

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 22 November 2022

### **Present:**

Councillor Will Rowlands (Chairman)  
Councillor Simon Fawthrop (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Kim Botting FRSA,  
Mike Botting, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland, Alison Stammers,  
Harry Stranger and Michael Tickner

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Sam Webber, Councillor Nicholas Bennett J.P.,  
Councillor Aisha Cuthbert, Councillor Thomas Turrell,  
Councillor Christopher Marlow and Councillor Christine  
Harris

### **220 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Cllr Adam Grant and Councillor Michael Tickner attended a substitute.

### **221 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Alison Stammers declared an interest as a member of the Friends of Chislehurst Recreation Ground. She also declared an interest as Chairman of the Woodlands Practice and Chislehurst Medical Practice Patients Participation Group.

Councillor Michael Tickner declared an interest as a member of the Friends of Kelsey Park.

### **222 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6th SEPTEMBER 2022**

The minutes of the meeting that was held on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2022 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

### **223 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS OR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO THE CHAIRMAN**

No questions were received for the Chairman.

### **224 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDERS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Four oral questions had been received from members of the public for Cllr Aisha Cuthbert.

Two oral questions had been received for Cllr Nicholas Bennett from members of the public.

Twenty one written questions had been received from the public across both portfolios.

The questions are appended to the published minutes.

## **225 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDERS FROM COUNCILLORS**

Two oral questions from councillors had been received for Cllr Cuthbert.

One oral question from a councillor had been received for Cllr Nicholas Bennett.

Five written questions had been received from councillors across both portfolios.

The questions and responses are attached as appendices to the minutes.

## **226 MATTERS ARISING AND WORK PROGRAMME**

### **CSD22140**

A Member suggested that due to the volume of items on the Work Programme, the current ECS PDS Committee should be split into two committees which would complement the fact that there were now two Portfolio Holders. The Chairman responded and said that the suggestion was noted. Members discussed when data related to particulate matter would next be discussed at Committee. It was likely that this would be in about a year's time as a year was required for this data to be useful. It was agreed that a follow up AQAP report be added to the Work Programme.

A Member wondered why this particular committee meeting was so weighted and loaded with reports as this made it impossible to scrutinise matters properly. The Director for Environment and Public Protection stated that the Work Programme had been agreed by Members.

A Member suggested that as the agenda was voluminous, a 10 minute break should be considered.

**RESOLVED that the Matters Arising and Work Programme report be noted and that an AQAP update report be added to the Work Programme.**

**227 IDVERDE ANNUAL CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REPORT:  
CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF PARKS MANAGEMENT  
AND GROUNDS MAINTENANCE**

Martin Bradley (Operations Director, Idverde), attended to update Members and answer questions. The Chairman drew attention to the Tetra Tech report commissioned by Idverde regarding public satisfaction with grounds maintenance in Bromley. The Chairman asked how Tetra Tech arrived at the question format and it was clarified that the questions were proposed by Idverde in consultation with a consultant. The Chairman noted that the survey had been sent randomly to 3000 people and there had been 336 responses. The Chairman pointed out that with respect to the figure of 3000 this only equated to 1% of the population of Bromley and with a 336 response rate this only constituted 0.001% of the Bromley population. Mr Bradley said that he was disappointed with the response and felt that there needed to be a smarter way to catch feedback. He suggested that electronic surveys may be more useful.

A Member suggested that 'Friends Groups' should be consulted. There were a number of Friends Groups and active Friends Forums, many playing effective roles and the Chairman agreed with this. A Member urged caution and said that if surveys were directed primarily to Friends Groups then casual users may get missed and the results could be skewed. Mr Bradley said that the requirements of the survey needed to be reviewed.

There was a discussion about the condition of Bromley parks and concerns were expressed by Members regarding broken or no benches to sit on, litter, rats, toilets and the dredging of ponds. A Member commented that Chislehurst was the first ward where a park was awarded the 'Green Flag' status. She commented that this status was unlikely to have been achieved without the sterling work undertaken by Friends Groups and she would have liked this to have been noted in the report.

A Member commented on work that had been undertaken by Idverde in the Orpington Ward (Priory Gardens) and said that Idverde had been excellent and had dealt effectively with issues that had arisen.

The Chairman addressed Mr Bradley and said that there was room for improvement which the Committee hoped to see next year.

**RESOLVED that the Idverde Annual Contract Performance Report be noted.**

**228 ECS PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW**

It was noted that regarding the Arboricultural Service, the KSI achieved was 64.53%, which was below the Council's target of 75%. This was because of a backlog of work and key work that needed to be undertaken with respect to

*22 November 2022*

Fix My Street. Meetings were being held with the contractor to deal with the backlog. Members noted the indicators with respect to Riney and the fact that meetings were being held with them to seek improvements.

Members discussed School Travel Plans and it was noted that the Council's target was 90 out of 116 schools. The Council was below target in this regard and was actively seeking to re-engage with schools.

**RESOLVED that the Performance Overview update be noted.**

**229 UPDATE FROM THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR TRANSPORT, HIGHWAYS AND ROAD SAFETY.**

A Member enquired as to the new design of the buses that were intended for the 358 bus route and the Portfolio Holder responded saying that the new buses would look similar to a tram and were exhibited at the NEC recently. These were due to be operational in April 2023.

A Member stated that subsequent to the 'calling in' of the report regarding School Streets on the 15th of July, the Council issued a statement saying that they were supporting school streets. She asked how this was being achieved and if the Council could use contractors to man the barriers. The Portfolio Holder responded and said that the Council would not use contractors as it was the responsibility of the schools to arrange the manning of the barriers.

A Member stated that she had recently attended the Public Transport Liaison Group and was able to view images of the new buses. She had subsequently submitted questions to the representatives of the various operators, but was still awaiting a response after six weeks. The Portfolio Holder said that if the Member forwarded him the details he would try and assist.

**RESOLVED that the update from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety be noted.**

**230 UPDATE FROM THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR SUSTAINABILITY, GREEN SERVICES AND OPEN SPACES**

A Member asked if streets that were located next to schools were given priority in terms of leaf clearing. The Portfolio Holder responded and explained that priority was allocated to streets and roads with a high leaf fall. However, if there was a particular problem with leaf fall at a school then the Council would be prepared to look at that. It was noted that there had been 30 applications with respect to the Jubilee Grant and that the results of the applications would be known by the end of the month.

**RESOLVED that the Update from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces be noted.**

**231 UPDATE FROM EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT CLLR THOMAS TURRELL**

Councillor Turrell assured the Committee that plans to deal with various issues around FMS ('Fix My Street') were progressing and going in the right direction. He said that some exciting plans were being developed and that these would be communicated to the Committee in due course. A Member expressed the view that it would be beneficial for someone from FMS to attend the ECS PDS Committee. The Director for Environment and Public Protection said that he would look into this.

The Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Parks and Open Spaces thanked Councillor Turrell for his great work and support.

**RESOLVED that the update from Executive Assistant Councillor Thomas Turrell be noted.**

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

**a BUDGET MONITORING 2022/23**

**ES20231**

The Committee noted the Budget Monitoring Report for 2022/23.

**RESOLVED that the Environment and Community Services Portfolio Holders be recommended to endorse the 2022/23 revenue budget monitoring for the Environment & Community Services Portfolio.**

**b FUTURE CENTRAL DEPOT SECURITY PROVISION**

**ES20221**

Members noted the report concerning the Future of the Central Depot Security Provision and agreed to accept the recommendations.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces be recommended to agree that from 1st April 2023, security at the Central Depot is provided by Veolia Environmental Services as part of the Waste Collection Contract through a variation process for a period of 4 years at an estimated total cost of £504k for the period of the variation (of which £126k only is charged to the Council).**

**c CONTAMINATED LAND STRATEGY 2022**

*22 November 2022*

**ES20194**

Members noted the final report regarding the Council's Contaminated Land Strategy.

