

**ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY DEVELOPMENT  
AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the virtual meeting held at 6.30 pm on 9 September 2020

**Present:**

Councillor Will Harmer (Chairman)  
Councillor Kieran Terry (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Ian Dunn, Colin Hitchins, Samaris Huntington-  
Thresher, Angela Page, Melanie Stevens, Harry Stranger  
and Michael Tickner

**58 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest

**59 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF  
SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Councillor Mark Brock and Councillor Angela Page attended as substitute.

**60 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE  
PUBLIC TO THE CHAIRMAN OR THE COMMITTEE**

No questions were received for the attention of the Chairman or the Committee.

**61 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29th JANUARY 2020**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29th of January 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

**62 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

Questions were received from members of the public for written response.

*Post Meeting Note:*

(The answers to the questions were emailed to the questioners on September 11<sup>th</sup>).

Councillor Dunn had submitted a question for oral response. The answer to this question had been incorporated into the written responses noted above. This was because at the time of the meeting, the presumption was that no oral responses were being provided. The written response to this question

was noted and then Cllr Dunn was permitted to ask a supplementary question. This was as follows:

*'A pupil of Eden Park High School was struck by a car last week, resulting in a broken leg. Can I have your assurance that Bromley Council will fund a study to determine what type of crossing is necessary on the road where the pupil was struck by the car and install it irrespective of TfL funding?'*

The Portfolio Holder stated that in his view this was not a valid supplementary question, as a supplementary question should follow on from the original question, and in his view this question did not meet the criteria. The Portfolio Holder agreed to respond to Councillor Dunn by email following the meeting.

*Post Meeting Note:*

The answer to the supplementary/additional question was disseminated to Councillor Dunn on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

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

**a DRAFT PARKS AND GREENSPACE STRATEGY 2020-25**

**ES20027**

The Committee was presented with the Draft Open Space Strategy report and also the Open Space Strategy document 2021--2031 that had been drafted by Idverde. An introduction to the report was provided by the Assistant Director for Environment. It was noted that the strategic document set out the principles and general direction for the future of the Portfolio's various land holdings.

The Assistant Director informed Members that the Strategy covered 168 parks and that the Strategy was for ten years. The contract for maintaining and developing parks and green spaces had been awarded to Idverde in April 2019. The production of the strategy document was part of the contractual agreement and was in line with the Council's objectives.

He explained that the objectives were set out in the draft strategy document and the objectives were supported with case studies. The Strategy was broken down into review stages, and the annual contract performance reports would be provided by Idverde.

A Member drew attention to a section in the report that referenced a 10% increase in income, and she hoped that no small groups or charities would be penalised as a result. It was confirmed that the Council would not be looking to penalise smaller groups in any way--rather they would be looking at the

Events Management Portfolio and would not be looking to penalise local residents.

A discussion took place as to the criteria that would qualify a park for new play facilities; it was explained that Idverde had identified suitable sites, and these had been included in the site management plans which were now being developed.

A Member remarked that the incorporation of case studies into the document was useful, and there was a discussion as to what groups should be involved in the consultation process. The Assistant Director stated that other bodies would be consulted. The Chairman asked who would be able to respond to the consultation, and the Assistant Director replied that the document had identified particular stakeholders who would be consulted. The Assistant Director said that consultation could also involve the public if that was recommended by the Committee.

A Member commented that detail was missing and not much had been factored in with respect to sports facilities. The Assistant Director responded by saying that it was not the purpose of the report to provide granular detail, but the Strategy would identify where gaps existed. Progress on the Strategy would be updated upon annually in the annual report.

The Chairman expressed the view that parks were critical and was glad to see that exciting projects were planned—he hoped the plans would be ambitious. The Chairman recommended that a public consultation of some form should take place in addition to the consultation with stakeholders and this was seconded by the Vice Chairman.

**RESOLVED that**

- 1) The Portfolio Holder agreed to undertake a consultation with the Stakeholders that had been identified within the Draft Open Space Strategy, plus that residents and visitors to the borough would also be able to comment on the Strategy.**
- 2) The Portfolio Holder would expect to approve an Open Space Strategy Policy following a future ECS PDS meeting after receiving a report on the results of the consultation..**

**b AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN 2020-25 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

**ES20041**

The Assistant Director for Public Protection and Enforcement presented the Air Quality Action Plan consultation response that had been approved by the GLA. The consultation had received 869 responses from members of the

*9 September 2020*

public; which was an excellent response, (as the average response for such consultations was 284), and indeed one consultation had only received 34 responses. The GLA had commented that there was a lack of detail in some areas of the Plan and that dates and targets needed to be set; however the overall response to the Plan from the GLA had been very positive. Formal approval for the Plan had been received on the 27th of August. The letter of endorsement from the GLA had been circulated separately to the Committee.

Following consultation, all responses were fed back to internal partners for their response and comment and these were outlined in Appendix A of the report.

The Vice Chairman endorsed the Plan and was pleased to note the positive feedback from the GLA, and also the fact that the Plan would complement the Council's Carbon Neutral Strategy. He was also pleased with the level of public consultation and engagement.

