

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 29 November 2010

### **Present:**

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)  
Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Kathy Bance, Jane Beckley, Ellie Harmer,  
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Nick Milner, Ian F. Payne,  
Richard Scoates and Michael Turner

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Peter Fortune, Councillor Julian Grainger,  
Councillor Colin Smith and Councillor Tim Stevens J.P.

### **59 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Councillor Papworth.

### **60 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

### **61 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

Councillor Grainger put two questions to the Committee, which were answered by the Chairman. These are summarised at **Appendix A**.

### **62 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING**

Questions for oral reply were put to the Portfolio Holder for answer; a summary of these is attached at **Appendix B**.

Questions for written reply were put to the Portfolio Holder by Mr Colin Willetts, Mr Jeff Thurgood and Mr David Stark. These questions and replies are at **Appendix C**.

### **63 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS**

Decisions of the Portfolio Holder taken since the Committee's meeting on 9th November 2010 were noted.

**64 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**65 LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (LIP) - DRAFT CONSULTATION**

**Report ES10173**

Members considered a Draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP) for submission to TfL no later than 20th December 2010.

It was proposed to use the draft for consulting a range of statutory consultees and other stakeholders. When comments had been received from TfL and others it was intended to seek approval for a final LIP in spring or early summer 2011.

Following a recent TfL notification of reduced funding for the borough 2011/12 to 2013/14, it was not possible to include the implications of this in the draft LIP given its production timetable; the draft LIP was therefore based on the original funding levels and decisions taken by Council in September 2010. A disclaimer to this effect was included the LIP Delivery Plan section. A recommended final version would be put before the Committee for pre-decision scrutiny in the spring.

In discussion, the Committee highlighted the following issues for future consideration as the drafting process progressed:

- The importance of including the implications of any sharp drop in Mayoral funding for mandatory projects or targets within the risk assessment that was yet to be drafted;
- Ways in which the Committee could seek to hold TfL to account for its responsibilities to deliver against certain of the LIP objectives;
- The ability to fine-tune certain targets or objectives at a local level to assist in prioritising efforts (such as focussing efforts against school run congestion in areas where there was a tangible impact on local economic activity);
- Given the Borough's demographics, ensuring that there was consultation with groups representing older people's interests, and also interest groups such as cyclists' associations and the Institute of Advanced Motorists;
- The implications of the Borough's inclusion within the current south London sub-region, as opposed to the east London sub-region (noting that this was being actively discussed elsewhere);
- Exploring the Council's position on key issues of local interest, such as the pros and cons of discouraging parking by 'railheading' commuters

in the area, as opposed to them driving through the Borough, adding to congestion; and

- The relative position of the Council on certain key benchmarked indicators, such as the reduction rate for road safety injuries.

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

**(1) approve the updated draft Local Implementation Plan attached as an Appendix to Report ES10173 for submission to Transport for London (TfL) by 20<sup>th</sup> December; and**

**(2) authorise the Director of Environmental Services to make minor presentational or drafting changes prior to submission.**

**66            BROMLEY TOWN CENTRE VARIABLE MESSAGE SIGN SYSTEM FOR CAR PARKING**

**Report ES10152**

There would be a loss of town centre parking as a consequence of several development sites identified in the Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) and congestion problems were already caused by vehicles queuing to enter some of the town centre car parks e.g. The Glades and the Civic Centre car parks on some Saturdays and especially during the Christmas period. The repairs needed to The Hill car park would also lead to a further reduction in supply.

Therefore, to assist with the management of parking traffic a proposal was considered for the procurement and implementation of a variable message sign (VMS) system for car parks at Bromley Town Centre. A VMS system would provide motorists with real time information on available parking spaces in the town centre. Benefits envisaged for the area included not only the potential encouragement of shoppers to the Town Centre by making parking easier and quicker, but also reduction on traffic congestion and consequent reduction in carbon emissions.

The Committee was informed that this proposal had been received positively by all the major car park operators and businesses such as the Glades. The Renewal and Recreation Portfolio Holder and key staff working on his portfolio were also supportive. Supermarkets had been approached but were not interested in participating since they wished to keep their spaces for their own customers rather than for more general town centre use.

In discussion the Committee explored whether there was direct evidence that such a scheme had boosted economic activity or wellbeing elsewhere. Whilst this was difficult to quantify, they were told that those who had adopted such schemes continued to support them.

Whilst in the longer term the Committee were keen to see more encouragement of modal shift across to public transport and park and ride type approaches (and supported these being promoted through this signage in time) it was accepted that more immediately this would be a useful way to ensure that remaining parking spaces in the town were well-used. The Committee were also assured that care would be taken not to add to street sign clutter through this scheme, but that where possible existing and more confusing signage would be removed.

**RESOVED that the procurement and implementation of a VMS system for car parking in Bromley Town centre be supported at a cost of up to £200k, to be funded from TfL formula budgets during 2010/11 and 2011/12.**

**67            VEHICLE CROSSING TO THE REAR OF 75 KENWOOD DRIVE**

**Report ES10157**

The Chairman advised that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the Director of Environmental Services.