**RESOLVED that:**

**The Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces be recommended to approve the adoption of the finalised Contaminated Land Strategy 2022 and that delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Public Protection & Enforcement to make minor amendments to the Strategy post adoption, should it be required.**

**d LIP FUNDED TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY PROGRAMME**

**ES20227**

A discussion took place concerning the allocation and usage of TfL funding. It was explained that the funding from TfL needed to be recorded as committed to projects. TfL would not want any money that was unspent or returned to them. It was anticipated that the new projects would be reported to the Committee in January and March 2023. The Ward Councillor for Beckenham Town and Copers Cope referenced the junction at Southend Road and Park Road. He was pleased to note that grant funding had been allocated so that modifications could be made at this junction where there had been frequent accidents. It was noted that the Principal Transport Projects Manager was working on a new design for this project alongside design consultants. The new design plans would be provided to the Ward Councillor at his request.

The matter of traffic and road safety programmes and the corresponding level of consultation that would be appropriate with Ward Councillors was discussed.

The Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety expressed his thanks to the Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking for his hard work and dedication.

A Member commented that road traffic schemes should only be developed if they were of benefit to residents.

**RESOLVED that:**

**The Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety be recommended to:**

**1) Approve the draft 2023/24 Transport Improvement Programme set out in Table 5 for submission to TfL for approval of funding, subject to any changes recommended by the ECS PDS committee that are supported by the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways & Road Safety.**

**2) Approve the delegation of any amendments to the programme, once the final allocation is confirmed by TfL, to the Director of Environment & Public Protection in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways & Road Safety.**

**e TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY POLICIES**

**ES20234**

A Member queried why public transport had been classified as ‘active travel’.

A Member stated that it was good to see the policies in one place, however he felt that it was rather negative in some respects. He expressed the view that the stance taken in the report with respect to roundabouts was negative and should have a more positive spin. He said that in his ward, roundabouts had been a successful and cost effective way of forcing traffic to reduce speed. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking explained that the original text in the report had been shortened to save space and so the way the text was written may have conveyed an unnecessary negative view of roundabouts that was not intended. It was possible that this may need to be re-worded before the policy was published on the Council website.

A discussion took place concerning what statistics were taken into consideration when deciding to progress and implement road safety schemes. A Member requested that the Council keep under review the evidence base with respect to the implementation of 20 mph speed restrictions. The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking responded and said that a DFT study had arrived at the conclusion that blanket 20 mph speed restrictions had no impact on reducing casualty figures. In his view, it was not the best way to spend money in order to save lives. He felt that the best way to reduce casualties from road traffic accidents was to focus on accident cluster sites and implement the most appropriate solution for each site. The process for determining what could be regarded as an ‘accident hotspot’ or cluster site was explained.

It was noted that work was underway to implement changes to what was regarded as a dangerous roundabout in Luke Road, Chislehurst.

The Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety reminded Members that the report was a statement of the Council’s traffic and road safety policies at this time.

It was noted that the traffic and road safety policies were already in the public domain in the sense that the report had already been published as part of the agenda on the Council website. However, it was clarified that the policies would be formally published on the Council website after some of the wording was modified.

*22 November 2022*

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder for Highways, Traffic and Road Safety be recommended to confirm the traffic and parking policies set out in Section 3 of the Traffic and Road Safety Policies report.**

**f NATURE FRIENDLY VERGES TRIAL**

**ES202230**

A Member mentioned that some of his residents were not happy with the implementation of a nature friendly verges trial, commenting that they would use their lawn mowers to mow the verges themselves. The Chairman responded and said that in the view of the Committee this would be an act of vandalism. It was felt that a communications/education campaign was required to explain that the trial had a biodiversity aim. It was suggested that explanatory signs could be used, but that care should be exercised so that road signs were not obscured.

**RESOLVED that:**

**The Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces be recommended to approve the trial for Nature Friendly Verges in accordance with the management regime and public engagement proposals set out in this report, at the following sites:**

- **Addington Road (West Wickham/Hayes & Coney Hall)**
- **Beadon Road (Bromley Town)**
- **Copers Cope Road (Beckenham Town & Copers Cope)**
- **Court Road (Orpington)**
- **Downs Hill/Ravensbourne Avenue (Shortlands and Park Langley/Bromley Town/Beckenham & Copers Cope)**
- **Northfield Road (St Mary Cray)**
- **Ormonde Avenue (Farnborough and Crofton)**
- **Pickhurst Lane and Pickhurst Mead (West Wickham/Hayes and Coney Hall)**
- **Rangefield Road Footpath (Plaistow)**
- **River Pool Walk (Penge and Cator)**
- **Warren Road (Chelsfield)**

**g ACCESS ROAD REAR OF 75 - 113 STATION ROAD, WEST WICKHAM - PROPOSED MAKING UP UNDER PRIVATE STREET WORKS PROCEDURE**

**ES20219**

Members noted the report and were happy to accept the recommendations.

The Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety commented that all the Ward Councillors were in favour of the recommendations, but it would have nice to have been consulted.

**RESOLVED** that the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety makes the following decisions:

(As part of the Bromley's Housing Regeneration, the planning application (Application No.21/04851/FULL1) for the redevelopment of the car park site on Croft Avenue to provide a mews of 6 houses comprising 12 flats (6 x 1 bed and 6 x 3 bed) and a detached three storey block of flats comprising 14 units (5 x studio and 9 x 1 bed); with the associated bike and bin stores, car parking, ancillary space, private, communal amenity space and alterations to the access road has been approved, (see also Committee Report by the Renewal, Recreation and Housing Committee on 16th November 2021))

1) Agrees that an access road will be brought up to Adoptable Standards (see attached plan) through Private Street Works (PSW).

2) Makes a First Resolution under s.205(1) of the Highways Act 1980 in respect of the access road to the rear of 75 – 113 Station Road, West Wickham, as follows:

3) Declares that the access road to the rear of 75-113 Station Road, West Wickham is not sewered, levelled, paved, metalled, flagged, channelled, made good and lighted to its satisfaction and therefore resolves to execute street works therein, under the provisions of the Private Street Works Code, as set out in the Highways Act 1980.

**Schedule of Works:**

From the junction of the access road with Croft Avenue to the north, for a distance of 98.0m to the south, as shown on Drg. No. P2359 PAR-ZZ-XX-DR-C 8100 attached.

4) Approves the proposed layout to which it is proposed that the access road be made-up all as shown on Drg. No. P2359-ZZ-XX-DR-C 8100 attached.

5) Agrees that in this instance, the Council meets all the expenses of the Private Street Works scheme, under the provisions of s.236 of the Highways Act 1980.

**h CROFTON ROAD BUS STAND IMPROVEMENT AND PEDESTRIAN/CYCLING ROUTE REVIEW**

**ES20228**

A brief update on the report was provided by the Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking.

*22 November 2022*

Cllr Marlow (Ward Councillor) read out a brief statement on behalf of himself and the other Ward Councillors—Cllr Charles Joel and Councillor Robert Evans. The Ward Councillors expressed concerns regarding the possible uprooting of trees and safety issues on the zebra crossings. It was requested that if there were any trees that were uprooted, that they be re-planted. They expressed the view that the post completion survey yielded mixed results and that ‘measures of success’ should be clearly defined before the implementation of future schemes.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:**

**1) Approve the proposals to rectify the current situation at the westbound bus stop near Orpington Station when buses change drivers which causes delays to other traffic, utilising grant funding from TfL of £77k.**

**2) Agree that any minor changes to the design of this scheme deemed necessary on site are delegated to the Director of Environment and Public Protection, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and Ward Members.**

**i     **PARKING SERVICES - REVIEW OF PARKING FEES AND CHARGING PROCESSES****

**ES20177**

The Committee noted that the proposed changes to parking fees and charging processes would not be applied to the car park at Sundridge Park.