A Member referenced actions that were detailed in the matrices at the end of the Plan, noting that they were due for completion during March and April 2020; he asked for an update concerning these actions. It was deemed prudent that the Member would receive a written answer concerning the question that he had asked about the actions detailed in the Plan. He further referenced the matter of funding for the monitoring of PM10 and PM2.5 and asked why the Council was not able to fund this itself. The Assistant Director for Public Protection stated that LBB did have their own monitoring stations for PM10 and PM2.5 but would make use of extra funding if it could be sourced for additional monitoring. It would be prudent to save money if possible.

A Member commented that it would be useful if LBB could reduce the use of road humps and 20 mph speed limits as this slowed traffic down and created more pollution.

A Member noted that 63% of respondents were female and questioned if the consultation process had been robust enough. The Assistant Director for Public Protection responded that the response was typical. It was noted that Bromley's main concern was with the monitoring of NOX, and that the monitoring of this was being extended.

The Chairman noted that the report stated that a single monitor for PM10 and PM2.5 was considered sufficient. He asked who it was that said one single monitor was sufficient; was it LBB or was it an independent body? The Assistant Director for Public Protection responded that Kings had not expressed concern that having a single monitoring station was an issue.

The Chairman raised the issue of the lack of support from TfL. TfL were trialling electric buses and various forms of non-diesel transport and it would be really helpful if TfL could support Bromley's Air Quality Action Plan by bringing some of these modes of transport to Bromley. The Chairman

wondered if it was possible to 'reverse consult'; he proposed that contact be made with TfL to explore how they could support Bromley's AQAP.

The Chairman asked if it was possible to have a follow up report on the AQAP coming back to the Committee in about a year's time to monitor the actions that had been taken.

The Assistant Director for Public Protection informed the Chairman that this was a matter that had to be reported on annually anyway, and that an annual report of some sort would be generated for ratification by the GLA. The Chairman asked if this was a matter that would normally come to the Committee and the answer to this was 'no'. However, the Chairman requested that in a year's time, an update report of some sort on the AQAP should come back to the Committee.

The Chairman expressed his thanks to the local community for their responses.

**RESOLVED that:**

**1- The report be noted and that the final version of the AQAP be recommended for adoption by the Executive.**

**2- An update report be brought to the Committee to assess progress on the Plan in a year's time.**

**c CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING REPORT**

**FSD20065**

Members noted the report which summarised the current position on capital expenditure and receipts following the first quarter of 2020/21. The report outlined the revised capital programme for the four-year period of 2020/21 to 2020/24 as agreed by the Executive and the Leader

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**64 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS GOING TO THE EXECUTIVE FOR DECISION**

**a MOVING TRAFFIC CONTRAVENTIONS**

**ECS20035**

Members were briefed on the Moving Traffic Contraventions report by the Interim Head of Shared Parking Services (Bromley and Bexley) and the LBB Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking. It was noted that the current responsibility for enforcing moving traffic conventions lay with the police, but the police usually only issued about three fixed penalty notices per year. By

*9 September 2020*

comparison, the neighbouring borough of Bexley had issued 14,000 fixed penalty notices during the same period.

The aim of the recommendations was to improve traffic flow and air quality. The Committee noted that if the recommendations were approved, the relevant procurement route would be established in 2021. The purpose of the report was for the Portfolio Holder to make recommendations to the Executive. The final decision would be made by the Executive or by the Leader.

The consensus was that this was a good report, however one Member expressed concern regarding the source of funding; this had been identified as coming from the contingency budget; the Member recommended that the source of funding should be changed--so that the funding would come either from Invest to Save or from an alternative budget.

A Member noted the proposed 12 locations for the implementation of the first phase regarding enforcing moving traffic conventions. He expressed the view that Widmore Road and St Blaise should have been included in the first phase, as both these areas seemed to have more potential for traffic contraventions. The Interim Head of Shared Parking Services (Bromley and Bexley) explained that that twelve locations were not fixed in stone, and that cameras could be moved to different locations as the need arose. She made it clear that the aim of enforcing any contraventions was to encourage people to drive properly and was not simply a means of enforcing financial penalties and revenue generation for the Council. To this end, in the initial phase of implementation, warning notices would be issued in the first instance to give people a chance to avoid being penalised until they got used to the new regulations.

There was a consensus amongst Members that the cameras should be installed where the need was greatest. It was noted that in terms of best compliance rates, this was normally 85%. This meant that there would be 15% of drivers that would never be fully compliant.

The timescales involved were explained, and that the target date for implementation was October 2021 for two reasons:

1. Initially, permission to implement the recommendations would need to be obtained from London Councils.
2. There was uncertainty as to the length of time required for the procurement process. This was because a decision would need to be made either to simply add new cameras to the existing network or to refresh the whole of the network .

A Member had asked what length of time needed to expire if a vehicle was caught in a yellow box, before enforcement action would be taken. The

answer was that the camera would send images to the CCTV reviewer after three seconds.

