

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 11 January 2011

### **Present:**

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher (Chairman)

Councillors Kathy Bance, Jane Beckley, Will Harmer, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Nick Milner, Tom Papworth, Ian F. Payne, Richard Scoates, Pauline Tunncliffe and Michael Turner

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Peter Fortune, Councillor John Getgood, Councillor Julian Grainger and Councillor Colin Smith

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

Apologies were received from Councillors Lydia Buttinger and Ellie Harmer and Councillors Pauline Tunncliffe and Will Harmer attended as respective alternates.

### **74 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chairman declared a Personal Interest at item 7f by virtue of working with colleagues using the route of the proposed footway for cycling to work.

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

There were no questions to the Committee.

### **76 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD ON 9TH AND 29TH NOVEMBER 2010**

For the minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2010 it was agreed that:

- (i) certain factual corrections necessary to the minutes would be addressed outside of the meeting; and
- (ii) the final sentence of the minute to the Warren Road/Court Road junction safety scheme would be amended to read:

*“As the scheme was close to the boundary with Orpington ward, the Chairman asked that those Councillors also be kept informed.”*

For the minutes of the meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2010, the Portfolio Holder had previously highlighted some editorial inconsistencies which had been removed from the minutes for signature.

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

There were 12 questions put to the Portfolio Holder for oral reply. Details of the questions and replies are at **Appendix A**.

## **78 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS**

Decisions of the Portfolio Holder taken since the Committee's previous meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2010 were noted.

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

### **A) BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11**

#### **Report ES10191**

Based on expenditure and activity levels to October 2010, the controllable budget for the Portfolio was expected to balance at year end after allowing for transfers to and from the central contingency for a waste underspend of Cr £756k and recession monies to cover a £400k net shortfall in parking income.

There were significant variations related to waste tonnages and parking income. After allowing for transfers to and from the central contingency there would be a nil variation for controllable budgets and an under achievement of income on non-controllable budgets of £43k.

Members asked some questions related to waste and concerning a shortfall in parking income the Chairman suggested an assessment to confirm that the shortfall was due to the impact of the recession and that the position should recover afterwards. It was suggested that there might be a possibility the shortfall could be related to a modal transport shift rather than the recession.

The Director circulated a paper identifying estimated costs of £779k above budget on winter maintenance related to last month's snow events. Members discussed salt stocks and their costs and referred to pot hole damage to roads and funding their repair. A policy question was whether budget provision should be adjusted in future years to cover costs from winter snow

events. A suggestion was made that a full discussion take place next year on whether budgets for such events be regularly set. For the moment it was agreed that costs associated with the recent snow events be made available to the local press.

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

**(1) endorse the latest budget projection for the Environment Portfolio;  
and**

**(2) make available to the local press details of winter maintenance costs associated with the recent snow events in December 2010.**

**B) CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2nd QUARTER 2010/11**

**Report DR10109**

Following Executive agreement on 3rd November 2010 to a revised Capital Programme from 2010/11 to 2013/14, changes were highlighted to the Capital Programme for the Environment Portfolio.

Members noted the report but in doing so it was suggested that the Playbuilder Capital Grant should be allocated to CYP as budget holder and not the Environment Portfolio.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to confirm the report and highlight a need for the Playbuilder Capital Grant to be allocated to the CYP Portfolio.**

**C) TRADE WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE ANNUAL PRICE INCREASE**

**Report ES10193**

An above inflation increase in prices for 2011/12 was required for the Council's Trade Waste Collection Service, representing an increase of 15% and raising annual income by £58k above the inflation target of £43.6k. This was necessary to maintain income targets, allowing for the annual Landfill Tax increase, the annual inflationary increase of contractor collection and disposal payments, and the annual inflation estimate applied to all income budgets.

The Controlled Waste Regulations (1992) currently prohibited local authorities from recharging certain customers for the cost of disposing the waste collected. As the government was currently consulting on revising the legislation, to allow such charges to be made, in line with the 'Polluter Pays' principle, it was proposed that such charges be applied when and if the revised legislation was enacted so increasing income in line with the estimated £58k above.

Although the government was looking to introduce the revised Controlled Waste Regulations in April 2011, a 12 month 'notice period' was proposed before the charges could be introduced which if agreed would mean that the revised charges would be introduced from April 2012.

In discussion the Assistant Director (Street Scene and Green Space) was confident that the income projections outlined in report ES10193 would be achieved taking account of a 5% customer fallout rate. Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher suggested that officers monitor the position on fly tipping following implementation of the increased costs.