A statement was read out from Cllr Alison Stammers expressing concern that the proposals in the report would have a detrimental impact on residents and businesses. She said that herself and ward colleagues had been inundated with emails urging resistance to the removal of pay and display machines. She highlighted problems with the App and with internet access and the fact that a high percentage of transactions were still being processed using cash. She expressed the view that given the impact of the proposals, there should have been a process of consultation beforehand. She requested therefore that the decision be deferred to allow time for a Boroughwide consultation, or if that was not feasible, time for Ward Councillors to consult with residents and businesses in their respective wards.

The motion for a deferral from Cllr Stammers was seconded by Cllr Ireland. A Member said that she would like to see more work undertaken on the Equality Impact Assessment before progressing any further with the proposals.

Biggin Hill Ward Councillors Melanie Stevens and Sophie Dunbar requested that the following statement be noted in the minutes:

*'We totally oppose the recommendations to implement paid parking bays on Main Road Biggin Hill. To implement would be the death of a very tangible, but struggling "High Street" following Covid, the rise in rent and cost of living. It would result in further retail space being converted into residential dwellings, forcing local residents to travel to shop!*

*The Main Road of Biggin Hill is populated by businesses to the west side and residential properties to the east.*

*The free on street waiting bays are located mainly to the shop side of the Main Road with half a dozen being to the residential side.*

*Most businesses, (83%,) are independent traders which include barbers, beauty & hair salons, florists, card & stationery outlet, post office, convenience stores, food & alcohol retailers, opticians, printing & art design, gift & homewares, butchers, and dry cleaners. None of these have off street free parking and rely on the parking waiting bays for passing trade which they rely on to stop and visit their shops.*

*We have not received any complaints from any shop owners that the waiting bays are abused and any vehicles outstaying their time. They comment on how it increases the footfall and is vital to the ongoing success of their business.*

*The remaining 9% is made up of major supermarket retailers, homeware and food outlets, all with behind store off street free parking facilities.*

*There is always ample parking within these car parks. The danger of making the on street free waiting bays into paid bays is that shoppers will park to the rear of the major chains and then fail to exit onto the Main Road and shop at the independent retailers.*

*In the last 18 months, 2% of retail space has been converted into residential flats; this is due to Covid, high rents and a lack of desire from retailers to take the space.*

*2 % of retail space, which at the present time is still within the planning system, which we envisage, will be converted into residential flats if again this space cannot be let.*

*3 % is owned and run by the local church providing limited, controlled off street, free parking.*

*1 % is the local police station, with dedicated police parking bays.*

*The last bank in Biggin Hill, (Barclays) has just closed, leaving 2 retail units empty for rent.*

*22 November 2022*

*We personally know many of the landlords renting retail space and they have all expressed concern, along with shop owners of the cost of living, the change in the shopping experience, on line, click and collect and the need for all to economise.*

*If fee paid parking is introduced into the Main Road of Biggin Hill, we foresee a downturn in passing trade for the small independent shopkeepers resulting in closure, properties turned into residential flats, leaving only the major chain stores who will not be affected as they have their own free parking facilities for their customers.*

*We as local ward councillors, believe that our residents should have the choice to use independent retailers and have the choice to put food on another families table, pay for a child's swimming lessons, each supporting each other so that our residents are able to lead independent lives, alongside bustling retail giants'*

There was some concern expressed by Members that the removal of the cash parking machines may adversely affect the elderly who may have difficulties adjusting to new technologies and who therefore could become more isolated.

Members noted this was the third tranche of trials, two having already been undertaken. It was noted that so far 102 cash machines had been removed and 131 remained. The Head of Service, Shared Parking Services (Bromley and Bexley), reported that there had been no formal complaints received and no drop off in usage. In terms of a communications campaign, various notices and posters would be provided at various sites and offered for officers to attend in person to assist the public.

The Head of Service, Shared Parking Services (Bromley and Bexley), commented that the cash machines would become more difficult to manage, because going forward (with the expiry of 3g technology) it would be difficult to know which cash machines had money in them, which were in a state of disrepair and which machines had actually been broken into and the cash stolen.

A Member expressed the view that the Council should take advantage of this opportunity to be a progressive Council and make savings. The Ringo Contract Manager had promised to help with the implementation of the project and officers were confident that the public would end up with a better service.

The Chairman said that he would ask Ringo to attend the PDS Committee if there were problems with the service. A Member suggested that Ringo should be asked to come in first.

Cllr Stammers (following up on her initial statement to the Committee) responded and said that she understood the arguments in favour of Ringo,

but asked for a phased implementation to reduce the impact on the elderly and vulnerable.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking said that Apcoa were due to present to the Committee in January and it was possible that Ringo could be asked to co-present with them. The Chairman thought this was a good idea.

There was a mixed response overall to the proposals, some Members felt the proposals were 'too much too soon', would affect the elderly and vulnerable and lose parking revenue, reduce spending power and footfall. Others felt that it was the correct way forward, and would avoid spending on outdated technology and would save the Council money.

The Portfolio Holder for Highways, Traffic and Road Safety pointed out that elderly people drove cars, they taxed, insured and MOTed them, and paid the Congestion Charge if required. He said that a 'smart' phone was not required. Buses were cashless. He said that the Council had to make a choice and could not go down the hybrid route. He said the adoption of the Ringo technology would be accompanied by various public campaigns, leaflets in libraries and supermarkets, signs in offices, in car parks etc. He reminded the Committee that the existing chips would not work after April. In his view the Committee should agree the recommendations of the report.

Councillor Stammers motioned to defer the recommendations which was seconded by Councillor Ireland--this motion was defeated by six votes to four.

The Assistant Director for Traffic and Parking read out a statement from Councillor Jefferys. Councillor Jefferys had referenced the Crown Lane Car Park and if a season ticket scheme could be used there.

The Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety referenced Sundridge Park Car Park and said that he had received representations with respect to this car park from the Leader of the Council (Councillor Colin Smith) Councillor Alisa Igoe and Councillor Tony McPartlan. He thanked them for their representations which were noted.

Members discussed the revised fees for parking charges and residential parking permits.

The Portfolio Holder pointed out that it had been four years since Bromley had increased its parking fees. It was expected that in the future, a review of the parking fees would take place every two years. The Portfolio Holder commented that Bromley's charges were probably the least in London.

There was a vote on whether or not to accept the recommendations in the report; this was motioned by Councillor Fawthrop and seconded by Councillor Tickner. It was agreed that the Portfolio Holder should be recommended to accept the recommendations in the report with the exception of Sundridge Park.

**RESOLVED** that the Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety be recommended to agree the following:

- The proposed tariff increases of 20p to all on and off-street parking locations, as set out in section 3 and appendix one.
- The proposed tariff review timescale being changed to every 2 years as set out in section 3.
- The proposed tariff charges for The Civic Offices car park as set out in section 4.
- The proposed changes to The Hill car park as set out in section 5.
- The proposed evening tariff in Mitre Close as set out in section 6
- The proposed implementation of tariffs in the existing free on and off-street parking places as detailed in section 7
- The proposed permit charges as set out in section 8.
- The proposal to accelerate the removal of all pay and display machines across the Borough as set out in section 9.

