

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 29 January 2020

Present:

Councillor Will Harmer (Chairman)
Councillor Kieran Terry (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Mark Brock, Ian Dunn, Colin Hitchins,
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Melanie Stevens,
Harry Stranger and Stephen Wells

Also Present:

Councillor Graham Arthur, Councillor David Cartwright
QFSM, Councillor Peter Fortune, Councillor William
Huntington-Thresher, Councillor Neil Reddin FCCA and
Councillor Will Rowlands

41 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Michael Tickner –
Councillor Stephen Wells attended as his substitute.

42 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

43 QUESTIONS TO THE COMMITTEE FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

There were no questions to the Committee.

44 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13TH NOVEMBER 2019

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 13th November 2019
be confirmed.

45 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING

The Chairman explained that a number of questions relating to two specific areas had been received. As a result of this, and to ensure that all questioners were able to have their questions answered and pose a supplementary question if they wished, the Chairman had asked the Portfolio Holder to make two statements in response to the questions. Questioners would then be able to pose their supplementary questions in the order that

29 January 2020

they were received. The Chairman noted that the time allowed for questions was 30 minutes and the Committee would hear as many supplementary questions as possible in that time.

As the time allowed for questions expired before all questioners had asked their second questions and supplementary questions, the Chairman encouraged questioners with outstanding questions to submit them in writing to enable a response to be provided.

Questions to the Portfolio Holder and the two statements made by the Portfolio Holder are set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

46 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN: PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

The Committee received a performance monitoring overview. The Senior Performance Officer provided Members with an update on indicators that had not been RAG rated green.

In response to a question from the Chairman concerning the action being taken to address waste and recycling in flats, the Senior Performance Officer agreed to investigate further and provide an update following the meeting. Members discussed the need to use the Planning process to enforce better recycling provision in blocks of flats and the Senior Performance Officer agreed to include the issue of waste and recycling in flats in future Waste and Recycling Plans presented to the Committee.

In response to a question from the Vice-Chairman concerning what could be done to reduce the amount of paper recycling being rejected as a result of being too wet, the Senior Performance Officer reported that a number of different options were being considered including educating residents to encourage them to store their paper recycling somewhere that was as dry as possible.

Members noted that a corrective action plan was in place for the missed bin collections and Veolia would be attending the next meeting of the PDS Committee for the regular contract monitoring item.

In drawing the discussion to a close, the Chairman highlighted that reducing carbon emissions needed to be added to the Portfolio Plan.

47 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO HOLDER

The Committee scrutinised the following proposed decisions by the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder.

a CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2ND QUARTER 2019/20

Report FSD20010

At its meeting on 27th November 2019, the Executive had agreed a revised capital programme for the four year period 2019/20 to 2022/23. The report highlighted the changes affecting the Environment and Community Services Portfolio.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder is recommended to confirm the changes agreed by the Executive on 27th November 2019.

b HAYES VILLAGE LOCAL NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENTS

Report ES19077

At its meeting on 13th November 2019, the Committee had scrutinised a proposal to introduce a low-cost version of a Liveable Neighbourhood Scheme around Hayes Primary and Hayes Secondary schools. The Committee had recommended that the scheme be deferred and that an amended scheme be developed for this meeting.

Councillor Graham Arthur and Councillor Neil Reddin addressed the Committee as ward councillors, making the following points:

- Thanks should be extended to the Residents Associations, schools and local residents who had engaged in the process and made their feelings clear.
- There were three key points to consider:
 - (i) In recent years the number of children attending Hayes schools had more than doubled to over 2000.
 - (ii) Housing developments had significantly increased the number of families in the area and proposed developments would also increase the number of elderly and frail residents in the area.
 - (iii) The volume of through traffic had considerably increased and cars travelled far too fast in the area. It was hoped that the new signage would make speeds clear and encourage drivers to slow down. It was regrettable that the lower limits were advisable not mandatory but this was due to the Police being unwilling to enforce the lower limit.
- In scaling back the 20mph zone, officers had tried to address the concerns previously raised by the Committee. However, there would need to be a continuous review of the problem of speeding traffic to identify at an early stage whether more action would be needed in the future.