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

- (1) the implementation of a 15% increase in the costs of both collection and container rental for customers utilising the trade waste collection service and / or renting containers from the Council; and**
- (2) the implementation of disposal charges to those Schedule 2 customers re-designated under the proposed changes to the Controlled Waste Regulations, should the revised legislation facilitate this, in line with the time-scales specified in such revised legislation.**

**D) BROMLEY TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ) REVIEW**

**Report ES10194**

Findings were reported on the parking review carried out to establish whether the Bromley Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) continues to be fit for purpose.

In the light of research and the views of Members, officers recommended that:

- No major changes be made to the shape, size or subdivisions of the Bromley CPZ;
- A suggestion to extend the CPZ boundary in Bickley Ward, and the residents' individual parking requests, be subsequently addressed as separate schemes; and
- the design/designation of the shared use bays in zone 'A' be reviewed.

In discussion it was suggested that some of the parking signs in the CPZ were confusing and the Portfolio Holder asked for any such cases to be reported to the Department. Councillor Michael Turner commented about parking enforcement on a weekday bank holiday and publication of a policy in this regard and the Chairman asked that these matters be noted for the Committee's meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011 when implementation of the recommendations of the Parking Working Group would be reviewed.

Members supported the recommendations but should any additional areas join the CPZ it was felt that monitoring should be undertaken for any inter zone commuting.

**RESOLVED that:**

**The Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree that:**

- 1) no major changes be made to the shape, size or subdivisions of the Bromley CPZ;**
- 2) the various individual parking requests received from residents and Members during the Review be subsequently addressed as separate proposals, along with proposals to install new parking bays in locations identified;**
- 3) should areas be added to the CPZ, then the potential for additional inter-zone commuting be assessed; and**
- 4) Officers review the shared use bays in the town centre.**

**E) MIDFIELD WAY SAFETY SCHEME - PROPOSED RIGHT TURN BAN**

**Report ES10195**

Members supported a proposed scheme to ban right turns into Sevenoaks Road from Midfield Way following a series of traffic accidents at the junction of Midfield Way and Sevenoaks Way. It was also proposed to review lighting on the approaches to the junction.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree the plan to ban right turn movements from Midfield Way into Sevenoaks Road, St Pauls Cray, as detailed in drawing labelled ESD10720-1.**

**F) COURT ROAD ORPINGTON - FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR SHARED FOOTWAY**

**Report ES10187**

Approval was sought from the Portfolio Holder to progress certain design proposals for improving walking and cycling facilities adjacent to Orpington By-pass with funding for progressing the designs being met from the TfL 2011/12 budget.

Members were advised that the existing footway was sub standard and that a new shared footway would improve facilities for walkers and cyclists. Lighting could also be improved along the route.

Councillor Julian Grainger suggested that demand for cycling was low along the proposed route particularly towards its southern end approaching Hewitt's roundabout and he referred to an earlier suggestion for off road facilities alongside Chelsfield Lane. As the proposal would attract TfL funding he felt that a shared footway to replace the existing footway was acceptable provided it was of normal footpath width given a limited number of cyclists. He added that a footpath parallel to Warren Road could also be updated if there was funding to spare from the scheme.

Councillor Payne felt that until the scheme was completed it would not be possible to assess its use. Although the route would end at Hewitts roundabout implying the end of cycling facilities, Members were advised that possibilities for the roundabout would be looked at by TfL should the shared footway be implemented.

The Chairman suggested that St Olave's Grammar School be consulted on the scheme and the Portfolio Holder felt that if re-instatement of the footpath was supported, the scheme presented the best opportunity for obtaining necessary funds. However, Hewitts roundabout was intimidating for cyclists and the Portfolio Holder suggested that the shared footway proceed from Spur Road to Church Road with the final stretch to Hewitts roundabout held in abeyance. For this area he enquired whether the cycle route could run along Church Road and over to Knockholt.

If the proposed route were to be implemented, Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher suggested that the Warren Road/Court Road Junction scheme be implemented at the same time.