**j KELSEY PARK REPLACEMENT BRIDGES (OPTIONS APPRAISAL)**

**ES20224**

The Assistant Director, Carbon Management and Greenspace, briefed the Committee and said that she had met with ward councillors and the Chairman of the 'Friends of Kelsey Park' the evening before the meeting. They had expressed some concern regarding the proposed length of time required to repair 'Bridge B' and had asked if it was possible for this timescale to be constricted. It was explained that the timescale for the repairs was based on professional advice. If there was any way going forward that the process could be accelerated then it would. It was confirmed that the gates on the bridge would be retained as part of the schedule of works.

The Executive Assistant to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces, said that he maintained regular contact with the Friends of Kelsey Park to ensure that they were being informed of any matters relating to the development of the project.

A Member said that it was very sad that just one bridge was being replaced and that the park was not as clean as it should be. A discussion took place regarding section 3.30 of the report concerning the amount of contingency funding and 'unknowns'.

A Member commented that the proposals were just 'sticking plaster', Kelsey Park should be given a much higher priority and that the proposals should have been implemented 5 to 10 years previously. She suggested that funding could be allocated from the 'Shared Prosperity Fund' and possibly from other similar sources. The Portfolio Holder responded and said that the park was

being given a high priority and that this was evidenced from the fact that funds were being drawn down from reserves to be used to repair the bridges in the park. The Portfolio Holder pointed out that the bridges were now coming to the end of their expected 'lifespan'.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces be recommended to:**

**1) Note the potential options explored within the existing market to reduce costs.**

**2) Approve proceeding with the option to replace Bridge B with a new timber footbridge structure and authorise officers to proceed to procurement for a design and build contract to this purpose.**

**3) Approve an addition of £567k to the Capital Programme for the replacement of Footbridge B, with £412k to be funded from the Investment Infrastructure Fund and £155k to be funded from the Healthy Bromley Earmarked Reserve.**

**4) Agree to delegate authority to the Director of Environment and Public Protection in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces to award contracts for the delivery of the footbridge replacement.**

**233 PRE DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS GOING TO THE EXECUTIVE FOR DECISION**

**a DEPOT INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS STAGE 3 UPDATE**

**ES20222**

A Member noted that the report referenced three strategic waste sites. She enquired as to the location of the third site and it was clarified that this site was based in Swanley and that it was a Biogen composting site. Biogen was a private company. It was further noted that the weighbridges would be moving to the Bath Road side of the Depot and a discussion took place as to what impact in terms of noise and traffic this might have on local residents. The Head of Environmental Strategy, Technical Support and Commissioning responded and said that there would be no changes in terms of noise impact and traffic movement times. A Member commented that it had been reported that vehicles were entering and leaving the site before 7:00 am. There was a discussion concerning who owned those vehicles and it was stated that an agreement existed that there should be no vehicles entering or leaving the site before 7:00 am apart from emergencies.

A discussion took place concerning the use of an alternative number plate system to control traffic flow and the possibility of reintroducing a booking system. The Head of Environmental Strategy, Technical Support and

*22 November 2022*

Commissioning said that a number of options would be looked at. There would be twelve months to consider various options and mitigations and an updated report on these matters would be presented to the Committee in November 2023. It was anticipated that the major works on the site would commence early in 2024.

**RESOLVED that the ECS PDS Committee support the recommendations of the report that would be presented to Full Council and the Executive.**

**234       LAWN TENNIS ASSOCIATION PARKS TENNIS RENOVATION FUND**

Members noted that this report had already been scrutinised by the RR&H PDS Committee. Clarification was requested as to whether or not the tennis courts concerned were grass courts or hard courts and it was clarified that the courts being upgraded were hard tennis courts. This had been possible because of grant funding to the value of £230,000 from the LTA.

The sites had been prioritised in terms of need and distance from population centres. The aim was not to build new tennis courts, but to refurbish existing ones. A Member enquired as to why there were no courts in her ward (Penge and Cator) that were on the list to be upgraded. The Sports and Leisure Manager said that he would look into the matter and report back to the Member who had made the enquiry.

**RESOLVED that the Committee support the recommendation to the Executive that the LTA Grant be accepted, subject to standard terms and conditions and agree to the scheme being added to the capital programme.**

**235       POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS**

**236       LBB's NET ZERO CARBON ACTION PLAN REPORTING YEAR THREE**

**ES20220**

**RESOLVED that the Council's Net Zero Carbon Action Plan Reporting for Year 3 be noted.**

**237       FLY-TIPPING ACTION PLAN UPDATE**

**ES20220**

The Portfolio Holder for Traffic, Highways and Road Safety stated that he had spoken to the police on many occasions and encouraged them to stop any lorries carrying waste in the early hours of the morning, as at that time there would be no licenced premises open where the waste could be deposited.

**RESOLVED that the Fly-Tipping Action Plan update be noted.**

**238 OPEN SPACES STRATEGY--YEAR 1 UPDATE**

**ES20223**

A Member expressed concern regarding the audit of open spaces and hoped there would not be any selling off or re-purposing of them. The Assistant Director, Carbon Management and Greenspace responded and said that this was not the purpose of the audit, but rather the purpose was to see how the land and open spaces could be better utilised. A Member commented that it was sad that momentum had been lost and warned against 'bureaucratic creep' which strangled the enthusiasm of volunteers. She encouraged the Council to maintain close links with the Friends Forum. She suggested that it may be prudent (in view of lost momentum) for a six monthly update report to be presented to the Committee.

**RESOLVED that the Open Spaces Strategy—Year 1 Update be noted.**

**239 ECS CONTRACTS REGISTER**

**ES20211**

**RESOLVED that the Contracts Register Report be noted.**

**240 ECS RISK REGISTER**

**ES20215**

**RESOLVED that the ECS Risk Register be noted.**

**241 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION)  
(VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF  
INFORMATION ACT 2000**

**242 FUTURE CENTRAL DEPOT SECURITY PROVISION--PART 2  
REPORT**

Members noted the Part 2 update on the Future Central Depot Security Provision.

**243 DEPOT INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS STAGE 3 UPDATE-PART  
2 REPORT**

Members noted the Part 2 update concerning the Depot Infrastructure Works Stage 3.

**244 ECS CONTRACTS REGISTER: PART 2**

*22 November 2022*

Members noted the Part 2 ECS Contracts Register.

**Oral Questions to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services  
and Open Spaces**

**Oral Questions from the Public and Councillors to the Portfolio Holder  
for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

**Written Questions from Councillors**

**Written Questions from the Public**

The meeting ended at 9.58 pm

Chairman

ECS PDS—22<sup>nd</sup> November 2022

**Oral questions to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces from members of the public and Councillors:**

**Oral Questions from the Public:**

1) Question from Helen Brookfield:

Kelsey Park Bridge. Can the Council clarify why there have been so many delays and periods with no action being taken since the first bridge closed in February 2021?

Response to Question 1:

When the bridges were first closed in 2021, initial investigations by the Council's contractor idverde did identify certain options for replacement bridges, however on further investigation it became apparent that the process for replacing the bridges would be significantly more complex than was originally anticipated. Resources were approved to take this work forward, and subsequent stages have been completed as quickly as possible in compliance with the council's processes for robust governance.

This has included:

- Procuring specialist contractors to undertake surveys
- Produce costed designs
- Work with stakeholders to obtain feedback on the designs
- Ecological and arboriculturally surveys
- Finding contractors and obtaining costs
- Going back out to market to ensure value for money
- Considering all options against a backdrop of high inflation and council budgetary constraints.

I'm very pleased to say that we will be discussing a way forward tonight and if approved, the project can push forward.

2) Question from Helen Brookfield

Kelsey Park Bridge. Can the Council estimate how much extra costs for the works are now likely to be then they would have been if they had started the process of replacing the bridge immediately after it was declared unsafe almost 2 years ago?

