

## ECS PDS: 12<sup>th</sup> June 2024

### Oral Questions from Councillors

#### 1) Question from Councillor Alisa Igoe to the Portfolio Holder for Transport, Highways and Road Safety.

Was it appropriate for Plaistow residents who pay £80pa for parking permits, where parking is already difficult in their CPZ, to be inconvenienced for 2 days by suspension of 32% of restricted parking bays in their road, because a film crew were filming on the footway and in one house?

#### Response to Question 1:

Eight bays were suspended for two days.

Bromley encourages reasonable requests for filming to enhance the reputation of the borough; there are significantly more than 8 bays in the road, and the suspension for a short period of time was therefore agreed.

#### Supplementary Question:

There were 8 bays suspended as well as an additional 7 bays in nearby roads. There are three children that have special needs and are picked up by mini-buses. The mini-buses were not able to park. There was also equipment left on the pavement. This is very disruptive for residents. What is the Council's policy on filming?

#### Response to the Supplementary Question

I am not the person responsible for filming on streets, so this is not really a question for me. With respect to parking permits, no one is guaranteed a parking space. Also, the Council has the right to suspend parking bays as required. Councillor Igoe has not stated where this road is. It would have been useful to have provided specific details of the road.

#### 2) Question from Councillor Alison Stammers:

What is the Council doing to fix all the potholes blighting Chislehurst and indeed our borough and to deal with the potholes that remain, but which are showing as closed on FMS with no date indicating when they will be fixed?

#### Response to Question 2:

Like every authority in the UK and indeed in Europe, great efforts are made to fill potholes in line with our published criteria. FMS reports will be closed if they are duplicates or the work is already programmed.

#### Supplementary Question:

The data on page 57 (section 3.4) only goes to February and does not really show how bad things really are. We see numerous FMS reports closed prematurely and erroneously. We receive numerous resident complaints. The fact of the matter is that we receive continued assurances that backlogs will be reduced and that improvement plans have been in place since February/March. Your report says that you had a meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> May to seek a solution. Due to the sensitivities of this matter, please can we have a discussion under Part 2 so that councillors can be informed of what is actually going to be done please?

Response to the Supplementary Question:

It will be up to the Chairman if we have a discussion under Part 2

Chairman:

Let's get to Part 2 and we will see how we are doing for time.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:

I believe that at the last meeting, Cllr Fawthrop said that he was aware of a pot-hole that was over 400 days old—is that correct Portfolio Holder?

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

Yes, there are a number that are well overdue to be repaired. That was why I had the meeting with Riney and that is why we are having meetings with them regarding their working practices.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Ireland:

The old issue of FMS not being updated properly enrages residents. Has any progress been made to resolve matters so that FMS is updated correctly?

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

We have given extra support to officers regarding FMS. In some cases, the issue may not have met the criteria for the hole to be repaired. It would be helpful (if this is the case) if this was explained on FMS.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Fawthrop:

We need a list of the oldest outstanding pot-holes. I requested this but it has not been brought forward. Does the Portfolio Holder agree that this would be helpful for members of the public? As Cllr Owen would say, all these repeat requests are a cost of failure to actually repair the pot-holes.

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

We need to be aware of duplicates. We will consider Cllr Fawthrop's request to determine if it would be practical or not, as information could be out of date by the next day.

3) Question from Councillor Alisa Igoe:

01/04/23 new regulations came in for a performance-based inspection regime to ensure utility companies resurface roads to best possible standard after street works, so as to prevent potholes developing in future. How much do Bromley charge for inspection and re-inspection, how many have occurred since 01/04/23 and what monetary total has been collected?

Response to Question 3

The cost of each inspection is £50. The income for 2023/24 was £88,350, which equates to 1,767 routine inspections.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Alisa Igoe:

I have noticed that after pot-holes have been repaired, there is a lot of grit left on the road. Is there a system in place for this grit to be swept away?

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

It is up to the contractor to make sure that the road is swept after they have done the work, whether this is a utility company or Riney. If you find a road that has not been swept then please let us know.

4) Question from Councillor Alison Stammers:

There have been higher numbers of PCNs issued by the CEOs in Bromley in recent months. Why is this the case and to what extent is it down to customers having issues with paying by RingGo?

Response to Question 4:

The number of PCNs has increased over a number of years as more CEOs have been employed. The largest increase in PCNs has been for non-parking offences. There is no evidence to suggest that the increase is linked to the removal of Pay and Display machines.