**Resolved that the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder be supported subject to:**

**(1) the proposed stretch of shared footway from Church Road to Hewitt's Roundabout being the subject of further consultation particularly on routes that the scheme could take from Church Road or Warren Road;**

**(2) consultation be undertaken with Kent CC and TfL concerning facilities for any progression of the shared footway across Hewitt's roundabout and beyond; and**

**(3) comments being requested from relevant resident associations, school travel co-ordinators and other groups as the designs are progressed.**

**80 MINOR TRAFFIC/PARKING SCHEME REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**A) UPPER ELMERS END ROAD SAFETY SCHEME**

**Report ES10184**

Members supported a proposal to extend the current refuge in the middle of the existing zebra crossing at Upper Elmers End Road, near to the junction with Altyre Way, and to introduce a tight turn pocket into Altyre Way. This followed a series of traffic accidents at and near the crossing.

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

- 1) agree the plan to improve the existing crossing and to introduce the right turn pocket in Upper Elmers End Road as detailed in drawing number 0157163/Altyre/Pre/005;**
- 2) meet the scheme construction costs of £24.5k from the Transport for London Casualty Reduction Schemes budget; and**
- 3) delegate authority to the Director of Environmental Services for making any further minor modifications which might arise as a result of any construction work.**

#### **B) STAPLETON ROAD - PROPOSED MINI ROUNDABOUT**

##### **Report ES10183**

A mini roundabout was proposed at the junction of Stapleton Road with Sevenoaks Road, Orpington to improve turning movements and traffic flow. It was also anticipated that the scheme would help reduce driver speeds and benefit road safety.

As part of the scheme it was also proposed to replace an existing refuge in Stapleton Road with a wider pedestrian refuge. Minor amendments were also proposed to existing footways and kerb lines - the existing kerb line in Stapleton Road (both sides) was intended to be re-aligned so that the give-way lines in Sevenoaks Road were not too far apart. It was also proposed to realign the eastern kerb in Sevenoaks Road to allow some deflection on the southbound approach.

As part of any subsequent detailed design of this scheme an investigation would be undertaken on whether valuable road space could be acquired by diverting the footway along the eastern side of Sevenoaks Road so that it would run at the top of the bank behind the trees, rather than the minor re-route of the footway as shown in the design drawing.

Members supported the proposed scheme.

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

- (1) implement the proposed improvements to Stapleton Road / Sevenoaks Road shown on drawing number 60157163/Fig1 subject to detailed design;**

**(2) meet the estimated scheme cost of £20k from the Transport for London (TfL) budget for Locally Determined Schemes; and**

**(3) delegate to the Director of Environmental Services, authority for making any further minor modifications which might arise as a result of the detail design.**

### **C) KINGS HALL ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS**

#### **Report ES10186**

Further possible measures had been investigated to reduce the speed of drivers passing through the bends in Kings Hall Road. Safety measures were installed in the area in 2008 but there had been further collisions on the bends which had raised concern.

The effectiveness of the earlier measures was investigated in 2009 and in the post-scheme consultation a majority of residents were unhappy with the scheme, particularly the islands on the bend. Speed activated signs were installed to reduce speeds on the bend at Kings Hall Road and it was agreed to carry out a further review when more post-scheme collision data was available.

Accident data now available for a 17 month period from when the scheme was substantially completed indicated that there had been three recorded injury collisions on or near the bend in Kings Hall Road during this period. Residents had also reported a number of other collisions on the bends, particularly adjacent to the island outside house number 136.

A speed survey was also undertaken in early October 2010 and results were compared to a speed survey undertaken by the police in May 2009.

To slow drivers on the approaches to the bend and help ensure more driving care, two options were proposed for further change:

Option 1 comprised high-friction surfacing through the bend and approaches with the installation of Chevron signs giving advanced warning of the bend along with reflective discs on timber posts to highlight the bend. The islands outside Nos.116/118 and 136/138 would be removed and the central hatching replaced with buff coloured background hatching to emphasise the narrow running lanes.

Option 2 comprised two double chicane features on both approaches to the bend with other features included as outlined in option 1. However the removal of a further traffic island outside Nos.100/102 would be necessary to accommodate the chicanes.

Subject to the results of any further consultation and in the light of safety audit recommendations, officers recommended Option 2 as it was felt more likely to slow vehicles on the approach to the bend.



In discussion the Head of Traffic and Road Safety reported that at a meeting held with residents the previous week, residents were generally in favour of the chicane approach but with some adaptations. He also explained that the cost of temporary chicanes which residents had requested could cost as much as permanent chicanes. Councillor Getgood spoke on the scheme commenting that a range of opinions had been expressed at the recent meeting with residents. Some had advocated vertical deflection which he agreed with and others included support for a 20 mph zone. He felt that the current policy did not provide a number of residents with what they wanted and he had serious doubts about the positioning of the chicanes particularly in regard to their effect on rush hour traffic. Councillor Getgood indicated that without a trial scheme involving some form of vertical deflection it was difficult to see a way forward.