Response to Question 2:

Prices were initially obtained back when the bridges were first closed, however these did not take into account the various items outlined in your previous question, for example, the site constraints and substructure requirements, so any comparison would not be meaningful.

The additional work undertaken to date has been necessary to inform design options and the wider business case.

Post meeting Note:

*(Ms Brookfield originally sent in her questions for oral response. On the day of the meeting Ms Brookfield contacted the Council to say that she was no longer able to attend—as Ms Brookfield had contacted the Council, the responses to her questions were provided to her in written form)*

3) Question from Eileen Welsh:

Given the high cost of either repairing or replacing these two bridges did the Council make any applications for extra funding from other funding streams; e.g. Lottery, London Mayor's funding so that both bridges could have been restored to their previous conditions?

Response to Question 3:

We have considered grant funding options for supporting the replacement of the bridges, but we are not recommending proceeding with an application because local authorities do not qualify for a number of community grants and the time it would take to secure the grants would delay us starting works onsite.

Officers have also investigated the availability of s106 of CIL contributions but there is nothing currently available to support this work, but we will pursue CIL money if it does become available.

I have told the Friends Group, they have our support if they want to fundraise to repair the second bridge.

Supplementary Question from Eileen Welsh:

The bridges have needed repairing for some time. There are various funding streams, so why not apply for funding earlier?

Response to the Supplementary Question from Eileen Welsh:

This matter is not straightforward as there are many criteria that need to be matched to successfully source commercial funding

4) Question from Eileen Welsh

There are many maintenance activities required to keep the infrastructure of Bromley's parks in good condition. The bridges are a good example of some considerable neglect over the years. The water in the lakes in the park is at such a low level that the birds are walking on mud and rats are frequently reported. Benches

need re-varnishing and toilets renovating. What is the Council's budget for park maintenance and how is it prioritised?

Response to Eileen Welsh:

The council's budget for maintenance of park assets has historically been met and managed under the annual operational maintenance budget, with works across the whole of the council's estate prioritised to manage risk. The total operational maintenance budget for 2022/23 is £2.314m. However, when setting the budget for 2022/23, the council also put aside an additional £2m in a Building Investment Fund, and an allocation of £250k was specifically made for park infrastructure.

idverde have responsibility for managing health and safety in the borough's parks and open spaces and this includes cyclical inspections of park assets, such as the Kelsey Park Bridges, with recommendations made on repairs.

In addition to this, there are some minor infrastructure repairs that are funded through the council's contract with idverde for the provision of parks management and grounds maintenance, such as bench maintenance, with items prioritised as a result of condition and risk assessments.

The council has recently launched the Parks Platinum Jubilee Fund which will see investment of up to £1m in the borough's parks and open spaces allowing for community-led prioritisation of this investment.

Supplementary Question from Eileen Welsh

Does the maintenance Fund get priority?

Response to the Supplementary Question from Eileen Welsh.

Not in terms of repairs.

The Council is currently reviewing all of its park assets, this includes toilets.

### **Oral Questions from Councillors**

1) Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe

Fly-tipping beside recycling banks in car parks and at sites around the borough is a constant problem, including dumped household waste, mattresses and waste from businesses. Our contractor's cleansing team visit recycling bank sites daily to remove it. Could the Portfolio Holder please confirm that this removed fly-tipping is included in the total number of fly-tipping incidents recorded in the borough?

Response to Cllr Alisa Igoe:

Neighbourhood Management are aware of fly tipping concerns linked to recycling bring sites, our contractors Veolia visit sites regularly to empty banks whilst also clearing loose waste placed beside containers. All reported deposits are included in our fly capture returns.

Enviro-Crime officers visit recycling banks to monitor fly tipping, searching waste for evidence which could lead to enforcement action.

Neighbourhood Management are looking to introduce CCTV at known fly tipping hotspots. This CCTV uses artificial intelligence to identify fly tipping with images sent direct to enforcement officers allowing swift action against those who choose to deposit waste illegally in Bromley.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Igoe:

Are these images counted as part of the total number of fly-tipping incidences in the borough?

Response to the Supplementary Question from Cllr Igoe:

Yes.

2) Question from Cllr Ruth McGregor:

Will the Council commit to carrying out the necessary works to de-silt the canal in Betts Park, which is an important focal and heritage point for the park and the area and which is in need of improvement works.

Response to Cllr Ruth McGregor:

The Council has previously invested in a programme of improvements to Betts Park Canal which have stabilised the bank at the north eastern section of the canal.

Officers have scoped de-silting work that may be of further benefit to the canal as part of my commitment at the September PDS to consider options for improving the health of the borough's water bodies.

However, the costs to undertake works to the water bodies across the borough is predicted to be high, and therefore works will need to be appropriately prioritised considering the financial challenges facing the council in the next four years. This work will continue over the coming months with the results reported back to a meeting of the committee in 2023/24.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Ruth McGregor:

I believe that in the last meeting, there was an identified underspend of £8k which I think was to do with the canal structure rather than de-silting. Given that in the summer there were many health and safety and environmental issues raised by the public. I understand that the required spend is higher than what is in the budget but I would have thought it could be prioritised.

Response to the question from Cllr Ruth McGregor:

I don't have the details to hand. I am very happy to look into this with officers and write back to you.

ECS PDS Committee--22nd of November 2022.

## **Oral questions for the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety.**

### **Oral Questions from the Public**

#### 1) Question from John Perkins:

Many residents in the Crofton area have commented that they do not feel safe using the zebra crossings that were installed as part of the cycleway scheme, partly because of lack of visibility by motorists and partly because of the removal of the central islands. What action does the Council propose to take to address these concerns?

#### Response to Question 1:

This question is disallowed as it was submitted after the ten day period and does not seek clarification on a report to the committee.

#### 2) Question from John Perkins:

Assuming that the Crofton Road widening proposal is agreed by the Committee, when is it envisaged that this work will be started and what is the expected duration?

#### Response to Question 2:

Work is likely to start on site in the Spring, although a work programme cannot be agreed with the contractor until the decision is made by Members to proceed with the scheme.

#### Supplementary Question from John Perkins:

I would just like to comment on the point that this issue has been outstanding for some time since it was identified and all of the Ward Councillors agree that it's a very important safety issue so I would urge you to try and progress the matter with the contractor urgently if that is possible.

#### Response to the Supplementary Question from John Perkins:

Unfortunately we have to wait until we have funding from Transport for London. We have now got that and as soon as its practical I will make a decision and officers will progress this as soon as possible. We will need the contractor to find space in their work programme.

### **Oral Questions from Councillors:**

#### 1) Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:

The Portfolio Holder's decision on School Streets, ref: ES20192, dated 24 June 2022, states "the Council should support schools that were currently operating a

School Street". Could he please tell me in detail what support the Council offered to St Mary's Primary School before the Council closed their School Street on Westgate Road. Thank you

Response to Question 1

The School Street at St Mary's RC Primary School has not been closed, it has been suspended on a temporary basis due to health and safety concerns. Each school is responsible for providing marshals to close the road as well as ensuring their School Street runs as per the Council's operating guidelines and risk assessment. Officers are currently liaising with the school regarding the schools' capacity to be able to fully staff the School Street so it can be reinstated.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Igoe

Are Poverest and Hayes Schools also suspended?

Response to the Supplementary Question from Cllr Igoe:

If you look at my update you will see that Poverest is suspended because they are not manning the barriers. Hayes School is continuing as there are no problems with the barriers.

## ECS PDS—Written Questions from Members

22<sup>nd</sup> November 2022

### 1) Question from Cllr Josh King:

At the full council meeting in October the portfolio holder stated that £1.5M had been spent on maintenance of the depot at Churchfields Road in recent years.