The Portfolio Holder reminded Members that the Executive would be making the decision, but he was happy to suggest the inclusion of some flexibility in terms of where the cameras would be placed.

The Chairman commented that the A21 (which was administered by TfL), had now become a permanent bus lane which they were enforcing. He asked if officers were aware of this. The Assistant Director replied that they were aware in the summertime that this may be happening, but it only been notified to the Council on the previous Monday. He further clarified that this only affected the A21 outside of Bromley College.

The Member that had previously raised the issue regarding the budget head for the project re-raised the matter, as the answer had not been provided earlier in the meeting. He asked for clarification of where the money would come from to fund this project—reiterating his point that (in his view) it should not come from the contingency budget. The Director of Environment and Public Protection stated that the budget had been signed off by the Director of Finance, so this was something he would need to go back and speak to him about. He promised that after he had clarified this with the Director of Finance, he would update the Member accordingly .

The following recommendations were agreed for the Portfolio Holder to recommend to the Executive :

1. to approve that Bromley apply to adopt powers to enforce moving traffic contraventions from the 1st April 2021
2. to agree to adopt powers on the basis that Bromley enforces as set out in the report
3. to agree that cameras will be initially installed at the top twelve sites listed in table one, but with some flexibility built into this recommendation to allow cameras to be moved to different locations if required
4. To authorise officers to enter into any necessary agreements or arrangements with neighbouring boroughs
5. to agree to a one-off expenditure of an estimated £266k to implement the policy through a suitable procurement route which would be determined going forward. The funding to be taken from the Councils 2020/21 central contingency fund
6. to request officers to investigate what service providers offered the best value for money for the Council, given the possible need to replace the Council's existing bus lane and school keep clear enforcement

*9 September 2020*

cameras within the next 18 months, and to produce a further report to Members, including a decision on the recommended procurement route .

**65 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CONTRACTS, LOT 1,2 AND 3  
(2019/20 ANNUAL CONTRACT PERFORMANCE UPDATE)**

**ES 20040**

The Committee was briefed concerning the Environmental Services Contracts that had been awarded to Veolia on the 1st of April 2019. The update was given because the Council's Corporate Performance Rules required that an annual performance review of the contract be provided, this was because the value of the contract exceeded £1m. Representatives from Veolia attended the meeting to answer questions. Veolia was represented by Nick Allan (Senior Contract Manager), Simon Moore (Regional Manager) and Matt Elmer (Waste Collection Contract Manager).

The Vice Chairman noted that the report provided data up to March 2020 and enquired as to what the performance ratios were post March. Mr Moore responded that Veolia had been dealing with an increased level of waste because more people were working from home. He explained that some services had been dropped during the peak of the Covid Pandemic so that the organisation could focus on the key matter of refuse collection. He said that 'post Covid', Veolia was still seeing high levels of waste. Veolia was trying to get back to normal levels of service; missed bin collections were decreasing but there was still much work to do.

The Vice Chairman asked what was being done to decrease contamination levels, and what was being done to address the matter of missed bin collections.

Mr Moore explained that regarding contamination levels, much more wet paper was currently being collected; Veolia was considering the use of new containers. It was noted that the transfer station roof was in a state of disrepair, allowing some rainwater to damage paper whilst it was being stored. It was mentioned that Veolia was aiming to reduce the number of batteries entering the general waste stream--as these were a fire hazard.

Members heard that with respect to textiles, most of the textiles being left out for collection were not good quality, thus reducing their value. Some were not even good enough to be used as rags. Veolia expressed the view that the processing of textiles should be focused around the use of the existing textile banks. It was further noted that there was much contamination in glass waste.

The LBB Strategic Manager for Waste Services explained that as part of the new contract, contamination reporting was more transparent. Residents place materials that are not accepted for recycling within the green box for plastics, cans and glass. As a result of the improved data on contamination, Veolia's



communication team were working with Bromley on a contamination campaign this year. A schools recycling workshop would be provided to inform children as to what could and could not be recycled in Bromley, so that they could help their parents to recycle the right items. Flats recycling communications was another element of the contamination campaign planned for 2020/21 but had been slightly delayed as a result of COVID-19.

A Member enquired if there was any statutory guidance in terms of the times that mechanical street cleaners could operate on residential roads and what arrangements were in place to clear footways when the mechanical cleaners were not able to gain access. Veolia responded that the service had not received many noise complaints and that the core operational hours were 6am to 6pm (Monday to Saturday). Tailored local solutions could be implemented if required. If complaints were received regarding noise, then Veolia would consider what options to take to reduce noise levels. Veolia was dealing reactively with any complaints on a case by case basis. It was explained that randomised checks were undertaken by client officers to check on the work that had been undertaken by Veolia 24 hours after the work had been carried out.

A Member referenced section 3.4 of Veolia's annual report which mentioned that Veolia had expressed the view that it was approaching the limit on what realistically could be delivered. Veolia had asked the Council to review the consistency and achievability of the original targets for missed collections. The Member asked if Veolia could expand on this.