**RESOLVED that the item be deferred.**

**68            MAIN ROAD BIGGIN HILL BANNED RIGHT HAND TURN INTO AND OUT OF SUNNINGVALE AVENUE**

**Report ES10171**

Following concerns raised by Sunningvale Avenue residents on the volume and type of traffic using Sunningvale Avenue and concerns about the safety of vehicles turning right out of the eastern arm of Sunningvale Avenue, a proposal was developed to implement a banned right turn into Sunningvale Avenue from Main Road and a banned right turn out of the eastern arm of Sunningvale Avenue into Main Road, as shown in drawing number ESD-10654-1. The proposal also included some amendments to the lane markings in Main Road.

Members were apprised of the outcome of public consultation and a Portfolio Holder decision was sought on the proposed changes.

Following consideration Members supported the proposal and it was **RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to introduce a banned right turn into Sunningvale Avenue from Main Road and a banned right turn into Main Road from the eastern arm of Sunningvale Avenue as described at paragraph 3.5 of Report ES10171 and shown in drawing number ESD-10654-1.**

## **69 ORPINGTON PARKING REVIEW - THE RIDGE AREA**

### **Report ES10176**

In August a decision was taken to make changes to the parking arrangements around Orpington, following a review of parking in the area. A decision was made to give special consideration to issues in The Ridge and surrounding roads and Members considered a report with information on the views of residents and Members. The Committee had already listened to the various issues and concerns of residents expressed through their questions to the Portfolio Holder earlier in the meeting.

On behalf of the local ward councillors Councillor Stevens conveyed their views that although views differed on exactly how to achieve this, a majority of local residents wanted some form of parking restrictions to be introduced. The ward councillors' view was that, whilst there could be some debate as to whether it was right to supply the flank fence parking policy retrospectively, it was important to take action and that this needed to cover a wider area because of the likelihood of parking displacement in the locality. The three ward councillors supported this scheme going ahead, subject to full and rigorous consultation at the end of the six month review period, and that the Council should be prepared to make changes if it was not working as hoped.

Committee members supported this approach, acknowledging that it was hard in a scheme like this to satisfy all residents. They concurred with the need for a full and thorough review, involving extensive resident consultation, and were anxious to ensure that the review was structured to take account of different areas that had emerged based on parking patterns arising from changed behaviour because of the scheme, particularly any perceived displacement.

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

**(1) Monday to Friday, 11am to Noon waiting restrictions be implemented in The Ridge, Hilltop Gardens, Pound Close and a small section of Pound Court Drive, as shown in diagram ESD-10539-2 Revision H, with gaps being left in the yellow lines as shown to allow free parking;**

**(2) No changes be implemented in Darrick Wood Road; and**

**(3) The scheme be subject to a full and thorough review after no more than six months of implementing the changes made on-street with further amendments being made at this time if necessary.**

## **70 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN**

### **Report ES10174**

Members considered a recommended structure and priority outcomes for the 2011/12 Environment Portfolio Plan. An actual draft Portfolio Plan would be

reported to the Committee on 5th April 2011 for consideration and then on to the Environment Portfolio Holder.

The Committee discussed the rationale for continuing to sustain the Portfolio Plan approach, and concluded that they wished to see one retained in order to provide a clear statement of portfolio priorities for the benefit of staff and the public, and to provide a yardstick to measure achievement against objectives that could be used by the public and by this scrutiny committee to hold the Portfolio Holder and Chief Officer accountable.

Councillor Turner requested that his vote against retention be recorded.

The Committee requested that when the Portfolio Holder considered the future structure and content of the 2011/12 Portfolio Plan he considered including a specific heading on reducing the impact of carbon tax, because of the financial imperatives of finding ways to do this; and they supported the continued development of green spaces across the Borough.

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

- (1) note the report;**
- (2) produce a Portfolio Plan for 2011/12; and**
- (3) consider adding a specific item on minimising the financial impact of the Carbon Tax.**

## **71 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2010/11; HALF YEAR PROGRESS REPORT**

### **Report ES10175**

Members considered progress at the half year stage against commitments in the 2010/11 Environment Portfolio Plan.

Given the growing focus on parking issues, as demonstrated by discussions elsewhere on the agenda, they suggested that any feasibility study on future Park and Ride options should seek specific input from Members. Officers were asked to organise an informal meeting with Members of this Committee early on during the feasibility study. It was also suggested that linkages with the proposed VMS scheme should be considered.

The Committee also expressed an interest in the timetable and financial arrangements for the proposed anaerobic digestion plant; they noted that this initiative was being led by the current composting facility operator with Veolia having a role to agree an appropriate gate fee for using the facility. There were potentially some benefits in having this facility sited locally, thereby reducing the transport cost created by having to transport putrescible waste outside the Borough.

**RESOLVED** that progress against the 2010/11 Environment Portfolio Plan be noted and that an invitation should be extended to all Committee Members to attend an informal meeting on the Park and Ride objective.

