

ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 9 November 2010

Present:

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

Also Present:

Councillor Peter Fortune, Councillor Julian Grainger,
Councillor Alexa Michael and Councillor Colin Smith

47 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

An apology was received from Councillor Ellie Harmer; Councillor Will Harmer attended as her alternate. An apology was also received from Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher who would be 10 minutes late.

48 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

49 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

Councillor Grainger asked two oral questions. All the questions and the responses are appended to these minutes.

50 PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 28TH SEPTEMBER 2010

The minutes of the meeting held on 28th September 2010 were agreed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

Minute 34, The Portfolio Holder referred to his parents-in-law not his parents.

Minute 39B, delete "Primarily due to the continued recession".

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

Councillor Grainger asked an oral question. Mr Colin Willetts submitted three written questions.

The questions and answers are appended to these minutes.

52 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS

The decisions made by the Portfolio Holder following the Policy Development and Scrutiny meeting on 28th September were noted.

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

54 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11

Report ES10156

Members considered an update of the latest budget monitoring position for 2010/11 for the Environment Portfolio based on expenditure and activity levels up to August 2010. There were significant variations highlighted in the report relating to waste tonnages and parking income. After allowing for the transfers to and from the central contingency there would be a net under spend of £26k on controllable budgets and an overspend on non-controllable budgets of £45k.

Members also noted that reward payments had been abolished by the current Government and that councils could no longer make income from carbon reduction. The Council would still be subject to penalties for poor energy efficiency performance.

The Portfolio Holder then addressed the committee outlining the achievements of different sections of his Portfolio. He was pleased that the rollout of the waste roll had, in the main, been successful.

The Street Friend's numbers were increasing and he felt that residents now recognised that the council could not cover all areas that needed to be maintained, particularly given the recent cuts pertaining to the Governments spending review. Snow Friends numbers had also increased as had Park Friends.

School travel plans were progressing well.

With regard to recycling in schools it was confirmed that Composting for All would be rolled out to schools over the next few years once the domestic service had bedded in.

RESOLVED that that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to endorse the latest budget projection.

55 MINOR TRAFFIC/PARKING SCHEME REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

A) REVIEW OF RESIDENTS' PERMIT PARKING SCHEME, CHATTERTON VILLAGE AREA, BROMLEY COMMON

Report ES10160

Members considered a report which outlined the results of the public consultation on extending the Residents' Parking Scheme in Chatterton Village.

There were four roads not included in the current scheme and a small majority of residents had requested that they were now included i.e. Pope Road, Union Road, Southlands Road and Victoria Road. A narrow majority of the residents in the sections of Victoria Road and Southlands Road currently not in the existing scheme expressed a wish for permit parking to operate along that remaining section of their road. However, to extend the permit parking area further down those roads would distort the geographical boundary shape of the scheme, and would also lead to displaced parking to the nearest free parking spaces then available. Consequently it was recommended that the wishes of that narrow majority were not adhered to, as to otherwise comply would not be beneficial to the scheme overall and displaced parked vehicles could detrimentally affect adjoining roads.

Councillor Michael, a ward member, addressed the committee; she explained that none of the roads currently in the scheme had asked to be removed. The council had undertaken consultation and the ward members had also consulted their constituents in the area. In some cases the figures the ward members obtained differed from those obtained from by the Council. But the results overall showed that residents wanted to extend the scheme. Councillor Michael reported that she and her ward colleague, Councillor Ruth Bennett, supported the proposals and were in favour of option 1.

Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee Members expressed concern at the "narrow Margins" in the results. Although the majority supported extending the scheme, the percentage of eligible residents responding was unavailable. In addition one member asked for clearer information, in the form of a table, to make it clearer to interpret the results.

The Portfolio Holder recognised members' concerns and felt there should be a benchmark for the percentage of consultation responses required before

(resident demanded) schemes were implemented. If the response rates were too small then perhaps certain types of scheme should not be progressed.

Despite concerns about the narrow majorities Members agreed to support the recommendations and that with regard to recommendation 2.4, Option 1 be approved.

RESOLVED that the recommendations are supported and that in regard to recommendation 2.4 Option 1 is supported.

B) WARREN ROAD JUNCTION WITH COURT ROAD - ROAD SAFETY SCHEME

Members considered a report which outlined proposals to make amendments to the Warren Road junction with Court Road. The staggered junction arrangement had been subject to a number of personal injury collisions and as a result it was felt improvements to the signage along Court Road could be of benefit to road safety and improve driver awareness.