Can the portfolio holder please provide details of what this money was spent on and when it was spent?

#### Response to Question 1:

The statement given by the Portfolio Holder at Full Council on 10th October 2022 was that the Executive had agreed a £1.5 million investment for infrastructure works at Churchfields Road Waste Site. For additional details about these works please see Report ES20222 that will be presented at the Environment and Community Services PDS Committee on 22 November 2022.

### 2) Question from Cllr Sam Webber:

A resident has asked about the removal of signs at the Bromley Palace Park at the Civic Centre previously preventing dogs from being walked here. Could the Portfolio Holder clarify if dog walking is allowed now at this park?

#### Response to Question 2

The signs may have been removed as part of the contractor works being undertaken with the Y Buildings project, however the Bromley Palace Park areas are used as a wedding venue site and it is felt that the location should remain a No Dog Walking area. The signs will be reinstated as soon as possible.

### 3) Question from Cllr Sam Webber:

Would the Portfolio Holder provide a list of all pay & display parking machines which have now been removed and set this out ward by ward following this table which was previously published by the Council.

#### Response to Question 3:

<b>On Street Location</b>	<b>Number of M/Cs removed</b>	<b>Ward</b>
Aldermany Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Aylesbury Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Babbacombe Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Church Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
College Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Cromwell Avenue, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Cromwell Close, Bromley	1	Bromley Town

East Street, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Elmfield Park, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Elmfield Road, Bromley	3	Bromley Town
Ethelbert Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Fernwood Close, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Southview, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Hammelton Road, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Harwood Road, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Hayes Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
High Street, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
High Street, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
High St North, Bromley	3	Bromley Town
North Street, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Palace Grove, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Palace View, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Park Road, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Pinewood Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Queens Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Rafford Way, Bromley	3	Bromley Town
Ravensbourne Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Ringers Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Sandford Road, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Sherman Road, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
South Street, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
St Blaise Avenue, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Station Road, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
West Street, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Westmoreland Road, Bromley	2	Bromley Town
Copers Cope Road, Coper Cope	7	Beckenham Town and Copers Cope
Park Road, Coper Cope	1	Beckenham Town and Copers Cope
Brackley Rd, Coper Cope	1	Beckenham Town and Copers Cope
Beckenham H/, Beckenham	1	Beckenham Town and Copers Cope
Palace View, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
The Chase, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Florence Rd, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Glebe Rd, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Alder Mary Rd, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Ravensbourne Ave, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Meadow Rd, Bromley	1	Bromley Town
Newsted Ave, Orpington	1	Farnborough and Crofton
The Avenue, Orpington	1	Farnborough and Crofton
Hillview, Orpington	1	Petts Wood and Knoll
Orchard Grove, Orpington	1	Petts Wood and Knoll
Mayfield Ave, Orpington	1	Petts Wood and Knoll
Oakhill Rd, Orpington	1	Petts Wood and Knoll
The Drive, Orpington	1	Chelsfield
Spur Rd slip, Orpington	1	Orpington
Knoll rise, Orpington	2	Orpington

Tower Rd, Orpington	1	Farnborough and Crofton
Elm Rd, Clock House	1	Chelsfield
Queens Rd, Clock House	2	Clock House
Clock House Rd, Clock House	1	Clock House
Sidney Rd, Clock House	1	Clock House
Blandford Rd, Clock House	1	Clock House
Thayer's Farm, Clock House	1	Clock House
Cedars Rd, Clock House	1	Clock House
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>88</b>	

<b>Car Park</b>	<b>Number of M/Cs removed</b>	<b>Ward</b>
High St, Chislehurst	1	Chislehurst
High Street, West Wickham	1	West Wickham
Hornbrook House, Chislehurst	1	Chislehurst
Lennard Road New Beckenham	1	Penge and Cator
Ravenswood Ave WW	1	West Wickham
St Georges Road Beckenham	1	Beckenham Town and Copers Cope
Station Approach, Hayes	1	Hayes and Coney Hall
Station Road, Bromley	1	Hayes and Coney Hall
Station Road, WW	1	West Wickham
The SPA, Beckenham	2	Clock House
Village Way, Beckenham	2	Beckenham Town and Copers Cope
West Wickham, Pools	1	West Wickham
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14</b>	

4) Question from Chloe Jane Ross:

At the last full Council Meeting it was suggested that the Environment Matters leaflet could be used to reach those digitally excluded with other important information, such as the inclusion of information on cost of living support services for residents, has this suggestion been taken forward in the upcoming edition of the leaflet?

Response to Question 4

[We are currently investigating the possibility of a wide distribution printed newsletter to go out to residents in the new year.](#)

5) Question from Chloe Jane Ross

With the planned reduction of parking meters across the borough in favour of Ringo, what provisions are being made for the digitally excluded in all parking sites, and is a payment by card facility (in addition to cash) being considered for all the remaining parking meters

Response to question 5:

Please refer to the report at item 13h of the PDS committee agenda, and also the [EIA](#) published on the Council's website

## ECS PDS—22<sup>nd</sup> November 2022.

### Questions to the ECS Portfolio Holders for Written Response from Members of the Public

#### 1) Question from Kat Dayanc:

Has the Council achieved the 2022 target of having “25% of Borough’s stations served by new or upgraded cycle infrastructure” as per the Local Implementation Plan (page 102)?

#### Answer to Question 1:

Of the 26 stations in the Borough, 9 (35%) have secured cycle parking/hubs, 16 (61%) have sheltered cycle parking, and 19 (73%) have cycle parking provision.

#### 2) Question from Kat Dayanc:

As recommended by the Govt in their Active Travel Local Authority Toolkit (updated August 2022) have the Council developed a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan? If so, has the Council produced, “A prioritised programme of infrastructure improvements for future investment in the short, medium and long term.”  
? <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/active-travel-local-authority-toolkit/active-travel-local-authority-toolkit>

#### Active travel: local authority toolkit - GOV.UK

Walking and cycling are the least carbon-intensive ways to travel. However, walking currently accounts for only 4% of the total distance travelled by households with access to a car.

[www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)

#### Answer to Question 2:

Please refer to the Council’s LIP3 document and to the report at 13d on the PDS agenda.  
[Local Implementation Plan \(LIP3\) – London Borough of Bromley](#)

#### 3) Question from Michael Dunn:

Having arbitrarily removed parking meters from roads around the Town Centre, is it the Council's intention to also remove machines from the large car parks in the Borough? If so, what other technology will they install, so as not to discriminate against users that cannot "pay by mobile" for their parking?

#### Answer to Question 3:

Please refer to the report at item 13th of the PDS committee agenda, and also the EIA published on the Council’s website.

A mobile phone can be purchased for less than £20 and can be used to text or ring Ringo to pay for parking.

4) Question from Metin Osman:

I'm enquiring about the public toilets in Keston in Cobham Park which is shut at the moment he has been closed for several years now I will be interested in converted into a coffee shop and also provide a public toilet for the people who uses the park could you advise me on this matter.

Answer to Question 4:

Officers believe the building to which you refer is currently in use by the Friends group there and is used for storage. Officers have had some contact with the chair of this Friends group and understand that they are potentially open to changing their use of the property.

The council is always interested in income generating uses that compliment the green space in which it is based.

However, there is a process that the council must go through if they decide to introduce commercial uses in its property. Under section 123 of the Local Government Act, the council has a duty to seek best value in relation to its assets. Therefore, if the council did decide to allow this property to be used as a café, we would need to market that opportunity so that all prospective tenants have the opportunity to bid.

It should be noted that it would be for any incoming tenant to secure any planning consents and undertake any capital works needed to set up their business in the property.

Marketing properties can be a resource intensive activity, so before we instruct our property department to take this forward, we will first need to do some work to check the viability of a proposal at this site. Officers will look into this and to update you in due course.