## **72 WORKING GROUP REVIEW OF THE STREET CLEANSING CONTRACT**

### **Report ES10170**

The Member Working Group commissioned by the Committee to consider the street cleansing contract (due for retendering in March 2011) had carried out its review and provided a report. The Group had concentrated its investigation on challenges for street cleansing in the borough, considering directly related service topics and their contractual arrangements, and exploring approaches that moved away from the more traditional input-led specification approach to one which looked at ways of targeting street cleansing activities more directly to local circumstances and demands. They also supported approaches that reinforced community involvement and corporate social responsibility within more flexible arrangements, not only contributing towards supporting the desired outputs but also monitoring of the work undertaken.

A slightly amended version of the report was tabled, which incorporated comments passed to the Chairman by Working Group members.

**RESOLVED** that the Committee endorse the recommendations of the Working Group as outlined in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.4 of its report.

## **APPENDIX**

### **Appendix A**

#### **ENVIRONMENT PDS – 29th NOVEMBER 2010**

#### **QUESTIONS TO THE PDS CHAIRMAN FOR ORAL REPLY**

##### **Questions received from Councillor Julian Grainger**

1. Does the Chairman support the Policy aspiration within Building a Better Bromley of "*vibrant and thriving town centres*"?

##### **Reply**

Yes

2. Given that the Council has a policy aim in Building a Better Bromley of

"vibrant and thriving town centres", can the Chairman explain how the displacement of over 100 cars firstly from the Walnuts Road estate (just 400 yards from the High Street) and then from the long roads either side of Spur Road encourages either staff or shoppers to choose Orpington Town Centre? Alternatively, does he think that the policy aim be changed to seek something like "sleepy and car free town centres"?

### **Reply**

I completely disagree with the questioner, I believe that shoppers, students, sports centre users and shortly library users are primarily attracted to town centres by their facilities.

At most times of year there is a plentiful supply of parking in and around Orpington High Street. Residents and visitors now have the choice of 2 supermarket car parks which offer free or reimbursable parking for up to 3 hours. In addition High Street parking bays were recently increased by 20%. Many residential roads will now offer free parking for half day visitors, replacing the paid parking bays. Staff and High Street residents will benefit from the permit scheme to offer parking at a very reasonable rate, much closer to the High Street than the previously uncontrolled residential areas. The occupancy rate has held up, and probably improved, during the recession, with many new businesses opening in Orpington. Accordingly the evidence suggests we can both remove the inconsiderate parking, which blights residents lives, and improve the vibrancy of the Town Centre.

### **Supplementary question**

Councillor Grainger asked the Chairman if, in the light of the human tendency to replace one destination with another, parking was made more difficult around Orpington station he would accept that people would be more likely to shift to spaces around Chelsfield station; and that a similar reaction might be expected amongst shoppers, who would go elsewhere if parking near Orpington High Street was constrained. The Chairman responded that if evidence bore this out it could be tackled at the review stage. There was no evidence that the introduction of controlled parking zones could be linked to any decline in Bromley Town Centre, for example.

-----

## **Appendix B**

### **QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ORAL REPLY**

#### **Questions from Mr Steven Georgiadis**

1. In the light of no presented evidence of parking problems, just a request from 28% of residents, will the Portfolio Holder recognise that the



proposed scheme does not meet the terms of the borough's Local Implementation Plan (LIP)?

**Reply**

With respect, no I don't. The proposals to introduce restrictions in this area came about because of concerns expressed by residents that commuter parking was detrimental to residential activities. This view was generally supported by the responses received from residents of The Ridge during the consultation.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Georgiadis asked whether the Portfolio Holder felt that the proposed scheme could be said to meet the terms of the LIP as residents' opinion was not in itself evidence on parking patterns. The Portfolio Holder replied that he felt it did since commuter parking was seen as detrimental to residents' activities.

2. Will the Portfolio Holder examine evidence through Google Street View and resident's photographs in order to reach a fact-based decision of the true impact of commuter parking?

**Reply**

Whilst anecdotal evidence from any source is useful, such photographs cannot anticipate displacement from another part of the road which is heavily parked, being the north side of The Ridge.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Georgiadis asked if the Council had looked at siting parking spaces elsewhere than at the front of residential properties. The Portfolio replied that the proposed arrangements were based on experience of numerous other successful parking schemes across the Borough.

3. The divided residents' response is due to the street by street analysis. Will the Portfolio Holder instead take on a geographic assessment, applying restrictions only to the North East of the area, being the only location where there is some commuter parking and resulting in displacement to the Green?

**Reply**

As stated in the last answer, displacement needs to be addressed in the design of any parking scheme. However, as with all such schemes, this will be reviewed within six months and changes made if necessary.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Georgiadis asked how the Council was proposing to assess and review the impact of the scheme after six months, and was told that the entire area would be re-canvassed to seek views, and that if it looked feasible to remove some of the lines then this would be considered.

**Question from Mr & Mrs Geoffrey Bristow**

4. Please confirm the free parking for Hilltop on ESD-10539-2RevH will not extend beyond a point in line with the NE edge of No 9's crossover and the permanent restrictions from the corner will align with this free parking. Thereby keeping the crossovers of No 9 & 10 opposite unobstructed

**Reply**

I am pleased to confirm that this will be the case.