The Head of Traffic and Road Safety suggested that it would be possible to look at positioning the eastern chicane nearer the bridge and a further recommendation could be added delegating the detailed design of the scheme to the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with ward members. Councillor Ian Payne asked if there had been any traffic modelling for the chicanes and was advised that some traffic counts had been carried out and it was possible to include a mathematical model.

Following debate the Committee agreed to support the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder provided that further consideration was given to the precise location of the chicanes, taking account of any additional traffic flow/modelling information, with authority for making any further modifications following review being delegated to the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with ward members

**RESOLVED that the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder be supported provided that further consideration is given to the precise location of the chicanes taking account of any additional traffic flow/modelling information with authority for making any further modifications following review being delegated to the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with ward members.**

## **81 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE EXECUTIVE**

### **A) CARBON MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME: PROGRESS REPORT 2009/10**

#### **Report ES10188**

Members considered an annual carbon management progress report presenting the Council's progress during 2009/10 in reducing its energy consumption and carbon footprint along with progress against the Council's overall target of 25% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction by March 2013. Details of progress made since 2006/07 were also reported along with comments on future projects.

In discussion it was noted that carbon emissions associated with staff commuting had increased from 2008/09 to 2009/10. The Assistant Director outlined a Departmental view of how measures were being taken forward on sustainable staff commuting. Although the Council had no formal staff travel plan in place for its workforce, staff car parking was currently the subject of a corporate review headed by the Chief Executive and it was necessary to provide spaces for those with an operational need for a parking space i.e. essential car users. For other non essential car users, arrangements had yet to be finalised but could include the possibility of charging non essential users for a parking space.

It was also noted that emissions by the Council's fleet and business travel sector had increased and in reply reference was made to increased travel by vehicles of Adult and Community Services following Day Centre closures. Councillor Papworth also questioned the rationale of replacing LPG vehicles with diesel vehicles.

Concerning street lighting where CO<sub>2</sub> emissions had increased by 2% between 2008/09 and 2009/10 and (orange) sodium lights were being upgraded with better quality, but higher consuming white light, the Chairman understood that the new white light columns could be spaced further apart so helping to reduce energy. However he felt that there was little evidence of this taking place in practice and suggested that a Highways Asset Working Group be established by the Committee in the new municipal year to consider the matter amongst other items. Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher commented that unless specifically requested new light columns were sited close to the location of former lights and she had requested that the lights in her area be dimmed slightly.

Councillor Julian Grainger as a visiting Member commented that the new lights in the Chelsfield area were very bright. He understood that they were powered by 60w bulbs compared with 45w bulbs in Farnborough village which were in any case brighter than the lights in place there previously.

**RESOLVED that the Executive be recommended to:**

- (1) note the work carried out by all departments in achieving a 12.9% (4,773t) reduction in carbon emissions in 2009/10 (compared with 2008/09) and a 14.5% (5,466t) reduction in emissions against baseline (2006/07);**
- (2) approve continued action for the reduction in carbon emissions and energy costs, with a view to achieving the Council's carbon reduction target of 25% by March 2013;**
- (3) receive a further annual progress report in one year's time, detailing progress in 2010/11 and carbon reduction plans for 2011/12;**
- (4) note support by the Environment PDS Committee for the establishment of a PDS Highways Asset Working Group in the new**

**municipal year, the scope of which should include matters concerned with street lighting, street signage and energy efficiency; and**

**(5) encourage the establishment of Environmental Champions at all Council sites.**

**B) CARBON REDUCTION COMMITMENT (CRC) SCHEME: 2010 ANNUAL REPORT**

**Report ES10189**

Concerning the Carbon Reduction Commitment statutory scheme it was reported that the coalition government no longer intended to redistribute allowance revenue among participants but would retain the revenue to support public finances, thus effectively becoming a carbon tax and significantly increasing the Council's projected financial liabilities.

The Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) scheme remained central to the Government's strategy for delivering targets set out in the Climate Change Act 2008 and measures were already being taken by the Council to reduce carbon emissions and hence projected financial liabilities.

Based on the Council's Carbon Management Programme (CMP) data, the Council's 2009/10 CRC footprint would be 31,952 tonnes and projecting this data, a 2011/12 CRC footprint of 32,152 tonnes was calculated. With allowances to be purchased (initially at £12/tonne CO<sub>2</sub>) retrospectively to cover the carbon emissions associated with the Council's operational property, schools and street lighting, a cost of £353,743, rising by more than £100k per annum, was currently being projected. Maintained schools were projected to be the largest single element of the Council's carbon.