5) Question from Richard Gibbons:

Please provide breakdown of number collisions and related casualties by severity (killed, seriously injured, slightly injured) on (a) Rural 'A', 'B', and 'C' & 'U' roads separately, and (b) Urban 'A', 'B', and 'C' & 'U' roads separately in LB Bromley for 2019, 2020 and 2021.

Answer to Question 5:

The Council does not hold the information requested in regard to these classifications. You may wish to refer to the DfT website: [Road accidents and safety statistics - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/road-accidents-and-safety-statistics)

6) Question from Richard Gibbons:

Please provide breakdown of number/type of recycling bins installed at Council's 39 recycling sites (excluding Churchfields and Waldo Road), and number of reports via FMS or otherwise in last 12-month period of fly-tipping at each recycling site by (a) members of public, (b) ward councillors, (c) council officers, (d) Veolia staff.

Answer to Question 6

Table below shows current recycling bring bank assets by type and location. Please note, latest count of location assets recorded in April 2022. Next count due in April 2023.

<b>Recycling bank asset type</b>			
<b>Location</b>	<b>PAPER</b>	<b>MIX</b>	<b>GLASS</b>
Crescent Way, Green Street Green (Pinewood Drive)	2	1	2
Warren Road, Chelsfield (Windsor Drive)	3	2	3
Charterhouse Road, Chelsfield (Saltwood Close)	2	1	3
Eldred Drive, Orpington	1	1	2
Jugland Way, Orpington	1	1	3
Carlton Parade, Orpington (Court Road)	2	1	2
Oasthouse Way, St Mary Cray	1	1	2
St Mary Cray, Station	1	1	3
Cotmandene Crescent Cray (Car Park, St Pauls Cray)	2	2	2
Tesco Sidcup, Edgington Way	0	0	0
Chislehurst Car Park	4	2	3
Kimmeridge Road, Mottingham	2	2	2
Nunnington Close, Mottingham	0	0	0
Rays Road, West Wickham	2	2	2
Hayes train station car park	2	2	4
Sainsbury Car Park, West Wickham	2	1	3
Sparrows Den, West Wickham, Corkscrew Hill	2	2	3
Tesco Car Park, Biggin Hill	2	1	4
Esso Station, Pratts Bottom (Sevenoaks Road)	1	1	3
Petts Wood Station	0	0	0
Locksbottom, Sainsbury	2	2	4
Swan Hill Car Park	1	1	3
Walters Yard Bromley	3	2	3
Lidl, Burnt Ash Lane (site suspended)	0	0	0
Waitrose, Beckenham Junction	0	0	0
St Georges Road Car Park, Beckenham	4	3	5
Harvington Park, South Eden Park Road	2	2	2
Lidl Car Park, Burnhill Road Beckenham	2	1	2
Beckenham Spa Car Park	2	2	3
Penge East Station Car Park	2	2	2

Ledrington Road, Crystal Palace	2	1	2
Tovil Close, Anerley	1	1	3
Croydon Road, Anerley	1	1	2
Pawlene Close, Penge	1	1	2
Shortlands Station Car Park	1	1	2
Baths Road	3	1	3
Magpie Hall Lane, Bromley (TS Narvik)	1	1	2
Normans Park, Hook Farm Road	3	2	3
Bromley South Train Station	2	1	4
Civic Centre Bromley	4	1	2
Sundrige Park Station	3	3	2
Normans Park Hayes Lane	2	2	3

Table below shows recorded reports via the FMS. Please note that Officers and Service providers co-ordinate directly through separate operational platforms.

Recycling bank location	Public	Cllr	Total
Bromley South Train Station	1	0	1
Carlton Parade, Orpington (Court Road)	1	0	1
Charterhouse Road, Chelsfield (Saltwood Close)	1	0	1
Chislehurst Car Park	5	3	8
Crescent Way, Green Street Green (Pinewood Drive)	16	0	16
Croydon Road, Anerley	20	0	20
Eldred Drive, Orpington	2	0	2
Harvington Park, South Eden Park Road	0	1	1
Juglands Road, Orpington	1	0	1
Kimmeridge Road, Mottingham	1	0	1
Ledrington Road, Crystal Palace	1	0	1
Lidl Car Park, Burnhill Road Beckenham	3	0	3
Pawlene Close, Penge	1	2	3
Penge East Station Car Park	53	0	53
Rays Road, West Wickham	3	0	3
Sainsbury Car Park, West Wickham	3	0	3
Shortlands Station Car Park	0	1	1
Sparrows Den, West Wickham, Corkscrew Hill	2	0	2
St Georges Road Car Park, Beckenham	2	0	2
St Mary Cray, Station	1	4	5
Sundrige Park Station	2	0	2
Tovil Close, Anerley	2	0	2
Warren Road, Chelsfield (Windsor Drive)	3	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>135</b>

### 7) Question from Sue Sullis:

La Niña Winter World Weather Patterns Put U.K. at risk of Severe Floods this February 2023. During Flood Action Week, the Met. Office and the Environment Agency have warned of severe flooding in the UK in February, due to Climate Change. The severe drought has increased the risk of increased runoff on baked soils. What is the Council doing to educate and inform people to assist them in coping with this crisis?

### Answer to Question 7

Bromley Council has not taken any direct action to educate people regarding climate change or surface water runoff from baked soils. The Bromley Council web site Flood Risk Management pages direct residents to the detailed information published by the Environment Agency.

### 8) Question from Sue Sullis:

Bromley's Flood Risk Strategy with regard to the October 2021 Flooding in the Crays. The Council failed and refused a request to carry out an investigation despite the responsibility to do so. LFB and Housing Association data demonstrates that at least 20 properties were internally flooded, in an identified Flood Path. What is the reason for this scandalous neglect?

### Answer to Question 8

This question is disallowed on the basis that the same question was asked at the June 2022 meeting.

### 9) Question from Brendan Donegan:

Has the Portfolio Holder for Transport disbanded Bromley's Road Safety Panel and, if so, (a) why? (b) does he have the authority to do this? and (c) is this appropriate given the [report](#) discussed at [the June Environment committee meeting](#) indicating a 26.7% increase in KSIs above the Council's target?

### Answer to Question 9

The Council's concern for road safety is undiminished, but as time moves on processes need to change. At one time there were three Road Safety Panels. As membership numbers declined the three Panels were, with the agreement of the Chairmen, amalgamated into one Panel.

The Road Safety Panel(s) provided helpful feedback to the Council about road safety concerns in the neighbourhoods of their representatives. However, with the increased ability of residents to report matters directly to the Council, for example via Fix My Street, reports from the Police to our professional officers and the local knowledge of ward councillors the need for a Panel, in my view, is no longer needed. The Panel last met in 2019 and the Police had not attended for many

years. The cost of running the Panel in officer time and resources cannot be sustained when the Council faces a growing budget deficit.

10) Question from Brendan Donegan

According to the report "[Air Quality Information for Public Health Professionals – London Borough of Bromley](#)" (published by GLA in February), 57 Bromley schools exceed the interim WHO guideline for PM2.5, and all Bromley schools exceed the WHO guideline for Nitrogen Dioxide. Does Bromley Council support air quality monitoring at schools?

Answer to Question 10:

The National Air Quality Objectives and Air Quality Standards Regulations set the limit and target values. All of our schools comply with the national air quality regulations.

We are working to improve air quality and reduce air pollution via implementation of our Air Quality Action Plan. This includes actions relating to schools and at our monitoring locations. Air quality monitoring is not undertaken at schools however all monitoring stations within London feed into the LLAQN network and the subsequent model, which the report stated in the question relies upon. Based on actual monitoring London wide, a high degree of confidence can be had in the modelled data.