**Questions received from Mrs Jenny McCarthy**

5. Why has no consideration appear to have been given to staggering the one hour parking restriction on opposite sides of the road ie, 11 – 12 on one side and 12 – 13.00 on the other as is the case in other parts of Orpington?

**Reply**

Consideration was given to staggered restriction times. The proposed Mon-Fri 11am – 12 Noon restrictions are common throughout Orpington and are consistent with many roads in the area. Consistency has considerable advantages in avoiding confusion.

However, following implementation, the restrictions will be reviewed and if residents would like to stagger the restriction times, this can be done.

**Supplementary Question**

Mrs McCarthy suggested that nearby parades had staggered parking restrictions, which meant that this sort of arrangement was familiar locally.

6. Why has it been considered necessary to impose 'Waiting Restrictions at any time' on opposite corners of The Ridge and Hilltop Gardens It is hardly a busy route. In 41 years there has only been one accident. With one hour parking there will be less traffic.

**Reply**

As part of the consultation process, concerns have been raised from local residents regarding this bend and junction. Therefore it was felt appropriate to upgrade the existing restrictions to double yellow lines to improve visibility.

**Questions from Mr Gordon Snashall**

7. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

Item 3.10 - Flank Wall Parking located directly opposite a resident's driveway and frontage creates a huge nuisance and safety hazard where the road is narrow. It will prevent a resident from parking outside their house and greatly restrict access. Flank Wall Parking should not be permitted opposite a driveway or frontage.

**Reply**

No I wouldn't. I would accept it might create a minor inconvenience and be aesthetically displeasing to those concerned about such things, (for which I do apologise) but certainly not a "huge nuisance" "safety hazard" or "greatly restrict access". I believe it definitely better serves the wider interests of The Ridge's residents as a whole.

We are unfortunately stuck with the reality that we have excess demand for parking across the wider Orpington TC area and need to manage the limited parking stock available to us as best we can to accommodate the reasonable and contrasting needs of residents, their visitors, delivery vehicles and commuters. Free parking on flank fences is designed to assist in achieving this.

8. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

Item 3.12 - Residents want Parking Restrictions in The Ridge to prevent Commuter Parking. After a Democratic Consultation in April 2010, a majority of residents approved the proposed scheme of yellow lines and one hour parking restriction. Flank Wall Parking not part of the Consultation and should not be in proposed scheme.

**Reply**

Partly. I recognise that a majority of residents who responded to the consultation did approve of the proposal tabled in April. I also recognise that some residents want all commuter parking eliminated from 'The Ridge'.

This option is not available given the Policy decision to utilise flank fence parking across the wider Orpington area to mitigate displacement caused by excessive yellow lining. I would add that such action also potentially displaces some fellow residents and inconveniences all local households' visitors as well. Flank fence parking will assist in reducing this problem where used thoughtfully.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Snashall suggested that the introduction of the revised scheme after April had not been democratic; the Portfolio Holder disagreed with this

view, pointing out that all households had their views sought, and that when the measures were reviewed after six months this would again be the case.

9. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

Item 3.12 - There are differences in width of road around The Ridge. North and South sections approximately 8.1 metres and 5.9 metres in width respectively. South section one average car width narrower. Flank Wall Parking in South section will create potential hazard to road users and residents and should not be installed.

### **Reply**

Partly. I would agree that the quoted dimensions are roughly accurate, as well the general point that the road varies in width in different places.

I am advised by trained Road Safety engineers that flank fence parking in the Southern section of The Ridge does not create a safety hazard and have no cause to question that judgement.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Snashall expressed surprise that given problems he believed were experienced by ambulances and dustcarts down these roads that the Council's road safety engineers did not recognise that there was a safety hazard. The Portfolio Holder declined to question the professional advice he had received.

### **Questions from Lynda and Christopher Taylor**

10. Item 3.12 and 3.13 - Why can't questions of safety, and inconvenience to residents, with regard to the proposed flank fence parking along the garden fence of 50 The Ridge, and opposite 93-97 The Ridge, involving minor redrafting, be incorporated into the Plan?

**Background explanation:**3.12: Safety: a) The whole of the top part of The Ridge overlooking the valley and the South side of The Ridge is *much narrower* than the North side of The Ridge which runs parallel to Crofton Road. In these narrower parts a car can just about pass through when cars are parked on both sides. Refuse vehicles frequently have to ask residents to move in order that they can get through. The corner by 50 The Ridge is a particular problem for refuse and emergency vehicles and I have had several near misses and incidents with cars travelling in the opposite direction, as already stated in a previous email. I know that others have had similar experiences on this corner. b) Turning left, out from the top of Pound Court Drive, into The Ridge, opposite numbers 93-97, can also be hazardous as you cannot always get a clear line of vision, past parked cars, to see oncoming traffic in this narrow part of The Ridge. *Inconvenience:* c) Parking along this the flank fence of 50 The Ridge will cause problems to those living opposite when they are reversing their cars out of their drives. d) Residents living in 93-97 will also suffer inconvenience with parking opposite their houses. I think that you should be aware that some of the residents on The Ridge are older and suffer from arthritic complaints, which causes

problems when having to manoeuvre in confined spaces.

