

Written Questions from the Public (30)

1) Question from Sue Sulis

BROMLEY'S ROLE AS THE LEAD LOCAL FLOOD AUTHORITY.

Bromley, as LLFA, is required to prepare and maintain a strategy for local flood risk management in their areas, coordinating views and activities with other local bodies and local communities through public consultation, scrutiny and delivery planning.

Please detail documents and dates when Bromley has carried out these public consultation requirements.

Response to Question 1:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

Public consultation was undertaken when the Local Flood Risk Strategy was prepared in 2015.

The Council cooperates with other bodies including Thames Water, Environment Agency and Thames 21.

2) Question from Sue Sulis

Q.2 The Council has stated that three significant flooding incidents on 10/06/19, 20/07/21 and 21/11/21, in which properties were affected, were reported to the Borough Resilience Forum and the Environment Agency.

Please give the details and dates when each of these reports were published, and where they can be found

Response to Question 2:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

The Borough Resilience Forum was made aware of these incidents, along with the Environment Agency, no formal reports prepared or published.

3) Question from Dermot McKibbon

What is the Council's plan to tackle air pollution outside schools and for older people in the borough? Why is it taking so long to publish the Council's air pollution plan?

Response to Question 3:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

The plan is now live on the website after it was amended to meet new accessibility guidelines.

4) Question from Dermot McKibbon

Has the Portfolio Holder read the report by the Environmental Research Group at Imperial College London "[London Health Burden of Current Air Pollution and Future Health Benefits of Mayoral Air Quality Policies](#)"? What plans does the Council have to reduce deaths in Bromley due to toxic air?

Response to Question 4

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

Yes, I am aware of the report and in fact, we met the writers of the report with the Director of Public Health to understand their methodology. The report concludes that anyone in Bromley who has died of any respiratory or cardiovascular causes, died from air pollution. As there are a number of reasons/ causes for these types of deaths, the report cannot conclude these same people died of poor air quality.

The authors failed to adjust their results to consider the age profile of each London borough.

In LB Bromley the age profile has significantly greater representation from older age groups, this caused the results and the conclusions of the report to be exaggerated for Bromley, as the numbers of death per head of population is, quite naturally, generally higher than for other boroughs. In comparison LB Lambeth, who have greater representation from younger age groups saw their results significantly minimised. To have considered the boroughs to be homogenous in terms of age profile is unfortunate and has led to results that do not reflect reality with regards to the conclusions regarding number of early deaths due to poor air quality.

It must be noted that air quality in the LB Bromley has met all UK air quality standards for the last 2 years, has arguably the best air quality of all London Boroughs and it continues to improve.

The Council's approved Air Quality Action Plan outlines the many commitments the Authority has made and is actioning to continue to improve air quality for all residents in the borough. A hard copy of the Plan is available by emailing ehs-customer@bromley.gov.com

5) Question from Eileen Welsh

I am shocked by the amount of unsightly litter and decaying leaf debris left along the streets and kerbsides of the residential roads in Beckenham, creating slippery pavements and blocked drains. Does the Council have a schedule for street and kerbside cleaning in residential areas, or do they totally rely on residents to report build-up of litter and blocked drains?

Response to Question 5:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

The Council does have a full, published schedule for street cleansing across the full 56 square miles and 3,000 plus roads in the borough as well as a client monitoring team that oversees the service provider's outputs. Operating across such a large area has its challenges admittedly, but there is no reliance on residents or volunteers. That said however, the work those residents or volunteers do is highly valued and supported through our Street Friends scheme. Beckenham is a broad area and comes with challenges of its own including heavily parked-up sections and tree-lined streets. If there are specific locations that we can look at with a view to improving the amenity we would be very happy to receive those and would work hard to improve standards.

6) Question from Laura Holdgate

Park Road/Southend Road Junction:

Why has the decision been made to go ahead with a different road design without gathering any clear evidence as to its impact, in particular given the limited effectiveness of four arm roundabouts, as noted in paragraph 3.3 of the public report? This seems contrary to the original plan to have a 12 month trial period of the initial solution, which clearly has merit in understanding traffic flows and displacement.