Mr Allan responded that there was room for improvement and Veolia were looking at the targets. He expressed the view that some of the targets needed adjusting. Prior to the Coronavirus outbreak, new services had been planned for September which were just starting. Now, with everything being affected by Covid, it was difficult to assess where targets should be. The view was expressed that they needed six months to review and reassess targets.

A Member commented that it appeared that recent surveys regarding street cleaning had indicated that the service was slightly below target. It was mentioned that a new live system existed in the cabs of the lorries to assist the crew in knowing if they had missed bins.

The LBB Assistant Director for Environment also mentioned that Veolia were asking the Council to consider adjusting performance targets, and he felt that a period was needed to consider if any targets could be adjusted. It was probably the case that another six months would be needed to re-assess the data. He felt that the current performance of each element of the contract was performing effectively.

The use of purple sacks by residents to collect litter was also discussed, along with any possible future plans to collect and recycle this waste. A Member stated that currently, all of the litter waste collected in this manner was placed in the same sack, and then was taken to landfill. She wanted to know

*9 September 2020*

specifically if any plans were being made to recycle the litter that had been collected.

Veolia considered that the costs associated with this would be too high. They said it would not be economical, but gave assurances that waste collected in this manner would not be landfilled. The Member asked if this matter could be kept as a 'work in progress'. Mr Allan suggested that possibly different colour bags could be used to aid with recycling the litter. Additionally, room would be required on site for storage. The Member responded, saying that the Biggin Hill Ward would be happy to run any pilot scheme.

The Chairman and Vice Chairman thanked Veolia for their sterling efforts over the period of the lockdown. The Chairman mentioned that he was aware that some other local authorities had not discontinued any services during this period and wondered why Bromley had not done the same.

Mr Moore responded that in his view, LBB had done the right thing in providing an effective limited service focusing on refuse collection. It had been the case in both the Bromley and Croydon boroughs that a large number of Veolia staff had gone off work during the early stages of the pandemic, which had affected service delivery.

The Chairman raised the issue of missed bin collections (which was one of the main issues of concern within the Bromley Borough) and asked if the new system that noted missed bin collections was robust enough from the point of view of Bromley residents. It was explained that there was 'in cab technology' which would allocate collections to crews and that feedback regarding any missed bins would be directed to a 'micro site' which would then feed directly into the Bromley Council website. There had been a huge increase in the collection of cardboard and it was possible that Bromley could make a charge for this. It was explained that the collection of large cardboard flat packs was not a statutory obligation.

The Vice Chairman asked what precautions were being taken to protect staff during the current Covid Pandemic. Mr Moore responded that Veolia had plenty of PPE and had put in place rigorous protocols for cleaning vehicles, the wearing of masks, and that these processes had been laid down plainly in the company guidelines. They had developed continuity plans to cope with a possible second wave of the virus which included quick testing for staff.

A Member commented that with respect to Covid 19, it should be accepted that the current conditions would probably remain unchanged for some time--this would be the 'new normal'. She was unclear as to why issues related to wet paper collection were currently a concern--she felt that as far as this matter was concerned, circumstances had not changed. She stated that the issue of missed bins should be dealt with. Collections should now return to normal and that LBB should not accept a higher level of missed bins—collections should return to acceptable levels; Covid19 was no longer an excuse and Veolia should be maintaining the contractual targets.

The LBB Strategic Manager for Waste Services said that it was too early to say if the change that had occurred in waste tonnages as a result of COVID-19 would be sustained--she felt that the current increase in paper tonnage would stay the same while people were working from home. The problems associated with recycling wet paper being rejected would vary depending on the tonnage collected; weather conditions, how long the box had been left outside, and the general manner in which the bins were presented. It also depended on the market for paper. At the moment the demand for paper was lower than the amount of paper collected for recycling as a result of the decline in printed media. This meant that the paper industry would only accept high quality paper and card with a low moisture content. It was in LBB's interest to achieve high quality paper and card recycling, as the Council could obtain good income from paper and card recycling.

A Member raised the question as to whether or not LBB was doing any investigation into the recycling centres—it was felt that some local traders used the centres to dispose of waste late at night; it was asked if checks could be carried out on what they were doing, and was it possible that they could be identified? They needed to pay for their waste collections.

The correct disposal of commercial waste by businesses was discussed. It was noted that this was something that LBB could investigate in partnership with Veolia to check if local businesses were compliant and if they possessed the relevant waste transfer note. LBB was conscious of the issues, and plans were in place to deal with such matters if they arose in the future.

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

**RESOLVED that the Committee note the report.**

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

This page is left intentionally blank

## ECS PDS Committee: 9th September 2020.

### Questions and Answers:

#### Question 1 from Clive Lees:

RVR members have been very concerned for many years at the excess traffic exiting Station Road at Shortlands traffic lights making the junction very dangerous for pedestrians. What is the situation regarding the proposal for a modal filter in Glass Mill Lane?

#### Answer to Question 1:

TfL have indicated that funding for a temporary/trial modal filter in Glassmill Lane may be available in the second part of this year, as it was not awarded initially. However, the installation of a modal filter in Glassmill Lane would need to run hand-in-hand with temporary/trial one proposed for Hillside Road, so plans to implement both are being discussed with TfL.