### **Reply**

Safety and inconvenience to residents are incorporated within the plan.

Safety has been assessed by trained road safety engineers and no concerns have been raised. I have no cause to question this advice.

Inconvenience to residents and their visitors will be minimised by the presence of free flank fence parking if the new arrangements are used sensibly.

I appreciate that some residents living directly opposite the bays would prefer they were removed from the scheme, but given I am further advised that their presence does not impede access to, or exit from these properties, I believe the greater good is served by their retention.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Taylor queried whether the road safety engineers had considered the background points raised in his question above. The Portfolio Holder responded that whilst the road width and bends had been considered, the situation here was not exceptional, with other areas locally having the same characteristics.

11. Why have you not considered the alternative suggested and by making changes beforehand, save taxpayers money?

**Background explanation** 3.13: a) You mention in this paragraph that you are considering improvements to safety on the corner at Hilltop Gardens, which is a good thing, but this corner and the North side of The Ridge is a great deal wider than the corner by 50 The Ridge, where you have already outlined the preliminary marks on the road, showing the parking bay extending well towards the curve of the corner concerned. This would appear to me to be inconsistent.

b) At the Hilltop Gardens end of The Ridge there is room for parking bays on both sides of the road, without causing either safety or inconvenience problems, due to the road being so much wider. I have already suggested this in a previous email.

c) Many local residents have lived in the area for up to 60 years and have valuable local knowledge which should be encouraged.

### **Reply**

Variations within policy to the tabled scheme have already been considered and will be further contemplated when the scheme is reviewed within six months time.

One of the benefits of the tabled arrangement is its relative simplicity and low cost both to implement and change.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Taylor raised the fact that double parking bays had been suggested on the other side of the road as well as potential changes. The Portfolio Holder responded that the Council was mindful of avoiding unnecessary expenditure (being the second lowest recipient of Government grant, an authority with one of the lowest spends per capita and a consequent low Council Tax level). The scheme would be simple to amend if local residents felt changes were needed at the review time, even within reduced budgets.

12. Why have you put free bays in the indents outside 36 and 55 The Ridge and in Pound Close?

**Background explanation** 3.13: Provision of free bays outside 36 and 55 will mean that these residents will have commuters parked all day outside their houses, without the possibility of using it themselves and they have no other opportunity to park outside their own houses, which is a pretty awful prospect.

3.12: This concerns both safety and inconvenience. Who will have to pay for any damage caused to vehicles parked there and those trying to pass in Pound Close? There are quite a few vehicles, ie., four wheel drive vehicles, that are considerably wider than saloon cars and many people park badly leaving their front wheels turned outwards.

### **Reply**

Similar indents across the Orpington area have been utilised to allow additional free parking, as any vehicles parking here do not obstruct driveways nor the free flow of traffic on the road. Also, there is no flank fence parking on this section of road, so these indents provide some opportunity for residents to park during the hour of operation of the yellow lines.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mr Taylor suggested that bays were inconvenient for people in houses because they were restricted in where they could park in the vicinity; and that the narrowness of the roads meant that on-pavement parking, resulting in expensive damage to kerbs was likely to occur if the proposed scheme was adopted. The Portfolio Holder responded that one of the benefits of free parking bays was to create opportunities for residents or their visitors to park on the road in the vicinity of their houses. He added that if at the six month review point there was evidence of increased on-pavement parking this would be taken into account in the assessment of the future of the scheme.

### **Questions from Mr Alan Belding**

13. Can the Council confirm the basis of the proposed parking restrictions, was this based on extensive traffic surveys if so what did this cover or is it based primarily on anecdotal evidence.

**Reply**

The proposals to introduce restrictions in this area came about because of concerns expressed by residents that commuter parking was detrimental to residential activities. This view was generally supported by the responses received from residents of The Ridge during the consultation.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Belding queried the methodology used in the survey of traffic patterns that had been undertaken to support these proposals. The Portfolio Holder responded that residents had been canvassed and responses received had guided the officers in their design, with the aim of meeting the majority of concerns and wishes expressed.

14. Can the Council confirm that the allocation of free bays meets the requirements of the residents currently parking in the road and does the empirical evidence support this.

**Reply**

Regrettably no – the Council cannot confirm this. Inconvenience to residents and their visitors will be minimised by the presence of free flank fence parking if the new arrangements are used sensibly, but we cannot confirm the allocation of free bays to everybody.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Belding asked for information on traffic or other surveys carried out in The Ridge. He was told that numerous visits had been made on different days and times by Councillors and Council officers, in order to draw up a scheme that seemed meet the concerns raised, which was then tested out more widely by contacting all households in the area.

15. Can the Council advise whether some resident in The Ridge unaffected by commuter parking for the station voted for the introduction of parking restrictions.