Response to Question 6:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

During the design of this proposed solution to the ongoing collision problem at this location, all guidance was taken into consideration. There are many locations across the UK where four-arm mini-roundabouts have been successfully used and do result in a reduced number of casualties and their severity.

If we were to introduce a three-arm mini roundabout there is more chance of displacing traffic to other routes and thereby inadvertently causing what is known as “collision migration”.

7) Question from Laura Holdgate

Park Road/Southend Road Junction:

Why has there been no consultation on the new solution? Given that 108 people responded to the last proposal it is clearly an issue of interest, surely this revised solution should be given the same opportunity to receive support or objection?

Response to Question 7:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

The previous consultation was based on the premise that Park Road would be closed, which would have had a possible major impact on traffic flows in this area. Although the current proposal may have a small impact on the routes drivers choose to take, it would not have the same potential impact on residents as the closure of Park Road might have done.

8) Question from Jennifer Geary

Proposal for roundabout at Foxgrove Road Junction:

How will BPP residents access the roundabout (via Foxgrove Road or Southend?) and how will sufficient priority be given to BPP residents at times of high traffic?

Response to Question 8:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Residents and visitors will still be able to enter and exit Beckenham Place Park (BPP) but in a more safe and controlled way than is currently possible. The introduction of the roundabout will reduce speeds and present more opportunities for side road traffic, including BPP, to enter the main junction

9) Question from Jennifer Geary

Proposal for roundabout at Foxgrove Road Junction:

Was a 5-arm roundabout, incorporating access from BPP, considered?

Response to Question 9:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

A five-arm mini-roundabout was considered but was not a recommended approach due to the limited benefits and because the existing geometry and restricted space would not enable a safe layout to be achieved.

10) Question from Martin Beasley

Mini roundabout at junction of Southern Road, Parke Road and Foxgrove:

Agenda Item Para 3.2 is misleading. Council Letter Feb 2022 stated:

*".....invited to take part in a **formal consultation after the experimental closure has been in place for a minimum of 12 months** to provide their views....."*

Residents misled to believe no comments needed immediately, hence comments which were received are distorted, giving people in favour less likely to comment.

Why has the Council changed and embarked on £1.3m scheme based on incomplete and biased comments?

Response to Question 10

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety:

The cost of this scheme is estimated at £125k, not £1.3M. The previous consultation was based on the premise that Park Road would be closed, which would have had a possible major impact on traffic flows in this area. Although the current proposal may have a small impact on the routes drivers choose to take, it would not have the same potential impact on residents as the closure of Park Road might have done.*

11) Question from Martin Beasley

Mini roundabout at junction of Southern Road, Parke Road and Foxgrove

Southend Road daytime traffic exceeds +1100 vehicles/hour (Council survey 2021), over double National recommended volume for 4 arm mini-roundabout.

If include Park, Foxgrove, Covid etc, likely volume is 3X National limit (recent resident survey +1500 vehicles/hour).

Report makes superfluous safety claim as not based on the proposed junction.

Why have the Council ignored National recommendations on maximum traffic volume and based safety gains on data not related to the 4 arm/high volume roundabout in question?

Response to Question 11:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety:

During the design of this proposed solution to the ongoing collision problem at this location, all guidance was taken into consideration. There are many locations across the UK where four-arm mini-roundabouts have been successfully used where traffic flow is not balanced. If there was not a serious problem at this junction we would not be proposing these changes.

12) Question from Marc Briggs

Reference to agenda item 13b

When the junction of Southend Road and Park Road suffers from a very poor injury crash record (item 3.1), and 3-arm roundabouts are more effective than 4-arm roundabouts at reducing collisions (item 3.3). What evidence do the council members have that the installation of a 4-arm roundabout will reduce the risk to pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers sufficiently, when a 3-arm roundabout is achievable?

Response to Question 12

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

During the design of this proposed solution to the ongoing collision problem at this location appropriate design guidance was taken into consideration. There are many locations across the UK where four-arm mini-roundabouts have been successfully used.

If we were to introduce a three-arm mini roundabout there is more chance of displacing traffic to other routes and thereby inadvertently causing what is known as "collision migration".