29 January 2020

- There was clear local support for the proposed measures, although it had to be recognised that many residents wished to see the measures go further.
- Measures would be put in place to address concerns relating to safety around schools, but it had to be clear that there would need to be an ongoing review of the other problems beyond those of school safety in the area.
- Ward Members were so far supportive of the School Street Initiative and were keen to see how the design of the scheme evolved.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking explained the concept of a School Street to Members, highlighting that the intention was that there was limited moving traffic in the street during the times children were going to and from school. Another aim of the initiative was to encourage more school children to use alternative modes of travel to school. It was acknowledged that the concept would not work everywhere and consequently officers would await the outcome of the consultation and develop the concept from there.

The School Street would be enforced using traffic orders with Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) being used to enable residents living in the street access to their properties. The times of operation of the School Street could be varied in order to minimise inconvenience to residents living on the street. The pilot would be closely monitored and if positive results were seen, other areas where the concept could be rolled out would be identified. Officers noted that in other areas where the concept had been used, feedback had been generally positive.

In response to a question, the Assistant Director explained that the Hayes Village scheme was not a casualty reduction scheme and as such the outcome of the scheme would need to be measured in terms of changing behaviour and perception – would more children feel safer walking to school as a result of reducing speed of traffic? School travel plans would be helpful in providing benchmarking data and the Council was working with schools to encourage them to collect data relating to the number of children walking to school.

A Member expressed disappointment that the 20mph scheme had been reduced, however it was noted that this had been done at the request of the Committee at its last meeting.

Councillor Wells proposed that the Environment and Community Services PDS Committee receive an intermediate report concerning the operation of the School Street six months after the concept had been implemented. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Melanie Stevens and the Committee agreed.

The other recommendations in the report were put to the Committee and agreed. (Councillor Dunn requested that his opposition to the recommendations be recorded.)

RESOLVED that

(1) The Portfolio Holder is recommended to approve the construction of the measures shown in drawings 13099-03 section 1 and 13099-03-Section 2, to improve the walking environment in Hayes around the primary and secondary schools.

(2) The Portfolio Holder is recommended to approve the installation of term time 20mph advisory signs, as shown in drawings 13099-03-20mph in the streets outside both Hayes Primary and Hayes Secondary Schools.

(3) Subject to the results of the public consultation, the Portfolio Holder is recommended to authorise the implementation of a trial School Street in George Lane, Hayes.

(4) The Environment and Community Services PDS Committee receive an intermediate report concerning the operation of the School Street six months after the concept is implemented.

**c ELMSTEAD LANE/MOTTINGHAM ROAD JUNCTION
IMPROVEMENT SCHEME**

Report ES20000

The report sought approval to make improvements to the junction of Mottingham Road with Elmstead Lane, William Barefoot Drive and White Horse Hill for the purpose of easing congestion and reducing injury collisions.

As Ward Member for a neighbouring ward, the Vice-Chairman expressed support for what he considered to be a positive scheme.

The Committee noted that the scheme was primarily being funded through contributions from bus companies with RB Greenwich also making a small contribution to the costs.

The Assistant Director of Traffic and Parking noted that it was hoped that there would be a visible reduction in accidents as a result of the improvements.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve -

(1) The widening of William Barefoot Drive at its junction with Elmstead Lane, as shown on drawing 12061-01.

29 January 2020

(2) That, subject to detailed design, any minor alteration to the design is delegated to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, in consultation with the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holder.

(3) That authority is given to allocate £65k from the 2019/20 Bus Priority Capital Programme for this scheme funded by TfL.