#### Question 2 from Clive Lees:

If funding is the issue, would LBB proceed with installation of the modal filter if there was a contribution from RVR?

#### Answer to Question 2:

There needs to be funding available, with sufficient time available to complete the measures, to install both the temporary/trial filter in Glassmill Lane plus the filter and cycle route in Valley Road / Hillside Road.

#### Question 3 from Alisa Igoe:

Ashfield speeding. Could you kindly update our resident's group on the installation date of a new 30mph Vehicle Activation Sign which was offered last June, the moving of the current one, the result of the assessment of the first set of Dragon's Teeth and the date of installation of the second set.

Answer to Question 3:

It was planned to relocate an existing VAS from Court Road (junction with Warren Road) where the crossroads ahead VAS sign will soon no longer be required. However, the scheme in Court Road has been delayed so the VAS is not yet available.

Dragons' teeth markings were proposed in one direction based on the result of the speed survey in the direction of higher speeds and these were installed. Observations by an engineer were carried out this year in March and July and no speeding was observed approaching this junction, nor is there a record of new collisions at this location. There are therefore no plans to install additional dragon's teeth markings.

Question 4 from Alisa Igoe:

Could you kindly confirm the amount of funds allocated for social distancing emergency measures in Chislehurst alone, from the three sources of emergency income which I believe the Council received - £100k from Department of Transport, £295k from Re-opening High Streets Safely Fund and £369k allocated by TfL's Streetspace initiative.

Answer to Question 4:

Spend for social distancing measures has not been broken down by location. Social distancing signs have been installed in both Chislehurst High Street and Royal Parade, and measures are soon to be introduced outside Chislehurst CE Primary School. Not all schemes proposed for Chislehurst received grant funding.

Question 5 from Jenny Dunwoody:

With regard to 'Gear Change: a bold vision for cycling and walking' , what plans has the Council to respond to this document?

If there are no plans, will the Policy Holder commit to a date by when draft plans will be produced?

Answer to Question 5:

The Council already had ambitions to make improvements for cyclists, as set out in our transport strategy (LIP3). In response to the Governments' recent initiative, Bromley has successfully bid for funding to introduce temporary cycle lanes in a number of locations in the Borough, such as Shortlands and Crystal Palace. These will hopefully be in place in the next month or so. We are also pleased to be able to offer cycle training once more, for adults and for children, following strict hygiene guidelines. There have been a number of very well attended Dr Bike events in Bromley over the summer and we are stepping up the pace to deliver escorted rides to the many new cycling commuters on our waiting list.

Question 6 from Brendan Donegan:

When will the Environment Policy Development Scrutiny Committee consider Bromley Council's Air Quality Action Plan 2020-2025?

Answer to Question 6:

This plan will be considered on the 9th of September 2020.

Question 7 from Brendan Donegan:

Bromley Council website states that in September 2020, 6 school streets will start in Bromley Borough. What was the process by which these 6 schools were selected?

Answer to Question 7:

Bromley contacted schools across the Borough in early June to offer them support in respect to their pupils returning to school, where the schools had concerns about social distancing on the highway near to their buildings. There was then a dialogue with schools who felt that a temporary school street might help them, and schools were asked to sign a MOU in regard to what they would offer to operate the school street if the Council was to install the facilities. Eleven schools were interested in a temporary school street, but after ongoing discussions

with these schools, five schools are soon to have the benefit of a temporary school street; these are:

- Harris Primary Academy Crystal Palace, Malcolm Road
- Harris Primary Academy Orpington
- St Mary Cray Primary School, Park road
- Proverest Primary, Tillingbourne Green
- Pratts Bottom School, Hookwood Road

A sixth school, Hawes Down School (The Mead) has sadly had to withdraw from the scheme, as they were in the end unable to staff the barriers.

These temporary School Streets will provide a valuable insight into the selection, design, consultation and management of school streets for consideration going forward.

#### Question 8 from Andrew Ruck:

What is the expected timetable for a final draft of the Air Quality Action Plan to be produced? Officers obviously need to have a sensible time frame to properly review and consolidate the responses to the Public Consultation within their draft Plan. An effective Plan is certainly worth waiting for, though a rough ETA would be appreciated.

#### Answer to Question 8:

The consultation concluded on the 10th August 2020 and a team of Officers worked hard to review and consolidate the responses. These were submitted to the GLA on the 27th August 2020 which approved the final plan, as such, there will be no further public consultation. The final draft will be scrutinised by the Environment PDS Committee on the 9th September 2020, in accordance with the timeline agreed by this committee on the 17th March 2020.

#### Question 9 from Laura Vogel:

Government made funds available for councils to provide temporary infrastructure changes enabling “active travel” through reduced speed limits, low traffic neighbourhoods and temporary cycle lanes; where did



Bromley Council include these in their Covid grant proposals and did Bromley residents lose out on funding and active travel infrastructure due to their omission?