**Reply**

Yes – I can confirm this is the case.

**Supplementary Question**

Mr Belding asked if it would have been reasonable to have discounted these votes; whilst understanding the point Mr Belding was making, the Portfolio Holder felt that this would not be defensible, because of the problems of adequately assessing or forecasting displacement that might occur.

**Questions from Mrs Pat Price (supported by Mr Brian Hide)**

16. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

Item 3.11 - that you should have proceeded with the April 2010 Proposal as that gained the support of a majority of residents. Inclusion of Flank Fence Parking not Democratic. By not proceeding with April 2010 proposal, Portfolio Holder and Bromley Council have reneged on Democracy. The April 2010 proposal should be re-instated.

**Reply**

No I wouldn't. The purpose of the consultation, any consultation, was to seek residents' views and adapt possible changes where it might prove possible to do so. Consultations should not be confused with referendums or binding 'votes'.

To achieve Democratic legitimacy (under the Council's Constitution rather than in my opinion) such schemes come to Committee, in this case the Environmental Services Policy, Development & Scrutiny Committee, for recommendation and comment to the Portfolio Holder, myself, as happened in this instance.

The Policy Committee made a recommendation to defer the whole Orpington Town Centre review (in which The Ridge featured) to enable new draft drawings to be designed including flank fence parking throughout.

I decided (as is my right under the Council's Constitution) that there was no need to 'defer' the scheme, potentially for months, as I was aware it had been eagerly awaited across the wider Orpington area for some time, including in and around The Ridge, and I believed it to be proper to keep the momentum going.

My decision was challengeable democratically under the Council's constitutional 'Call In' arrangements, but wasn't.

The April 2010 proposal cannot be re-instated as it sits outside of current policy.

**Supplementary Question**

Mrs Price asked whether it would not have been more reasonable to have reconsulted, since when the original consultation was undertaken in April, residents were unaware of changes around flank fence parking that were subsequently introduced. The Portfolio Holder responded that whilst this had been considered, discussions with the ward councillors had been held, and their view was that it was preferable to proceed with a scheme and then review and fine tune it after a six month period.



17. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

Item 3.15 - given your comment that you have had different responses and as Bromley Council have changed the original proposed April 2010 Scheme on two occasions in October 2010, there now needs to be a proper Final Democratic Consultation with residents in The Ridge, based on the now proposed scheme.

**Reply**

I have discussed this possibility at length with your Ward Councillors who are in agreement that the scheme should now be implemented as designed and reviewed meaningfully within six months from implementation. The Council will honour this.

**Supplementary Question**

Mrs Price queried why two maps of proposed parking arrangements had been circulated at different points, that differed in respect of flank fence parking, and was told that the first had been sent out as the result of a clerical error which, once discovered, had then been corrected by circulation of the correct version.

18. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

Item 3.12 - Commuters start to populate The Ridge from 6.00am. There will be no considerate and sensible use as there is no control. Proposed location of free bays not conducive to being available to serve all residents in The Ridge. better option is the road around the Green in Pound Court Drive.

**Reply**

I am happy to be advised as to what time Commuters start to populate The Ridge, but no, I don't particularly agree the point.

The bays are available to all comers on a first come, first served basis.

The policy of flank fence parking would include areas such as the green in Pound Court Drive in addition to, rather than instead of, roads such as The Ridge.

**Questions from Councillor Julian Grainger regarding large scale displacement of cars from around Orpington Town Centre**

**Pre-Tesco parking**

19. At the last meeting, the Portfolio Holder explained that amongst the reasons for proceeding with new restrictions around Orpington Town

Centre was that the new restrictions honoured a commitment to restore yellow line restrictions to the pre-Tesco arrangements.

a) Please can the Portfolio Holder state which of the road sections listed below had yellow line restrictions prior to September 2005. (*report on Tesco related parking changes*)

A) Lancing Road (north & west side) from Bedford Road (1st jct) to Bedford Road (2nd jct)

B) Bedford Road (both sides) from Lancing Road to Court Road

C) Felstead Road from Nos 140 & 161 to Park Avenue

D) Hillcrest Road from Nos. 81 & 64 to Felstead Road

E) Park Avenue from Nos. 109 & 90 to Court Road

F1) Goddington Lane (north side) from Sevenoaks Road to the Scout hut.

F2) Goddington Lane (south side) from Sevenoaks Road to Durley Gardens

G1) Charterhouse Road (north side) from Sevenoaks Road to Cheltenham Road

G2) Charterhouse Road (south side) from No. 14 to Cheltenham Road

(*note: "from" and "to" may be approximate for ease of reference*)

b) If the answer to any of the above is "No", how can creating such additional restrictions be described as "restoring to a previous state"?

### **Reply**

Quite simply because it is "restoring to a previous state" the erstwhile arrangements with a number of changes agreed by Local Ward Members and their residents after extensive consultation.