(4) That a Section 8 Highways Agreement be agreed with the Royal Borough of Greenwich in respect of a contribution toward the scheme cost (expected to be no less than £10k) and to request the Executive to amend the Bus Priority capital programme accordingly.

d CYCLE HUBS AT STATIONS

Report ES19096

The report summarised proposals to upgrade cycle parking at Clock House, Elmers End and Petts Wood Stations, funded by TfL's Cycle Parking Implementation Plan.

The Transport Planning Manager advised the Committee that regarding the procurement implications, Southeastern was seeking Bromley's agreement to proceed with a single tender instruction, given that in the past 18 months Southeastern had tendered programmes of similar schemes at a number of stations on their network. They therefore felt that they had market tested these type of works and saw no commercial necessity in repeating a similar process after such a short period.

The Committee noted that further roll out of the scheme would be dependent on TfL funding, but schemes would be rolled out all the while funding was available. The Council would continue to lobby for additional funding.

A Member queried whether there was any secure compound available for short-term use. The Transport Planning Manager explained that he was not aware of the offer of a weekly charge for the secure compound and this was something that could be further explored with Southeastern; however a secure area with CCTV was available for short-term use.

The Committee noted that the cost of the facility may be off-putting to some potential users. Members did however also note that there were cyclists across the Borough, with expensive bicycles, who would welcome the secure facility. The Transport Planning Manager agreed that take up could be slow but emphasised to the Committee that the intention was to build for the future and to allow for a growth in cycling. As such the secure facility was needed in order to encourage more people to cycle.

In response to concerns raised by Members surrounding the ability for the Council to control price rises imposed by Southeastern, the Transport

Planning Manager confirmed that officers were in regular dialogue with Southeastern and any proposed price increases would be monitored and if necessary, challenged.

Councillor Dunn, as Ward Member for Clock House, expressed support for the scheme noting that it was pleasing that some free to use bicycle stands was also being provided as this would also encourage people to cycle.

In bringing the discussion to a close, the Chairman noted the importance of ensuring that the correct procurement processes were adopted.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to -

(1) Approve the proposed cycle parking upgrades at Clock House Station, Elmers End Station and Petts Wood Station with minor amendment of designs delegated to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services.

(2) Approve the award of contract to Southeastern Railways, via an exemption to competitive tender for funding of £165k to complete the project at the three stations.

e CYCLE AND SCOOTER PARKING AT SCHOOLS

Report ES19097

The report set out proposals to install new cycle and scooter parking facilities at twenty four schools in fifteen wards across the Borough, funded by TfL's Cycle Parking Implementation Plan.

In response to a question around why only two secondary schools were involved, the Transport Planning Manager reported that there were more challenges in getting secondary schools to engage and the initiative had been school led.

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to

(1) Approve the proposed cycle and scooter parking and installation in schools.

(2) Approve spending of £135k from the TfL Cycle Parking Implementation Fund allocated for this project.

Noting that this was the last meeting that the Transport Manager would attend prior to taking up his new position at TfL, the Chairman and the Committee thanked Alexander Baldwin-Smith for his commitment to the Council and the support and advice he had provided to the Committee.

f 2029 NET ZERO CARBON STRATEGY

Report ES19094

The report set out a strategic plan for achieving the Council's 2029 Net Zero Carbon target, outlining the scope of the target, different funding options, and governance and reporting processes. The plan showed that the target was achievable through a variety of measures, but would require financial support and continued resource commitment as the plan evolved over the next ten years.

The Carbon Programme Manager reported that the Carbon Reduction Action Plan was likely to be available by the autumn. Members also noted that Bromley was one of the few Councils committed to measuring procurement omissions.

In terms of the way in which the Council could measure the reduction in the carbon footprint of its contractors, the Carbon Programme Manager explained that the larger suppliers had their own mechanisms in place for monitoring reducing emissions and this information could be made available to the Council to facilitate monitoring of carbon reduction.