The October 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR10) announced that revenue raised from the sale of CRC allowances would not be recycled back to participants but used to support the public finances and the first sale of CRC allowances, accounting for 2011/12 emissions, would be held in July 2012 rather than in April 2011. Each phase of the scheme would also be extended by one year. The requirement to report on 2010/11 emissions remained.

Members were apprised of possible future changes. The future of the emissions cap was currently under review as was the trading system element. It therefore remained unclear what price allowances would be present in future phases of the CRC and how prices would be determined.

Members were also informed about Data Management and the Evidence Pack which was a key element of the scheme and necessary for audit from August 2011. It was also reported that the performance league table would be retained but no longer used for the purpose of revenue recycling. The league table would now function principally as a reputational driver.

In discussion there were a number of comments and suggestions.

A question was asked on whether local MPs were being lobbied on how they felt about the CRC Scheme. In advocating reduced energy use, the Portfolio Holder felt that the matter was now essentially a financial one with the interest of the Environment Portfolio essentially focusing on street lighting with other interests such as energy management at Council properties and schools being the responsibility of other portfolios.

It was noted that under the CRC Scheme the Council currently had responsibilities for academy schools as well as maintained schools. The Chairman felt that the Executive should be recommended to write to the Secretary of State for Education about this highlighting the anomaly that academy schools appeared to be outside of the Authority's control except for the payment of carbon emissions.

In response to a question about energy management and the Council's estate, Members were advised that it was possible to calculate energy/carbon savings from a reduced Council estate and some work had already been carried out on this.

Councillor Julian Grainger suggested the on site use of renewable energy to help reduce liabilities under CRC noting that there were also generous feed in tariffs from renewable energy production. He suggested that a feasibility study be undertaken on using on site renewable generation facilities. In asking for details of costs associated with ground source and source heat pumps, Councillor Grainger enquired whether such generation facilities could be extended to street lighting. The Chairman supported Councillor Grainger's comments agreeing that they should be referred to the Executive for consideration. It was understood that an air source heat pump would take some eight years to generate a saving and that a ground source heat pump would take some 15 years to achieve a saving.

It was confirmed that feed-in tariffs could be claimed with payment made by the energy supplier. It would still be necessary to buy the CRC allowance and it was necessary to consider the value of energy efficiencies (reduction) against renewable energy. It was suggested to Members that energy efficiency would be more cost efficient than renewable energy – energy efficiency measures would tend to pay back in less than five years and renewable energy would typically start to pay back after eight years.

**RESOLVED that the Executive be recommended to:**

- (1) note the statutory duty on LB Bromley to comply with the CRC scheme, the likely costs arising from this 'tax', and the potential for civil and criminal penalties;**
- (2) endorse the need for sustained action to reduce energy use and carbon emissions and improve data management to minimise the Council's financial liabilities under the scheme;**

- (3) receive a further report setting out the Council's progress under the scheme and a forecast of its future financial liabilities in one year's time;
- (4) write to the Secretary of State for Education to enquire how it was proposed that local authorities should work with academy schools to reduce their energy consumption and deliver the Council's responsibilities under the CRC Scheme; and
- (5) ask the Improvement and Efficiency Sub Committee to look at further ways of reducing energy consumption and to look at benefits associated with renewable energy generation, feed in tariffs and other similar measures.

**82 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME, MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

**Report ES10180**

In noting the Committee's Work programme for the remainder of the year along with progress on matters arising from previous meetings and a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio it was **RESOLVED** that:

- (1) the Forward Work Programme be noted;
- (2) progress related to previous Committee requests be noted; and
- (3) a summary of contracts related to the Environment portfolio be noted.

**APPENDIX A**

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

**Questions from Councillor Tom Papworth**

1. Following the first recent snowfall event at the end of November, on what day did snow clearance operations start in Bromley and on what day did they cease and for the second snowfall event later in December when did snow clearance operations start in Bromley and when did they cease and what activity was undertaken between the two snowfall events?

**Reply**

First snow event - start of operations, Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> November, end Friday 10<sup>th</sup> December.

Second snow event – start of operations Saturday 18<sup>th</sup> December, end Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> December.

Winter service activities between the two snow events were restricted to precautionary carriageway treatments.

-----

2. On what dates were waste collections suspended?

**Reply**

The Waste Collections were suspended on Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> November.