### **Supplementary Question**

Councillor Grainger asked why, if many yellow lines were additional to the position before the Tesco development, that new lines had been put at the junction around Park Avenue and Charterhouse Road; the Portfolio Holder advised that Councillor Grainger was welcome to work with officers and other Councillors to try and ensure what he was trying to achieve on behalf of residents. Where changes are needed, flank fence parking approaches will be introduced.

### **Displacement**

20a) Is the Portfolio Holder aware that displacement resulting from the

proposed yellow line restrictions from these roads alone would be around 110 to 125 cars?

**Reply**

I am aware there is a potential displacement issue. There is with any parking scheme as you know. Just as there will be in time with the Green St Green scheme you are championing in your own Ward.

As you have been advised on many occasions, if displacement adversely affects any neighbouring road to a significant degree, the Council will be pro-active in offering residents living in them protection, should they required it.

**Supplementary Question**

Councillor Grainger asked if the Portfolio Holder would accept his offer to bring forward a simple and effective methodology to assess displacement; he had noticed that since changes, Repton Road had seen solid parking, as opposed to the more dispersed patterns previously. The Portfolio Holder responded that there was no failsafe way of predicting displacement, but that the Council would act proactively where residents needed to be protected from adverse effects.

b) Noting that the most likely destinations for some of these parkers is the Town Centre and for others the Station, why does the Environment department think it so difficult to work out where they might displace to?

**Reply**

Your assertion as to what the department thinks is misplaced. It simply doesn't know. Neither do you. Nor do I.

It is reasonable to assume some parking might potentially displace to the next available unprotected road(s). If it does, the Council will be proactive in offering residents living in them protection, should they required it.

**Supplementary Question**

Councillor Grainger reiterated his offer to suggest a robust methodology to anticipate and predict displacement, and expressed concern about the fact that the Council would revert to using further yellow lines to combat parking incursions into these areas.

He also requested that it was noted that neither he nor his Chelsfield ward colleagues had been consulted as part of the wider Orpington group of Councillors when these parking schemes were being considered, despite the knock-on effects on the areas they represented.

c) Given that some displaced cars are likely to park further along

Charterhouse Road, Repton Road and in Cheltenham Road, if residents there ask for new yellow line restrictions, will the Portfolio Holder support them? If so, where will the yellow lining around Orpington Town Centre end?

**Reply**

In principle yes, subject to the views and thoughts of the PDS Committee of the day.

**Questions from Mr Jack Jarvie**

21. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

Item 3.12 - that the inclusion of Flank Fence Parking was not part of the Democratic Consultation in April 2010 and not approved by a majority of residents. Therefore Flank Fence Parking should not be included at this stage.

**Reply**

Partly. I obviously agree that the inclusion of flank fence parking was not part of the Consultation in April 2010.

I do not agree that it should not be included at this stage on the grounds that the scheme continues to meet the broad principle sought of the Council at consultation with local residents (reducing Commuter nuisance) and sits within the policy framework by which the measures have been approved.

22. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

Item 3.12 - that Parking Restrictions were approved by a majority of residents in the Democratic Consultation in April 2010 to prevent Commuter Parking. Therefore the Portfolio Holder and Bromley Council should implement the April 2010 Proposal.

**Reply**

Partly I recognise that some residents want all commuter parking eliminated from 'The Ridge'.

This option is not available given the Policy decision to utilise flank fence parking across the wider Orpington area to mitigate displacement caused by excessive yellow lining. I would add that such action also potentially displaces some fellow residents and inconveniences all local households' visitors as well. Flank fence parking will assist in reducing this problem where used thoughtfully.

The April 2010 proposal cannot be re-instated as it sits outside of current

policy.

23. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

Item 3.12 - that most residents in The Ridge with multiple vehicles utilise their garages and make provision on their properties to accommodate additional vehicles to keep The Ridge safer and free for access? Flank Fence Parking should not be implemented. They will encourage Residents and Commuters to populate the road and create hazards.

### **Reply**

Partly, I am content to be advised and accept that the majority of households in The Ridge own more than one vehicle, as well that most choose to use their private drives &/or garages.

I have no cause to doubt the advice of trained Road Safety engineers that flank fence parking in The Ridge will not create safety hazards.

### **Questions from Beverley Mack**

#### **Background explanation**

i) We very much regret that due to the council acceding to the commercial interests of Tesco and the development of the town centre - almost a mile away from this neighbourhood - residents are now faced with a deterioration in their environment due to the displacement of the demand for parking.

ii) In your document you outline your assessment of customer impact. Clearly the proposed scheme does not benefit us as residents, and indeed impacts adversely upon us. It is proposed that there will be a yellow line immediately outside our house and a free parking bay opposite. Although the purpose of the free bay is to allow commuter or resident parking, it is reasonable to suppose that these spaces will be taken up by commuters from an early hour each morning, since there will be fewer spaces, than previously, nearer to the station. This will mean that we may no longer be able to park our car outside our home, but may have to park in an adjacent road. This seems, frankly, incongruous in a quiet residential backstreet such as ours and will adversely impact on the quality of our lives as residents.

24. Has the Council undertaken an audit or analysis of the likely demand for parking in the Ridge and the pattern of the displacement parking, in the context of the new restrictions? If so, what were the findings?