A Member noted that there had been some instances of new trees that had been planted being damaged and the Member questioned what could be done to protect any new trees and woodlands that were planted. In response, the Head of Performance Management and Business Support explained that once the trees had been planted, contracts would be put in place to ensure that the new trees and woodlands were protected and maintained.

In relation to encouraging carbon reduction through the Council's procurement processes, the Head of Performance Management and Business Support reported that in May 2020, a procurement training event would be held and a member of the Carbon Reduction Team would be participating in the event to highlight the issues of using procurement processes to encourage carbon reduction. The Committee discussed the need to ensure that Carbon reduction was a standard heading on any Council Committee reports. Emissions falling under Scope 1 and Scope 2 of the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Protocol could be addressed under the current 'Financial Implications' heading on reports with emissions falling under Scope 3 of the GHG Protocol addressed under the 'Procurement Implications' heading in committee reports.

Members considered whether more could be done by the Council to offer support and guidance to small and medium enterprises (SME) to become carbon neutral. The Committee noted that as carbon emissions were addressed through procurement processes, guidance for SMEs would be produced, however there was an expectation that the Council's larger providers worked to reduce their carbon emissions at an earlier stage.

RESOLVED that

- (1) The proposed strategy to reduce the Council's organisational emissions to net zero by 2029 be supported.**
- (2) The Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve the strategy and that the Carbon Management Programme (CMP3) is developed in detail to deliver it.**
- (3) The Portfolio Holder be recommended to support a review by the Carbon Management Team of Bromley's borough-wide emissions and the identification of further opportunities to influence their reduction.**
- (4) The Portfolio Holder takes forward an amendment to the committee report template so that a Carbon Implications section is incorporated that requires officers to consider the carbon impact of the proposal or decision they are presenting to Council committees - scope 1 and 2 emissions under the financial implications and scope 3 emissions under procurement implications.**

48 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE

The Committee scrutinised the following report due to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 12th February 2020.

a TEC AMENDMENT TO ALLOW LONDON COUNCILS A COLLABORATIVE ROLE IN ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE

Report ES20008

London Councils had requested that all London authorities amend the Transport and Environment (TEC) Agreement in order to allow them to continue to perform a coordination role in the planning and delivery of electric vehicle charging infrastructure. This was currently provided for under the Go Ultra Low City Scheme (GULCS), which was due to end in March 2020.

RESOLVED that

- (1) The proposal by London Councils to continue performing a coordination role in the field of electric vehicle charging infrastructure be supported.**
- (2) That the Executive be recommended to recommend that full Council agrees to the proposed Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) amendment that is requested, thereby authorising the Director of Environment and Public Protection to sign the amendment as required.**

29 January 2020

**49 ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PORTFOLIO
DRAFT BUDGET 2020/21**

Report FSD20017

The Committee considered a report setting out the Portfolio Holder's draft 2020/21 budget which incorporated future cost pressures and initial draft budget saving options as reported to the Executive on 15th January 2020. There were still outstanding issues and areas of uncertainty remaining, which would be reported to the next meeting of the Executive on 12th February 2020. All PDS Committees were being requested to consider the draft budget and identify any further action that could be taken to reduce the cost pressures facing the Council.

In considering the staff vacancy factor, the Committee noted that over half of the savings had been achieved as a result of the organisational restructure undertaken earlier in the year. The Head of ECS Finance explained that it was anticipated that further savings would be achieved through the natural turn-over of staff. The Director of Environment and Public Protection confirmed that there was no intention to deliberately leave vacancies unfilled, however the vacancy factor acknowledged that it often took several months to secure the right candidate to fill a post.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Head of ECS Finance confirmed that the review of the funding formula remained a significant financial planning risk, with uncertainty as to how any reallocation of funding would impact on the Council. The Committee noted that an indication of the outcome of the spending review was expected later in the year.

RESOLVED that

(1) The update on the financial forecast for 2020/21 to 2023/24 be noted.

(2) The initial draft 2020/21 budget be supported as the basis for setting the 2020/21 budget.