After analysing collision data for a three year period for the junction, officers felt that the most appropriate scheme was to improve the signing to warn drivers of the junction. Improvements to the advanced direction signing along Court Road and vehicle activated signs with loops to detect vehicles waiting at the Warren Road junction had been proposed. Rationalising the existing street furniture was also recommended.

Councillor Grainger, one of the ward councillors addressed the Committee. He was concerned that the proposal did not address the issue and that a revised scheme should be considered with more substantial engineering options.

There was also concern that there would need to be excavation work to install the signs. Officers explained that most of the excavations would be on the grass verges so there would little disruption to the carriageway.

The signs would illuminate for the duration a car was at the junction, giving ample warning to the vehicles on the main carriageway.

Members raised further concerns that £70,000 had been set aside for the project but the proposal only required £15,000. Officers explained that schemes which involved more engineering would cost considerably more than £70,000. They added that the scheme would be monitored and if it did not reduce the numbers of accidents then another scheme would be considered and if necessary funding would be sought to enhance the scheme.

The Chairman asked, as the scheme was on the boundary with Orpington ward, that those Councillors were also kept informed.

RESOLVED that the recommendations are supported.

C) HOMESDALE ROAD, PROPOSED ZEBRA CROSSING

Traffic Engineers had noted concerns from local residents who were finding it difficult to cross Homesdale Road, Bromley. Residents and a previous Ward Member had requested that officers consider installing a zebra crossing at this location.

Members considered the proposals. One Member expressed concern at the “build out” element of the scheme. The Portfolio Holder shared this concern and would liaise with officers to design this out. He did not see the need for an anti skid surface on both sides of the crossing, however, if the carriageway was in need of repair at this time then he felt that it might be wise to use an antiskid surface.

RESOLVED that the recommendations are supported.

D) ST GEORGES ROAD, PROPOSED ZEBRA CROSSING

Pedestrians were having difficulty crossing St Georges Road, by Bromley Road Infant School. As a result Ward Members had requested that officers consider installing a crossing at this location.

Members raised one concern that the crossing was very close to the junction.

Of the 20 consultations distributed there were 8 replies and all of these were in support of the crossing.

RESOLVED that the recommendations are supported.

56 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME - MATTERS ARISING

The committee considered its forward work programme. They noted that 2 working groups were coming to an end. The chairman asked if members would like to have a working group to consider re-surfacing mechanisms and develop a policy.

He suggested that the executive assistant could lead the group. Members considered the suggestion but felt that it was unnecessary and that it would be better for the Portfolio Holder and Executive Assistant to organise a small group, prepare a report and feed back to a future meeting.

Members also requested that scheme consultations should be considered substantively in the report due for the January meeting looking at traffic scheme design and consultation policy.

The Portfolio Holder would organise a small working party to be chaired by the Executive assistant to consider highway maintenance prioritisation, prepare a report and feed back to a future meeting.

Progress on matters arising from previous meetings and a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio were noted.

RESOLVED that:

- 1. the draft work programme be agreed;**
- 2. Review the progress report related to previous Committee requests is noted.**
- 3. the Environment Portfolio contracts list is noted**
- 4. The Portfolio Holder and a small group of members consider highway maintenance prioritisation; prepare a report and feedback to a future meeting.**

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

58 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 28TH SEPTEMBER 2010

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 28th September 2010 were agreed.

APPENDIX A

ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE, 9TH NOVEMBER 2010

QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PDS CHAIRMAN FROM COUNCILLOR JULIAN GRAINGER FOR ORAL REPLY

Question 1

Displacement by parking schemes

At the last Full Council the Chairman was asked:

"In the last 12 months, for traffic or parking schemes considered by the PDS, please can the Chairman list those schemes that have:

- a) addressed the issue of displacement of vehicles*
- b) provided an estimate of the number of cars to be displaced ?"*

While the answer provided for the Chairman started:

"All traffic and parking schemes consider the possible displacement of vehicles.", there was no mention of schemes where displacement was actually quantified.

Please can the list requested be provided - together with the number likely to be displaced for each scheme and what action followed this information (e.g. proceed, amend, withdrawn) as this information should inform the scrutiny process.

Reply

The schemes presented for scrutiny are the result of the design process described. This includes safety, congestion, service provision and displacement.

Displacement is virtually impossible to quantify with any degree of certainty. For example before the Station Road car park closure, that survey identified the need for a large number of on street bays. Many bays were never used.

Question 2

Orpington local CPZ - Homefield Rise, Walnuts Road & Uplands Road

- a) When this scheme was scrutinised what was the estimate of the number of cars likely to be displaced from these roads?
- b) What consideration did the report give to where these cars might displace to?
- c) Following implementation, how many cars have been displaced by this CPZ?
- d) How many of the cars so displaced will displace again if additional restrictions are introduced in roads such as Lancing and Bedford Roads?
- e) Where might such further displacement move to?