In October 2021 the WHO updated its recommended guidelines for air pollutants. For NO2 guideline annual levels were reduced to 10µgm<sup>-3</sup>. For PM2.5 it tightened the recommended annual average guideline to 5µgm<sup>-3</sup>, while retaining 10µgm<sup>-3</sup> as an interim guideline which the Mayor of London has committed to meet by 2030 (the legal annual average limit is 20µgm<sup>-3</sup>).

The revised WHO recommendations were made in late 2021 and this report published in early 2022, whether such levels are practical or achievable is still to be considered. The Environment Act 2022 requires National Government to set target levels for PM2.5, we are waiting on this level to be set, early indications are that this is likely to be 10µgm<sup>-3</sup> by 2030 for PM2.5.

11) Question from Brenda Davison:

Buckhurst Road - The replacement LED street lamp casts a harsh white spotlight which is so intense you cannot see beyond it and are taken by surprise if someone/something suddenly appears within it. It is far too bright for wildlife. Please could either the bulb be replaced or a cover fitted to modify the light from white to amber?

Answer to Question 11

The lantern has been installed as part of the Council's investment project and meets the design requirements for this type of road. The lanterns are designed to direct light downwards to minimise light pollution, and a shield has recently been fitted. Unfortunately, it would not be possible to install coloured cover, but the light produced by the lantern is a warm white which is more wildlife friendly than the cold white used in some areas.

12) Question from Stuart Ratcliffe:

How can it be that following a road safety audit, the zebra crossings on Crofton Road, especially near to the entrance of Pound Court, are more dangerous than they were before the installation of the cycle lanes? The central bollards have been removed in several places and this means the whole road has to be crossed, rather than one side. Traffic seems to be far more reluctant to stop at the crossings now there are no central bollards.

Answer to Question 12:

[This question is disallowed as it was submitted after the ten day period and does not seek clarification on a report to the committee.](#)

13) Question from Jasper Bell:

Despite a range of data sources highlighting the volume of residents including young children crossing South Eden Park Road, the absence of a safe crossing between Langley Schools and Unicorn School and the assurances given to residents following a meeting with Christine Harris and the previous Portfolio Holder for Transport in July last year, we have been told that a road crossing on this dangerous stretch is not a priority.

Could the portfolio holder please explain why a road with no crossing places or pavement on one side in one section is not a viable candidate for a crossing?

Answer to Question 13:

[This question is disallowed as it was submitted after the ten day period and does not seek clarification on a report to the committee.](#)

14) Question from Jasper Bell

Building on my previous questions, what, specifically, would need to happen for this location to be prioritised for a crossing?

Answer to Question 14:

[This question is disallowed as it was submitted after the ten day period and does not seek clarification on a report to the committee.](#)

15) Question from Kerry Nash:

Noting the Traffic and Road Safety Policies set out in the agenda, could you (a) provide example costs for implementing 20mph on residential streets, (b) explain why Bromley Council believes the marginal gains in creating safer streets that are achieved from introducing 20mph (that could make the difference between life and death for someone hit by a speeding driver) are not worth pursuing, and (c) explain why the Council believes it cannot enforce speed limits? Why wouldn't you do it?

Response to Question 15

a) Although the Council has not undertaken a study, the cost of implementing a borough-wide 20mph scheme would be well in excess of £1m

(b) Reducing the number of casualties on Bromley's streets has long been a priority for this Council, with resources being targeted at vulnerable road users and at locations where data tells us that there is a greatest risk of road casualties. Once we have successfully tackled the locations where, unfortunately, serious incidents are currently occurring, other high-risk locations can be addressed.

The experience the Council has from the various parts of the Borough where area wide 20mph limits have been installed in the past is that we receive very many complaints about speeding, despite the lower limit. Research commissioned by the DfT showed that following the introduction of signed-only 20mph limits the median speed fell by just under 1mph and found no significant change in collisions and casualties. In light of the lack of evidence that introducing widespread 20mph limits is effective, Bromley has no plans to introduce such area-wide 20mph zones. However, in light of evidence that drivers respond better to warnings or regulations where they can see the reason for them, part time advisory 20 limits are being introduced around schools in the Borough, on a case by case basis.

(c) The Council does not have powers to enforce against speeding – this is a function undertaken by the Police.

16) Question from James Brown:

The ECS performance overview notes car use on the school run has decreased from 31 to 27%. This is positive. Can the Council please share an overview of where this decrease in car use has occurred (e.g. which schools or wards)?

Response to Question 16:

I have asked the Travel Plan Team to investigate this, and I will respond when I receive their reply.

17) Question from James Brown:

The ECS performance overview notes that a significant number of schools are "committed to increasing active travel". This is also positive. But what tangible changes have there been?

Response to Question 17

Of 116 eligible schools in the Borough, 83 have an accredited travel plan, with 58 at Gold level, 11 at Silver and 14 at Bronze. Accreditation only comes with action that demonstrates a commitment to active travel and Gold level indicates an increasing numbers of active travellers.

This year we have seen an increase in the number of schools who are taking part in the Junior Travel Ambassador scheme, which sees pupils in years 5 or 6 running road safety projects in their schools. The scheme is popular amongst schools and this year saw the return of the in-person event, which was attended by the Deputy Mayor of Bromley.

Our Smart Movers scheme rewards pupils who travel actively to school with a collectable badge. They must walk, scoot or cycle to school at least 10 times a month to receive a badge. The badges have a different theme each month.

School Streets have overall seen even more pupils 'park and stride' to school, the closure of roads has led to the visibility of more cycling and scooting amongst the primary age group.

Cycle storage fund in 2020 gave schools the opportunity to apply for racks and shelters for bicycles and scooters.

18) Question from Dermot McKibbin:

Kelsey Park Bridge Report. Why have the bridges been allowed to deteriorate so much when the replacement costs are so high? What other facilities in the park need replacing and why?

Response to Question 18:

Although there are no formal records concerning the installation of these bridges, it is believed that they were installed approximately 50 years ago. The bridges have an estimated life of circa 40 years and therefore it is likely that they have come to the end of their durability. The council has undertaken cyclical inspections of the bridges and have undertaken repairs where necessary.

The second part of the question has been rejected as there was no reference to the Kelsey Park Bridge report.

19) Question from Dermot McKibbin:

Kelsey Park Bridge report. What funds are available from central government and or the Big Lottery and the Greater London Authority to replace the poor quality public toilets in Kelsey Park.

Response to Question 19:

The Portfolio Holder has rejected this question as there was no reference to the Kelsey Park Bridge report.

20) Question from Luke Murphy:

On what date did the council officially close the bridges, what is the estimated date for reopening both bridge A and bridge B, and what estimate has the council made of the increased costs of replacing the bridges between when they were first closed and now?

Response to Question 20:

Both bridges have been closed permanently since December 2021 following the recommendation of the structural assessment, however the larger footbridge had been closed for periods before this.

The estimated reopening of the bridge is for around July 2024, following the advised indicative programme outlined in the committee report that takes into account several factors and conditions on site.

Prices were initially obtained back when the bridges first closed, however it later became clear to officers that the repair would be more complex than originally anticipated and need to consider various factors (e.g. the site constraints and substructure requirements). Therefore, any comparison with these original prices would not be meaningful. The additional work undertaken to date has been necessary to inform design options and the wider business case.

21) Question from Luke Murphy:

The Council proposes to only replace one of the bridges with the cost being funded from the Investment Infrastructure Fund and the Healthy Bromley Earmarked Reserve. What is the total available funds in both the fund and the reserve?

Response to Question 21:

The funds are projected to have a combined total of £3.39M remaining at 31 March 2023.