(3) The Executive be informed at its meeting on 12th February 2020 that the Committee supports the initial draft 2020/21 budget.

**50 PARKING SERVICES – CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE
REVIEW, APCOA PARKING, JANUARY 2020**

Report ES20001

The Committee received a report on the performance of the Parking Services Contract held by APCOA Parking. The contract covered the enforcement of all civil parking restrictions within the Borough, the maintenance of car parks, all pay and display machine maintenance, cashless parking services and back office functions, excluding appeals against penalty charge notices. The report

included a Sustainability report from Kim Challis, Regional Managing Director for APCOA Parking.

The report highlighted the efforts of officers to ensure that there was adequate deployment of Civil Enforcement Officers in accordance with the contract and that the contractor was achieving compliance. It also included information on car park usage to show whether additional enhancements could be made to encourage usage or whether there was a general trend of reduction in car park usage.

The Interim Head of Parking Services clarified that due to a formal enforcement policy change of a reduction in enforcement in seven roads in Bromley Town Centre, the PCN issue rate quoted at the time of the tender needed to be revised to reflect this. Currently the revised issue rate had not been agreed but would be for the start of the new financial year.

The Regional Managing Director for APCOA Parking explained that there had been a large amount of pay and display machine break-ins. All the break-ins had been reported to the police and APCOA were undertaking a review to identify any patterns of behaviour, consider what more could be done to secure the machines and ensure that cash in the machines was kept to a minimum.

In relation to pay and display machines breaking down, the Regional Managing Director for APCOA Parking explained that the 34 pay and display machines that were being removed from various locations across the Borough would be given a full health check. Any that were in good working order could be used to replace machines that had reached the end of their life or had been stolen. The 34 machines could also be used to provide spare parts.

The Committee discussed the issue of cashless payments replacing pay and display machines, noting that LB Southwark was now 99% cashless. The Regional Managing Director for APCOA Parking explained that a proposal had been made that a cashless parking pilot take place at a car park in Bromley. As part of the pilot there would be a focus on promoting cashless parking and marketing the parking app. It was hoped that the pilot would take place before April and the outcome of the pilot would be presented to Members.

Turning to the issue of reducing the carbon footprint, Members heard that APCOA were now carbon neutral in terms of paper and there was now a focus on vehicle emissions. The Committee noted that in approximately 12 months' time APCOA would roll out electric vehicles across the Bromley estate. Staff across APCOA were also being incentivised to car share and use public transport in an effort to ensure that APCOA was carbon neutral by 2030. In response to a question from the Chairman the Regional Managing Director for APCOA Parking confirmed that it was hoped that the anti-idling measures would be in place within 6 weeks.

29 January 2020

In relation to the retention of Civil Enforcement Officers, the Regional Managing Director for APCOA Parking explained that whilst there was a range of reasons for staff leaving the primary reason could be attributed to pay. Staff retention could also be seasonal for example some staff were able to secure higher paid work at Christmas but these staff then migrated back once the seasonal work had ended. The Regional Managing Director for APCOA Parking reported that the situation in terms of staff retention had improved although it was a constant challenge that was being managed. The Regional Managing Director for APCOA Parking agreed to provide information concerning roster and employee numbers following the meeting.

Members noted that handheld devices tracked the locations of Civil Enforcement Officers. Each device had a unique reference number which was assigned to the individual users. Civil Enforcement Officers could be tracked using coordinates. Through the devices it would be possible to know if two Civil Enforcement Officers were working alongside each other. It would also be possible to track the officers in the interests of health and safety as well as performance management.

Members noted that the KPIs for the 30 schools with school crossing patrols were stable and that in the last 18 months a solid service had been provided. The Chairman reported that he was aware of two more schools wishing to have crossing patrols and the Regional Managing Director for APCOA Parking agreed that this could be discussed further.