13) Question from Marc Briggs

Reference to agenda item 13b

If the closure of Park Road, and the installation of a 3-arm roundabout offers the safest option (item 3.3) for all road users (item 8.1), and the council is rejecting this solution based on the feedback from 79 emails (item 3.2). Can the council explain why the revised 4-arm solution is not given the same opportunity for public consultation?

Response to Question 13

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

The previous consultation was based on the premise that Park Road would be closed, which would have had a possible major impact on traffic flows in this area. Although the current proposal may have a small impact on the routes drivers choose to take, it would not have the same potential impact on residents as the closure of Park Road might have done.

14) Question from Gareth Anderson

Proposed roundabout at Foxgrove Road/South End Road Junction.

What allowances are in place to prevent this congestion, for example will vehicles continue to be able to enter and exit BPP from or onto Southend Road via the cobbles as they do now?

Response to Question 14

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Residents and visitors will still be able to enter and exit BPP but in a more safe and controlled way than is currently possible. Drivers will still be able to cross the cobbles where this will help. The introduction of the roundabout will reduce speeds and present more opportunities for side road traffic, including BPP, to enter the main junction.

15) Question from Gareth Anderson

Proposed roundabout at Foxgrove Road/South End Road Junction.

Given the very high cost of the roundabout and the fact it could increase rather than decrease congestion and safety concerns, could alternative measures be imposed such as a 20mph speed limit and potentially adding speed cameras for this section of Southend Road?

Response to Question 15

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

The recommended design represents good value in terms of collisions prevented per pound spent and is thought to be far more effective as a casualty reduction scheme than would be a 20mph speed limit. The siting of speed cameras is not a matter for the Council but for the Police and TfL.

16) Question from Silvano and Gillian Deblasi

Proposal for roundabout at Junction of Foxgrove Road, Park Road, Southend Road, Beckenham Place Park.*

It is currently nearly an impossibility to access Southend Road from the Park, as we normally end up blocking the access into Foxgrove Road on trying to join Foxgrove Road to exit, with a roundabout there we would have to do a virtual U-turn to turn right into Southend Road, we may even have to turn left into Foxgrove Road, do a U-turn at some point, then join the traffic queue to access Southend Road. How will priority be given to vehicles exiting Beckenham Place Park?

Response to Question 16

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

Residents and visitors will still be able to enter and exit BPP but more safely and controlled than is currently possible. The introduction of the roundabout will reduce speeds and present more opportunities for side road traffic, including BPP, to enter the main junction.

17) Question from Silvano and Gillian Deblasi

We believe that a 4-arm roundabout is untenable, a 5-arm roundabout would be a better option as this would include Beckenham Place Park; is this an option you are prepared to consider?

Response to Question 17:

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety

This was considered and not recommended because of the limited benefits and because the existing geometry and restricted space would not enable a safe layout to be achieved.

18) Question from Richard Gibbons

Re. Item 12. ECS Performance Overview and 13d. Draft Portfolio Plan. Notably absent is any reference to the epidemic of casual littering, and specifically the discarding of nitrous oxide cylinders and disposable vapes,

both of which are misused by and injurious to young people. How do you plan to tackle these issues?

Response to Question 18

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

Any variety of fly-tipped, dumped or illegitimately discarded waste, including that which has been specifically mentioned, that is on the public highway, will be proactively removed via baseline cleansing frequencies or via targeted reactive resources such as upon receipt of a report from a member of the client team or public.

We are teaming up with Veolia to launch a new anti-littering campaign and we hope residents will help us to encourage everyone to look after our environment.

19) Question from Richard Gibbons

Re. Item 13e. Tree Management Strategy 2023-2027 and Indicator 7, (a) how many Tree Friends are currently registered, (b) what are your targets/dates for recruiting more Tree Friends, (c) when will the Tree Database website go public, and (d) when will the updated Tree Friends Toolkit be published?

Response to Question 19

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

- a) Only coordinators are currently registered. There are 90 coordinators.
- b) Targets will be defined after the re-launch and existing tree friends have re-registered.
- c) Seeking clarification

We are working toward a release date of the 30/04/23 in time for the tree watering season.

