

**Council**

**27 February 2023**

**Questions from Members of the Public for Written Reply**

**1. From Carrie Heitmeyer to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

How much money has Bromley Council already spent challenging ULEZ expansion, how much will Bromley Council be eligible to pay when it loses its proposed legal action, and how can this be justified when the Council has recently claimed “a budget gap of £29.6million is predicted in three years’ time”?

**Reply:**

The Council has not yet paid any money in seeking legal advice and seeking a Judicial Review. Any legal costs which are incurred, will be shared with the four other authorities joined in the application.

**2. From Laura Vogel to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

On 13 January Bromley Council published a statement in which the Leader claimed ULEZ is “cynical”. How is this statement in keeping with the [Code of Recommended Practice on Local Authority Publicity](#) which states publicity by local authorities should be “even-handed” and “issued with care during periods of heightened sensitivity”?

**Reply:**

The Council is not in a period of ‘heightened sensitivity’. The quote from Leader of the Council is part of the background as to why the Council, in conjunction with four other local authorities is seeking a Judicial Review of the Mayor of London’s decision. I refer you to Paragraph 20 of the Code.

**3. From Laura Vogel to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

Council Leader Colin Smith has devoted a lot of Council time and resource to campaigning against ULEZ expansion. Does the Council have data on number of Bromley residents affected by ULEZ expansion, and wouldn’t it be better to focus on improving protections for those residents rather than opposing ULEZ?

**Reply:**

The Council and, we believe, the Mayor of London does not hold such information as it would include people working in the borough but whose vehicle is registered to an address in another authority. The Council, which has not received any money for the Principal Road Network from TfL for some years and very little for local schemes believes that if the money to be spent on cameras and signs was reallocated to the boroughs, they could take much more effective action to reduce air pollution.

#### **4. From Gary Kent to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

Please provide details on proposed contract with Alliance Leisure for West Wickham Leisure Centre. Lack of information worries West Wickham residents given the rapidly deteriorating state of repair of this important local facility. Please also provide information on temporary alternative leisure facilities during the redevelopment/refurbishment of the Leisure Centre.

##### **Reply:**

Alliance Leisure Services has been contracted by the London Borough of Bromley to undertake feasibility and survey works for both The Walnuts and West Wickham leisure centres. This work will include: building surveys, high level block plans, research on need, and an extensive consultation process via surveys and focus groups. It is expected that any redevelopment of West Wickham Leisure Centre will be within the existing building envelope. There will be no temporary swimming pool during the works period as it is too costly and would use half the budget available, however, there is the possibility that the operator may be able to offer temporary provision of fitness classes.

#### **5. From Brendan Donegan to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

On 13 January Bromley Council [published a statement](#) claiming the Mayor of London's decision to expand ULEZ is based on "highly questionable, selective and incomplete findings of a research paper commissioned by TfL". Why are the research findings "highly questionable" and do you have any evidence to support your assertions?

##### **Reply:**

The evidence will be part of the Council's legal case and will be published by the court.

#### **6. From Brendan Donegan to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

4,000 Londoners die prematurely due to air pollution every year; in Lewisham, Ella Kissi-Debrah was the first person in the world with air pollution as cause of death. Bromley Council's recent [statement](#) opposing ULEZ expansion claims "Bromley already has amongst the cleanest air in London". Surely this misses the point?

##### **Reply:**

The Council, which has not received any money for the Principal Road Network from TfL for some years and very little for local schemes believes that if the money to be spent on cameras and signs was reallocated to the boroughs, they could take much more effective action to reduce air pollution.

## **7. From Janette Sewell to the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection and Safety**

Please provide: (a) number of operating HMOs in Bromley that the Council has licensed, (b) number of unlicensed HMOs operating in the borough, (c) number of HMO applications the Council has in progress, listing both applications received before 1 September 2022 and after 1 September separately.

### **Reply:**

(a) 265

(b) The Council does not hold this information

(c) Applications in progress made prior to 01/09/22 = 76,  
Applications in progress made after 01/09/22 = 32

## **8. From Susan Sulis to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

Bromley worked with local landowners to improve an 'Ordinary Watercourse' in Seymour Drive, which had not flooded homes internally. In 2021, 20+ St. Mary Cray homes were flooded internally, when water from Greenbelt farmland owned by a land speculator, overflowed its 'Ordinary Watercourse'. Will Bromley approach the owners to seek improvements?

### **Reply:**

The flooding at Seymour Drive was the result of a severe storm in which the exceeded the capacity of the drainage system. Liability lies with landowners who are responsible for the management Watercourse.

## **9. From Susan Sulis to the Chairman of General Purposes and Licensing Committee**

The Council's Constitution states that citizens have the right to see non-confidential reports and 'background papers.' When 'background papers', cited as evidence in reports, and relied on to a material extent in preparing reports, are not listed by the report's author, how can citizens enjoy their rights?

### **Reply:**

Background papers are required to be listed in each report (a box is provided in the standard template for this purpose) and should be produced on request. Sometimes there are no background papers, but in most cases there are relevant documents used in preparation of the report which should be listed by the report author, whose contact details are provided on each report. I have asked officers to remind report authors of this requirement.

## **10. From Dermot McKibbin to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

How many households have been rehoused from houses in multiple occupation (hmo's) on the Council's rehousing list, how many of these properties are licensed, what steps does the Council undertake to ensure that rehousing applicants living in hmo's are in fact living in licensed hmo's?

**Reply:**

The Council does not hold this information in a reportable format as it is not part of the statutory returns. However, when an applicant applies for housing support if there are concerns about the status of the property they are currently living in a referral will be made to public protection colleagues for investigation. Any accommodation utilized by the Council would be subject to checks to ensure that the properties meet all required standards including licensing if applicable.

**11. From Dermot McKibbin to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal, Recreation and Housing**

Please show for all wards in the borough for the 2011 and the 2021 census the number of households renting privately, the number of owner occupiers and the number renting from a housing association. Please show these figures as a percentage of the total households in each ward.

**Reply:**

Please see attached spreadsheets providing data from the census (Appendix 1 – to follow.)

**12. From Richard Gibbons to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

According to Census 2021 there are 135,800 households in LB Bromley. 23% of households do not own or have access to a car or van. Of the remaining 77% of households, how many households do not own or have access to one or more ULEZ-compliant vehicles?

**Reply:**

The Council and, we believe, the Mayor of London does not hold such information as it would include people working in the borough but whose vehicle is registered to an address in another authority.

**13. From Richard Gibbons to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety**

According to Census 2021 there are 330,000 residents in LB Bromley. 76,600 residents are over 60 years of age and eligible for a 60+/Freedom Pass. How many residents currently have a valid 60+/Freedom Pass?

**Reply:**

No details are held of the number of people with a 60+ Oyster card as these are issued by Transport for London. The number of residents with an Older Person's Freedom Pass is 53,393