Street will be consulted with affected residents. Resident groups etc. can engage with their ward members who will be kept informed.

The proposed School Street, if it proceeds after consultation, is most likely to be mandatory and not advisory.

All proposed Portfolio Holder decisions are subject to member scrutiny and potentially to member call-in. The report proposes recommendations for the Hayes scheme. You will see reports and published decisions following the meeting. If the scheme is approved work will start on this project in the Spring.

Other junctions in the vicinity are not part of this scheme. The junction highlighted will be reviewed. At the current time I cannot predict the outcome of that review.

ENVORINMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PDS COMMITTEE

29TH JANUARY 2020

Statement by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services in response to questions received in respect of Carbon Management

The Council committed to a 2029 net zero carbon target in July 2019, that will cover scope 1 and scope 2 emissions. Scope 3 emissions are not directly owned or controlled by the Council. However, we do recognise that the Council has a certain degree of influence, particularly around procurement emissions (created from the services and products we procure), which are over twice as large as LBB's own emissions. The Council's organisational emissions (i.e. scope 1 and 2) account for approximately 1% of the borough's total emissions.

Even during a difficult period of reducing funding, the Council has continued to play a part in helping to reduce borough-wide emissions, as detailed in tonight's report. Carbon Management Plans (CMP) 1 and 2 have already delivered a significant reduction in the Council's carbon emissions.

The report on tonight's agenda starts the process. At this time we cannot predict exactly how we will deliver each element of our Carbon Policy, but the strategy to evaluate options and propose the necessary decisions to future meetings will be laid out. Further information will be in the Portfolio Plan coming to a PDS meeting later this year and each subsequent year for pre-decision scrutiny.

As the zero net carbon is now Council policy, delivering it is a cross-Council priority for all members of staff. Staffing of a team titled Carbon Management is not a measure of the staff within the Council delivering our Carbon policy. For example our Highways team will deliver the Street Lighting Carbon Reductions. Tonight's report makes recommendations that all future Council reports will contain sections relating to the impact of future decisions on Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions. This will place Carbon on equal footing with other cross-Council priorities such as Child and Vulnerable Adult Safeguarding and Children Looked After. That is higher prominence than say Road Safety and recycling both significant priorities of this department and me as Portfolio Holder. It must also be recognised that funds spent on staff time, are not available for carbon projects such as tree planting, we always run an efficient organisation.

It must be said that to achieve a Borough or UK wide carbon neutral or better position will mean each and every one of us changing our lifestyles and choices. Each one of us needs to take personal responsibility for our Carbon emissions. The idea that this can be delivered by the Council or the Government alone is false. Plus any suggestion that tax payer funds will in the future pay for changes to reduce our personal footprint would in all likelihood result in delays to reduced carbon, since who

will be willing to pay once for our own changes and then through our taxes for everyone else's.

We must also recognise that some carbon changes are best delivered at the local level, whereas others are best delivered at the Regional or National level, some through funding others through legislation.

Tonight's draft budget proposes a Carbon Neutral Fund (CNF) for next year in recognition of new investment being required to achieve our target. Regionally, at London Councils funding has been proposed for next year for extra staff in this area to amongst other things co-ordinate actions and information across London, so avoiding the wastage of duplication if each Council did it themselves, repeating work done by our near neighbours. Until the Council's budget is approved in February, I cannot commit to, for example number of trees to be planted next year, but the CNF budget recommendation should provide you with an indication of our intentions.

Tonight's report puts forward a recommendation to conduct a proper review of borough-wide emissions and identify further opportunities to influence their reduction. To this end, we are currently developing a toolkit and guidance to embed robust sustainability and circular economy principles into the Council's procurement process. We are also hoping to roll out the tool across other local authorities to help them contribute to a low carbon economy for London. However, reducing borough-wide emissions in a meaningful way will require significant investment, both personal and public, policy change, and appropriate devolved powers from national government.

As I mentioned we will provide residents with information and direct them to other information sources so everyone can begin to make their changes as we transition to a low carbon economy. The adoption of the draft London Plan will see a new zero carbon requirement for all new commercial and domestic developments in London. In terms of the more vulnerable groups we will highlight to them competitive energy schemes.

The investment in street lighting will be repaid through energy savings in around 5 years. At that point the capital will be available to invest in achieving further energy and/or carbon reduction and the budget savings and carbon savings will continue. On that basis it is clearly representing value for money for the carbon saved. It is important that the Council leads by example, which is reflected in our commitment to reduce our own organisational emissions to zero by 2029. Street lighting is one of the Council's major carbon hotspots and therefore naturally forms a focus area.

Transport is a key area of Carbon emissions, and we are implementing walking and cycling schemes, EV (electric vehicle) charging options, including some on tonight's agenda to assist residents to reduce their carbon footprint.