Answer to Question 9:

Further to the report supported by Members of the Environment PDS committee on 8<sup>th</sup> June this year and subsequently signed off by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Services, bids for measures considered suitable for streets in this Borough were submitted for grant funding. Not all bids were supported by the funding bodies, but grants approved included those for temporary footway widening, cycle routes, pedestrian crossings, school streets and advisory 20mph speed limits.

Question 10 from Laura Vogel:

Bromley schools are reopening in September amidst numerous Covid-related transportation issues, including decreased capacity on busses, student travel costs rising and social distancing at school gates; what actions has the council taken to work with schools to prepare for schools to reopen and prevent gridlock on our roads?

Answer to Question 10:

Bromley contacted schools across the Borough in early June to offer them support in respect to their pupils returning to school, where the schools had concerns about social distancing on the highway near to their buildings. The Education Department of the Council, along with officers from the Council's Traffic and Road Safety Teams, have liaised with TfL about bus services and have also introduced social distancing signage around 114 schools across the Borough. Where schools have requested specific help, officers have liaised with the school regarding the introduction of measures such as temporary school streets and footway widenings, to help parents and pupils as they travel to and from the schools. These measures will help give parents choices as to how their children travel to school, so that whilst it will be appropriate for some parents to drive their children to school, others can choose to walk, scoot or cycle.

Question 11 from Richard Gibbons:

TfL Streetspace, DfT EATF, MHCLG RHSSF funding - Would Portfolio Holder please confirm amounts (£s) allocated/received from each funding source; details of schemes/funding associated with each source; details of other schemes bid for from each source and reasons why unsuccessful; and details of schemes bid for in second round/tranche?

Answer to Question 11:

The report to Environment PDS on 8<sup>th</sup> June this year set out the range of measures that would be bid for to these funding bodies. The proposals were then worked up by officers and included bids for

- Homesdale Road Zebra Crossing
- Cycle Parking at Stations
- Station Road Pedestrian Crossing
- Glassmill Lane traffic filter
- Farnaby Road Footway Improvement
- Recreation Road Valley Primary school footpath \* (£12k)
- Old Hill Traffic Island
- Beckenham Road Clock House Station Temporary Cycle Route (to connect GKH Route)
- Kent House Station via Ravenscroft Road & Marlow Road Temporary cycle route
- Southend Road / Foxgrove Road / Park Road Parallel Zebra Crossing
- Albemarle Road Temporary cycle route \* (£52k)
- Bromley Road Temporary cycle route \* (£59k)
- Southend Road Pedestrian Refuge \* (£20k)
- Beckenham to Greenwich Experimental Cycle Route via Copers Cope Road
- Lennard Road Cycleway scheme \* (£30k)
- Manor Rd / Wickham Rd / Bromley Rd junction Temporary pedestrian crossing
- Court Rd / Priory Gardens Floating Bus Stop
- Shortlands Station to Harris Primary School cycle route \* (£42k)
- Manor Park Road / A232 Refuge Widening
- Red Lodge Rd / The Avenue pedestrian improvement scheme
- Belmont Lane/Edgebury and Kemnal Road footpath

- Crystal Palace Park Road cycle route and Thicket Road pedestrian facility \* (£50k)
- Cintra Park and Chipstead Close Cycle Contraflow
- Ledrington Road Cycle Permeability
- SCHOOLS MEASURES – a bundle of school streets, crossings, widenings and signage \* (£204k)
- TOWN CENTRES – a bundle of footway widenings and social distancing signs \* (up to £295k)
- Old Cople Lane cycle path
- Anerley Hill temporary crossing
- Penge East Station cycle permeability scheme

Those schemes that were supported by the funding bodies in Tranche 1 are shown with an asterisk, with the amount awarded shown in brackets. All bids not successful in Tranche 1 were submitted to TfL for consideration by them and DfT in tranche 2 (the results of the Tranche 2 bids are not yet known).

The schemes awarded funding in Tranche 1 are still subject to design approval by TfL and must also meet Bromley's own standards before they can be completed on site. Schemes are subject to change, by negotiation with TfL, where a barrier to delivery of the originally envisaged scheme is identified during detailed design.

Question 12 from Richard Gibbons:

Primary/Secondary/SEN School Covid-19 Travel Surveys - Would Portfolio Holder please provide update on numbers of completed surveys received per school, including numbers of households and children represented; and confirm actions being taken in response to surveys, and wide disparity in response rate (0% to 15.7% at 20 July)?

Answer to Question 12:

There have now been 8,110 surveys completed by 113 schools. Breakdown as below  
 4228 responses from 89 Primary Schools  
 3822 responses from 24 Secondary Schools  
 These numbers include independent Schools.