In response to a question from the Vice-Chairman concerning the steps being taken to make car park users aware of the need to pay by phone if a pay and display machine was broken, the Head of Shared Parking Services explained that as this initiative would commence in April and officers were currently reviewing marketing and communication. Signs would be displayed on pay and display machines and information would be published on the Council's website.

The Head of Shared Parking Services also confirmed that LB Bexley was experiencing similar declines in the usage of car parks.

In drawing the discussion to a close, the Chairman noted the work done by APCOA around installing solar panels on the top of car parks for energy generation, suggesting that it would be helpful if LB Bromley could benefit from APCOA's experience in taking a similar initiative forward across the Borough.

On behalf of the Committee the Chairman thanked Ms Challis for attending the meeting and providing an update to Members.

RESOLVED that

(1) The contents of the report are noted and in particular the ongoing work to monitor that resources are adequately and efficiently deployed throughout the borough.

(2) The trends in on and off street usage for the pay and display machines be noted, along with the officers' ongoing data analysis on these services to ensure that a good service is provided.

**51 PARKS, COUNTRYSIDE AND GREENSPACE MANAGEMENT -
CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REPORT**

Report ES2006

The report summarised the performance of the Parks, Countryside and Greenspace Management contract held by Idverde. In opening the discussion, the Chairman noted that Members were happy with the general performance of the contract.

Idverde's Strategy Development Manager explained that, where possible, Idverde employed local contractors and the majority of staff working on the Bromley contract were from the Borough.

In response to a question concerning whether it was realistic for Idverde to be carbon neutral in line with the Council's target of 2029, the Strategy Development Manager reported that Idverde UK had recently appointed to its Board, a Director of Sustainability and Carbon Reduction. Some electrical equipment and electric vehicles had been introduced to the estate and with fast moving technologies it was likely that there would be further innovations which could support carbon reduction in future years.

The Committee discussed the charges that were levied for the use of Idverde parks, noting that there was a three tier charging structure. The charges that were levied to small local charities covered the costs of administering events.

The Strategy Development Manager confirmed that Idverde considered that it was well placed and well equipped to meet the challenges of what the Committee described as "the busy season". Lessons had been learnt from the previous year and security had been improved at the depot to minimise the risk of essential and high value equipment being stolen.

In relation to anti-social behaviour in parks, the Neighbourhood Manager reported that Officers were actively working to address instances of anti-social behaviour and options such as increased lighting in car parks were being considered. Officers were also investigating the possibility of procuring motorcycle inhibitors to address instances of anti-social behaviour involving motorcycles and quad bikes, however the cost of the inhibitors was an important factor to consider. The Neighbourhood Manager confirmed that

29 January 2020

synergy meetings were held with key partners such as Ward Security and the police four times a year. In addition, Friends Groups and Community Managers also supported efforts to reduce instances of anti-social behaviour.

The Neighbourhood Manager confirmed that Neighbourhood Officers had been provided with the contract and should therefore be in a good position to monitor performance. Performance monitoring sheets were also available and Neighbourhood Officers had access to the scoring system.

Neighbourhood Officers were also being actively encouraged to get to know their local ward councillors. It was agreed that following the meeting, consideration would be given to making the performance monitoring sheets available to local councillors for information.

The Chairman thanked the representatives from Idverde for attending the meeting.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

52 CONTRACT REGISTER

Report ES2004

Members considered an extract from the Contracts Register covering contracts worth over £50k within the portfolio., based on data as at 13th December 2019.

In respect of the contract for CONFIRM (line 3805), the Assistant Director for Highways reported that the contract was purchased through a framework and there was the option to extend for a further two years with Member authorisation being sought in March 2020.

RESOLVED that the Contracts Register is noted.

53 RISK REGISTER

Report ES20003

Members received the Risk Register for the Environment and Public Protection Department. This formed part of the Annual Governance Statement evidence base and had been reviewed by the Departmental Management Team (DMT) and the Corporate Risk Management Group.