### **Reply**

It is never possible to be sure where displaced vehicles will be parked. Based upon considerable experience of parking schemes, the Council has done its best to estimate the level of demand for parking in and around The Ridge and the likely displacement of parked cars. Flank fence parking has been recommended for this road, as elsewhere in Orpington, to help direct parking to where it will cause the least inconvenience to most residents.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mrs Mack queried whether, given the very mixed views between different ends of the Ridge, that a more rigorous and methodical analysis should have been undertaken, since she was concerned that a series of snapshot observations would risk missing important patterns and trends in traffic locally. The Portfolio Holder felt that the method used had been deployed successfully elsewhere, in areas facing similar commuter parking pressures.

25. Will the Council, taking into account the reasonable objections to this scheme, as above, and in the light of adverse public opinion now decide not to impose these restrictions (yellow lines outside our houses) on Council tax paying residents?

### **Reply**

The Council takes residents' views into account before making decisions. The recommendations in this report are as they are because of consideration of residents comments. The scheme was drawn up at the behest of residents. Any scheme implemented of this type will be subject to a review within six months and at this stage residents' views will again be considered and if suggested changes are viable they will be introduced at this point.

### **Supplementary Question**

Mrs Mack queried whether it might have been prudent to defer any implementation pending further analysis, especially given forthcoming cuts; the Portfolio Holder responded that the scheme was trying to balance different views, and making best endeavours to meet the expressed wishes of local residents. Given that the scheme was low cost to install and possible to amend in the light of actual experience it was felt that this was a robust and practical way forward.

-----

## **Appendix C**

### **QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

#### **Question from Mr Colin Willetts**

1. As Assistant Secretary of the Chislewick Residents Association I have been directed to request of the Portfolio Holder "could he repair tarmac upheaval (due to tree root creep) outside the whole of the frontage of 23 Broomwood Road which is presently the worse stretch of footway in the Associations immediate locale"?

#### **Reply**

The section of footway outside 23 Broomwood Road will be overlaid with asphalt concrete under a 35 day order.

**Question from Mr Jeff Thurgood**

2. Could double yellow lines be added eastern side of the junction of Hilltop Gardens with the Ridge? A thick, hedge on the western corner makes it blind; any parked vehicle on the eastern side, forces traffic exiting Hilltop Gardens over to the right, presenting a hazard to oncoming traffic.

**Reply**

I have been advised that the proposed 'at any time' waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) will be of benefit to road safety and help improve sightline when exiting the junction of Hilltop Gardens and when travelling around the bend of The Ridge. However, we will monitor any changes made and if additional double yellow lines are felt appropriate, these will be introduced following the review.

**Question from Mr David Stark**

3. The Ridge cannot accommodate cars parked opposite each other and 'all day' parking seriously affects residents. All houses have facilities for 2/3 cars off- road, therefore is it right that proposed parking restrictions for the benefit of the majority should be threatened by the unreasonable expectations of the minority?

**Reply**

I agree that cars being parked directly opposite each other in The Ridge is undesirable. The same is true in many other roads across the Borough.

The pressure on parking locally is such that all roads which form part of the Council's highway network have to play their part in the management of the problem.

With respect, I would personally dissent from the view that forcing fellow residents, visitors, contractors and all commuters from The Ridge, at someone else's expense, when a number can be reasonably hosted within The Ridge, was a fair or reasonable expectation.

**Questions from Carole and David Hawkins**

4. Yellow Banding - Revision G includes yellow banding for only house numbers 10, 12, 14, and 16 Pound Court Drive. Why have the remaining houses on this side not been included as they are on a bend that affects line of sight and free bays will be available directly opposite?

**Reply**

During the design of the scheme, road safety engineers noticed congestion through the junction of Pound Court Drive with Darrick Wood Road, which was causing a hazard at this location. The congestion will be eased by preventing all day parking on one side of Pound Court Drive along the stretch of road outside houses 8-16.

5. Customer Impact - Paul Nevard advised that the purpose of the scheme was to deter commuters and would be a failure if existing parking was merely displaced from The Ridge to nearby roads. Why does the scheme propose under Customer Impact '..... to improve parking for those using the town centre and station'?

**Reply**

The design of the scheme is to improve the situation for residents, whilst displacing parking as little as possible to other roads and whilst allowing commuters and shoppers to park in convenient locations, where possible.

6. Commuter parking - All day commuter parking is the main problem, exacerbated by the introduction of the London Congestion charge leading to increased rail usage. What steps have been taken to encourage a multi-storey car park at Orpington Station to solve this ongoing and increasing problem of residents being inconvenienced by rail travellers?

**Reply**

I completely agree and can confirm that I have raised this issue previously with the local MP(s), the Mayoralty, TfL, as well the rail authorities themselves. Providing the pricing structure was set sensibly the erection of such a facility would offer significant relief to the problems being experienced in roads such as your own. I offer you my assurance that pursuit of this goal remains a strong local priority which will be actively pursued.

-----

The Meeting ended at 9.50 pm

Chairman