*The data available is as follows:*

Alexandra Infants School	12
Alexandra Junior School	52
Ashgrove	1
Babington House School	4
Balgowan Primary School	1
Bickley Park School	12
Bickley Primary School	172
Biggin Hill Primary School	2
Bishop Challoner	0
Blenheim Primary School	40
Breaside School	3
Bromley High School	13
Burnt Ash Primary School	1
Castlecombe Primary School	35
Chelsfield Primary School	0
Chislehurst CE Primary School	69
Churchfields Primary School	1
Clare House Primary School	0
Crofton Infant School	161
Crofton Junior School	288
Cudham CE Primary School	0
Darrick Wood Infant School	110
Darrick Wood Junior School	161
Dorset Road Infant School	7

Downe Primary School	0
Edgebury Primary School	2
Eltham College	81
Farnborough Primary School	1
Farringtons School	1
Gray's Farm Primary School	46
Green Street Green Primary	121
Harris Primary Academy Beckenham	142
Harris Primary Academy Crystal Palace	13
Harris Primary Academy Kent House	3
Harris Primary Academy Orpington	16
Harris Primary Academy Shortlands	10
Harris Primary Acadmey Beckenham Green	72
Hawes Down Primary	3
Hayes Primary School	161
Highfield Infant School	160
Highfield Junior School	222
Holy Innocents RC Primary School	53
James Dixon Primary School	94
Keston CE Primary School	50
La Fontaine Academy	5
Langley Park Primary	72
Leesons Primary School	0
Manor Oak Primary School	0
Marian Vian Primary School	139

Mead Road Infant School	1
Midfield Primary School	0
Mottingham Primary School	0
Oak Lodge Primary School	0
Oaklands Primary School	131
Parish CE Primary School	1
Perry Hall Primary School	1
Pickhurst Infant School	199
Pickhurst Junior School	187
Poverest Primary School	59
Pratts Bottom Primary School	31
Raglan Primary School	6
Red Hill Primary School	47
Riverside School	6
Scotts Park Primary School	1
Southborough Primary School	133
St Anthony's RC Primary School	0
St Christopher's School	1
St David's College	0
St George's CE Primary School	113
St James' RC Primary School	11
St John's CE Primary School	35
St Joseph's RC Primary School	56
St Mark's CE Primary School	117
St Mary Cray Primary School	1
St Mary's RC Primary School	68

St Paul's Cray CE Primary School	53
St Peter & St Paul RC Primary School	1
St Philomena's RC Primary School	23
St Vincent's RC Primary School	2
Stewart Fleming Primary School	117
The Highway Primary School	0
Trinity Primary School	75
Tubbenden Primary School	203
Unicorn Primary School	137
Valley Primary School	9
Warren Road Primary School	92
Wickham Common Primary School	7
Wickham Court School	0
Worsley Bridge Junior School	0
Other (please specify):	40

Bickley Park School	7
Bishop Challoner School	3
Bromley High School	22
Bishop Justus School	111
Bullers Wood Boys School	285
Bullers Wood School	531
Charles Darwin	38
Chislehurst School for Girls	313
Coopers Technology College	531

Darrick Wood School	644
Darul Uloom School	0
Eden Park High	1
Farringtons	6
Harris Academy Beckenham	5
Harris Academy Orpington	5
Harris Girls Academy Bromley	2
Hayes School	287
Kemnal Technology College	7
Langley Park Boys School	9
Langley Park Girls School	13
Newstead Wood School	373
Ravens Wood School	440
St Olave's School	111
The Ravensbourne School	395

The many comments received from the surveys have been interesting to read to help  
interesting to note that most parents are not planning to alter their school travel beha  
existing plans to help parents and pupils as they return to school.

Question 13 from Carrie Heitmeyer:

It is fantastic that Bromley Council is initiating 6 school streets next month.  
What are the next steps in terms of the Council considering proposals to  
increase or decrease the number of school streets in the borough?

Answer to Question 13:

The 5 or 6 school streets will be monitored over the coming months to see how  
effective they are at helping achieve social distancing and how they help



children walk or cycle to school more safely. Although these are only temporary school streets, what is learnt by officers and members will help determine the future use of more permanent school streets in the Borough going forward.

Question 14 from Carrie Heitmeyer:

Please could you provide an explanation of Bromley Council policy on 20mph speed limits in the borough, e.g. if and why all 20mph zones in the borough are 'advisory' rather than 'enforceable'?

Answer to Question 14:

There are a mixture of permanent, part time and advisory 20mph limits across the Borough. The advisory 20mph limit signs are seen as being more effective at alerting drivers to the presence of children in the vicinity of schools at the appropriate times of day, so are often the preferred choice of the Council to improve safety around schools.

Question 15 from Gillian Lees:

Re AQAP Theme 2 Action 7, could this be amended to clarify that the Council seeks to reduce, through awareness campaigns, the use of wood stoves rather than simply promote the use of appropriate fuel. (Wood stoves are generally wholly unnecessary and contribute to particulate matter pollution).

Answer to Question 15:

The action as written has been accepted as appropriate by the GLA. The Mayor's guidance for wood burning stoves in London will be promoted.

Question 16 from Gillian Lees:

Throughout the AQAP, mention is made of using Planning Conditions to control pollution. Would the Council include in the AQAP the requirement that all developments must have a Planning Condition that The Code of Practice<<https://www.bromley.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/3492/control>

[of noise form demolition and construction sites - code of practice.pdf](#)> must be followed in order to prevent particulate pollution from construction sites.