The Committee noted that the one 'red' risk – Waste Budget - was rated 'amber' post mitigation. Members discussed the need to address the issue of paper getting wet outside households and the Head of Performance Management and Strategy confirmed that officers were looking at a number of options with the intention of presenting a report to a future meeting.

A Member suggested that in order to address issues of contamination, it would be helpful to be more descriptive on the side of the recycling tubs in terms of what could and could not be put in the bin. The Committee noted that improved communications had recently been sent to residents and information was available on the Council's website. Officers were also working on a process map of the journey taken by waste and recycling in the Borough which would be made available. The Vice-Chairman suggested that it would also be helpful to use the Council's social media platforms as this would enable Councillors to further promote the initiatives on social media.

In respect of Town Centre Businesses, Members noted that cross departmental work was being undertaken in relation to the detailed action plans being drawn up for each town centre.

RESOLVED that the risk register is noted.

54 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME & MATTERS OUTSTANDING

Report ES19092

The Committee considered its work programme and progress with requests made at previous meetings.

The Committee noted that the Air Quality Action Plan would be presented in March 2020.

It was agreed that officers would look to introduce a 12-month rolling work plan as this would better enable officers and Members to understand emerging issues and timescales.

RESOLVED that

(1) The forward work programme and progress with the list of requests from previous meetings be noted.

(2) A 12 month forward rolling work programme for the Environment and Community Services PDS Committee is developed.

Questions for Oral Response, including statements regarding the Hayes Scheme and Carbon Management Scheme
Questions for written response

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

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://cds.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 Council's 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?

Reply:

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's 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.

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES PDS COMMITTEE 29TH JANUARY 2020

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FOR WRITTEN REPLY

(1) From James Rowe, Chair, Beadon Road Residents Association

Hayes Village Local Neighbourhood Scheme I understand this scheme has been scaled back from the original proposal, for example with the permanent 20mph speed limit being downgraded to an advisory limit during school times. These changes will reduce the benefits of the scheme to active travel. Why have these downgrades been made?

Reply:

Please see the statement given by the Portfolio Holder at the meeting

(2) From James Rowe, Chair, Beadon Road Residents Association

Net Zero Carbon Strategy: I am pleased the Council recognises the climate emergency with its carbon neutral commitment. However, changes such as LED street lighting only offer a small potential reduction in CO2 emissions for significant cost (~£4.5M). Why is "borough wide road transport" for example not in scope? This produces 150x the CO2 so is surely a better target?

Reply:

Please see the statement given by the Portfolio Holder at the meeting

(3) From Alex Raha

Hayes Village Local Neighbourhood Scheme: Can the Portfolio Holder confirm this scheme has undergone scoring using the TfL Healthy Streets scoring matrix? If yes, can the scores for before and after implementation (expected) be provided to the committee and the public?

Reply:

The before and after Healthy Streets matrix scores are 50 and 61 respectively.

(4) From Alex Raha

Elmstead Lane/Mottingham Road Junction Improvement Scheme: Can the Portfolio Holder confirm this scheme has undergone scoring using the TfL Healthy Streets scoring matrix? If yes, can the scores for before and after implementation (expected) be provided to the committee and the public?

Reply:

This scheme, designed to improve bus journey times and reduce collisions, has not been through the Healthy Streets scoring matrix. However, as well as reducing delays at the junction, the new design will make it safer for cyclists and pedestrians as the current, observed red-light jumping will be reduced.

(5) From Peter Hardy

Net Zero Carbon Strategy: What specific commitments will Bromley Council give that future tendering for Council services will require suppliers to reduce carbon emissions?

Reply:

Please see the statement given by the Portfolio Holder at the meeting

(6) From Peter Hardy

Net Zero Carbon Strategy: When does London Borough of Bromley plan to set a target to achieve net zero emissions including scope 3 emissions?

Reply:

Please see the statement given by the Portfolio Holder at the meeting