Reply

This scheme was scrutinised on 14th October 2009. As you will recall, as Vice Chairman, and recorded present, the PDS scrutinised the decision and was happy with the report. The committee recommended to the PH that the scheme proceed, and that the six month scheme review should include the possibility of public bays if the demand for permits allowed.

There were a number of residents who had forecourt parking without crossovers. A number of residents took the opportunity of the pavement resurfacing work to apply for crossovers since bays would be across their

frontages. Policy, does not suggest displacement should be a consideration in crossover permission. Differentiating any displacement from the CPZ introduction compared to the new crossovers is extremely difficult.

The opening of TESCOs, the reopening of the college car park and two floors in the Walnuts car park, plus reduction in demand arising from a shrinkage in the open air market in the High Street plus other variances in demand such as the new college year could mean on street displacement was minimal.

**QUESTION TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM
COUNCILLOR JULIAN GRAINGER FOR ORAL REPLY**

Question

Orpington Parking Scheme - displacement and traffic speeds

On 5th August, the Portfolio Holder agreed (amongst others) Resolution 2) that:

- "*further flank wall parking might be added*"

and added Resolution 3 that:

- "*free spaces be found which might...*":

- "*increase the available parking stock*"

- "*... assist in speed management,*"

At Full Council on 25th October, the PH confirmed that he made these resolutions in order to address concerns about "*possible*" displacement caused by the proposed restrictions and because "*there is a link between parked cars and average traffic speeds*".

a) Is the PH aware that the latest published drawings fall well short of these aims?

Specifically, is he aware that:

i) restrictions along flank walls or similar are still included (*e.g Park Avenue, Charterhouse Road*)

ii) the parking stock would actually be reduced - both by the displacement of over 200 cars already identified - and also by the net reduction of over 60 marked bays (*e.g. Felstead Road, Hillcrest Road, Park Avenue*)

iii) that yellow lines along the entire length of very long side roads would remain thus negating any speed management by parked cars during the restricted hours (*e.g. Park Avenue, Hillcrest Road and almost all of Felstead Road*)

(*note: Felstead Road would keep just 4 free spaces between Hillcrest & Park Ave.*)

Reply

We have discussed this previously on a number of occasions and you are very well aware that I don't accept for a moment that the drawings "fall well short" of anything.

Officers are reviewing all roads within the area as directed and will effect any necessary changes in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors under the provision of recommendations '9' and '10' contained in the same report that you refer to.

b) So will the PH now ask for revised drawings that give real effect to his resolutions - minimising the huge displacement and inconvenience to residents in the Orpington area and managing speeds in these roads?

Reply

Please see my answer above.

QUESTIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MR COLIN WILLETTS FOR WRITTEN REPLY

Question 1

Would you spray weed infestation back of footway in:

- i) Cotmandene Crescent from the Launderette around to the Star of India restaurant?
- ii) Gutterline on highway adjacent to Whippendell Way through to Swanscombe House (apparently not listed on Kier cleansing schedule)?
- iii) Large clumps of footway weed infestation outside OAP Mrs Coveney's property at 7 Longbury Drive?

Reply

Yes.

Question 2

Would you enforce chest level overhanging low shrub/bramble vegetation on rear footway outside 1 & 11 Headley House, Longbury Drive and low branch

overhang to footway Tillingbourne Green junction Churchill Wood?

Reply

Yes.

Question 3

As Assistant Secretary of the Chislewick Residents Association I have been directed to seek an explanation as to the environmental damage caused to the following location. (i) could you investigate who undertook removal of the frontage hedgerow on a Site of Scientific Interest along Sevenoaks Way opposite Kemnal Technology College and (ii) could this hedgerow be replaced as the site has now become a virtual eyesore along this leafy stretch of road.

Reply

The damage to the trees along the frontage of Sevenoaks Way was brought to the attention of the Council on Thursday 7th October 2010. The land is owned by the London Borough of Bromley, and the Council is currently investigating the matter with the intention of proceeding with a prosecution. Officers are currently compiling a detailed schedule of the damage. Reinstatement is likely to be undertaken when the position with the prosecution is much clearer. The Council owned land is Green Belt, but it is not understood to be a Site of Special Scientific Interest. Trees on land to the East of the Council land were also damaged at the same time, and this area is subject to a blanket Tree Preservation Order. This breach is also being investigated by the Council.

The Meeting ended at 9.20 pm

Chairman