Answer to Question 16:

The actions concerning the application of planning conditions have been accepted as appropriate by the GLA.

Question 17 from Sarah Laughton:

The questions relate to the summary of responses to the consultation (Air quality Action Plan 2020-2025) Theme 3 - Parks verges and Highways.

It was stated that the Council has organised the planting of wildflowers on some grass verges. Precisely which grass verges have been planted with wildflowers so far and when, and are these verges being cut on a twice yearly basis with the arisings being removed and composted?

Answer to Question 17:

The council recently established a wildflower earth mound to the perimeter of Leaves Green Common sowing a 1300 linear meters of wildflower seed mix comprising of Linseed, Barley, Triticale, Phacelia and White Millet. The bunding will be cut and collected once per annum in October. The Heathfield Road and Westerham Road roundabout was recently transformed into a wildflower roundabout consisting of Garlic Mustard, Betony, Foxglove, Wood Avens, Red Campion and Self Heal to name a few. This area will be cut and collected once per annum in October. The council is at final stages of preparing a wildflower creation plan for sites at Coney Hall Recreation Ground, Green Street Green Common, Leaves Green Common and Biggin Hill Recreation Ground, subject to Member consideration. As is the case with all the other projects, the aim is to create wildflower interest with improved wildlife habitat creation. These areas will also receive an annual cut and collect maintenance programme.

These initiatives are all early phase trials and the council will be investigating further projects in line with the soon to be published Open Space Strategy.

Question 18 from Sarah Laughton:

The questions relate to the summary of responses to the consultation (Air quality Action Plan 2020-2025) Theme 3 - Parks verges and Highways.

The report states that Council's ability to extend the planting of wildflowers is budget dependent. Can community groups get involved with planting wildflower plugs or sowing seeds on verges to help the council reduce costs, or cover the costs of doing so and if so, how can they do this?

Answer to Question 18:

Wildflower restoration is an intensive process of scraping off existing vegetation and nutrient topsoil and removing it from land. This is the most costly task in a wildflower restoration programme. Wherever possible the council encourages community involvement and will do so with further initiatives.

Question 19 from Leila Allsopp:

What measure of air quality improvement does LBB hope to achieve from implementation of its new AQAP 2020 over the term of the plan?

Answer to Question 19

The matrix shows the specific actions that are being implemented to improve or maintain air quality. Each of these actions have targets and success of the plan will be measured against these.

Question 20 from Leila Allsopp:

Are there hopes to bring NO<sub>2</sub> & PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels down to reach specific lower levels at the end of that 5 years or to reduce such pollutant levels by a specific percentage?

Answer to Question 20:

The plan shows the specific actions that will be taken to either maintain or improve air quality. Whilst there is an ambition to meet the WHO levels for PM2.5, there is no percentage target set for reduction for either NO2 or PM2.5.

Question 21 from Jonathan Coulter:

Given that under the AQAP 2020, TFL appears to be identified as the cause of most road related air pollution in the Borough of Bromley, what will LBB do (and advise TFL to do) in order to reduce all boroughwide road traffic, which accounts for 61% of NOx emissions across the borough?"

Answer to Question 21:

Whilst active travel as an option is promoted with technology improvements it would not appear necessary to reduce car usage to reduce NOx from vehicles. Our LIP strategy does have the ambition that providing new active travel options will increase active travel thus reducing unnecessary use of other modes. The ULEZ may encourage earlier replacement of vehicles, but the natural cycle of vehicle replacement is seeing more electric and hybrid cars on our roads. Typically, vehicles with the highest annual mileage are replaced most frequently. Nationally, reports suggest 4% of new cars are electric, with the ULEZ it might be expected that the proportion in London would be higher. All other things being equal, it would appear reasonable to expect NOx emissions from transport to reduce. It is not clear that other sources of NOx are seeing the same impact of technology and will reduce at the same rate.

Consultation with staff possibly affected has started. It is far too soon to say whether this will lead to redundancies, but any proposals to make changes to the structure of the Council's Traffic and Road safety Team would come to this committee for comment, before any impact on staff could be identified.

## 1-Question from Cllr Ian Dunn:

Please provide an update on the potential redundancies in the Traffic Team.

## Answer to Question 1:

As TfL funding for local authorities to implement their local transport strategies is, as far as we know, to cease from the end of October, a consultation with staff possibly affected has started. It is far too soon to say whether this will lead to redundancies, but any proposals to make changes to the structure of the Council's Traffic and Road safety Team would come to this committee for comment, before any impact on staff could be identified.

## Question 2 from Cllr Ian Dunn:

Please provide details of any additional payments made to any of our contractors in respect of additional costs they have incurred in respect of COVID.

## Answer to Question 2:

The Council have paid Veolia an additional £183k for additional COVID-19 costs that they incurred between 19 March and 31 May 2020 to deliver waste and street cleaning services in accordance with Health and Safety Executive Guidance. The additional costs are reducing with the costs incurred by Veolia in June expected to be £29k and for July, £9k.

Additional costs have not been paid to any other Council contractor.

This page is left intentionally blank