The service resumed as best it could on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> December.

With conditions underfoot remaining treacherous throughout that week only a limited catch up proved possible despite the praiseworthy efforts of the waste crews whom I would like to publically recognise and thank for their efforts during that difficult period. It is not widely known that a number of them fell whilst executing their duties.

Four accidents were recorded in the accident book due to employees slipping on the ice, two of which had to go to hospital and became RIDDOR (The Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations), reportable accidents.

Injuries sustained were:

Twisted ankle  
Torn Ligaments  
Bruising to Arm  
Bruising to Knee

In total 16 days were lost due to injuries.

In addition to this, the contractor was notified by telephone from approximately 10 employees who had slipped over during the course of their work, but these incidents did not cause any significant injury and were reported under the contractor's 'near-miss' procedures.

With much improved conditions on the ground by that stage, the week commencing Monday 13<sup>th</sup> December allowed a more general and effective 'catch up' of all waste and recycling streams still outstanding at that time.

-----

**Supplementary Question**

3. Councillor Papworth enquired further on action being taken to catch up on waste collections.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder referred to thawing conditions week beginning 13<sup>th</sup> December but also referred to a further snowfall on 18<sup>th</sup> December which meant that collections were disrupted for week beginning 20<sup>th</sup> December. Some two thirds of waste was collected during the Monday collection with some three quarters during the Tuesday collection. Later that week efforts were made to try and catch up. The Portfolio Holder commented that there those who had praised collections in view of the snow events.

-----

4. What action was taken to clear ice from pavements in residential areas?

**Reply**

The removal of ice from pavements focused on the Council's prioritised areas for treatment. These include, schools, shopping parade, medical surgeries, and transport hubs.

Little extra clearance treatment of the Borough's 760 miles of pavements took place due to the pure logistics and necessary prioritisation involved in managing the Borough's priority road network.

In an effort to address this problem, the Borough has initiated an innovative scheme called 'Snow Friends' which seeks to encourage local volunteers to take responsibility for clearing pavements in their neighbourhoods.

The interest demonstrated by residents wishing to 'do their bit' has been extremely encouraging thus far with over 1000 'snow scoops' and complimentary bags of salt/grit having been dispensed for effective use across the Borough during such conditions.

Officers will shortly be discussing how to take this initiative on to the next level with Residents Associations across the Borough (also less formal groupings of residents who identify themselves with effective proposals) in an effort to build on this success.

-----

**Supplementary Question**

5. Councillor Papworth made further enquiries about clearance.

**Reply**

To enable further clearance operations along pavements, the Portfolio Holder explained that it was necessary to take staff away from duties involving services such as waste collections and street cleaning. On balance he felt that the principal of getting services up and running was the correct course of action.

-----

**Questions from Dr Mike Roddis concerning item 8C, Kings Hall Road, Beckenham**

6. Why has the Council adopted a policy of no vertical deflections or speed cameras for road safety improvement?

**Reply**

The Council's policy of seeking predominantly non-vertical deflection solutions to new road safety schemes across the Borough stems from its belief that such measures cause unacceptable disruption to the emergency services, quite possibly culminating in unnecessary deaths due to the delays caused to the medical treatment of victims both prior to reaching them and by way of the disrupted treatment they cause to recovered patients.

Also, vertical deflection causes discomfort to other road users with a number of medical conditions, and likewise such measures contribute to pollution (both physical and noise) and can cause costly damage to residents' vehicles.

Regarding cameras, the Council's Road Safety team work closely with local Safer Neighbourhood Teams across the Borough where asked to do so.

The Council has also recently provided the local Police with a number of hand-held cameras to enable them to undertake further work in reported hot spots borough-wide.

I very much hope to be able to announce shortly that this balanced approach has contributed to the 4<sup>th</sup> successive year of record new low injury accidents across the Borough during 2010.

-----

**Supplementary Question and Reply**

7. Dr Roddis enquired about ambulance movements along Kings Hall Road and in support of his previous reply the Portfolio Holder felt that one ambulance movement would be sufficient to seek predominantly non-vertical deflection solutions.

-----



8. How was the positioning of the build-outs in this proposed scheme determined in relation to the road, particularly in view of the fact that the majority of accidents and collisions have occurred at the proposed location of the eastern chicane?

**Reply**

I am advised that the proposed locations were selected to give maximum benefit in terms of reducing the speed of vehicles on both the straight sections of Kings Hall Road and, crucially, through the bend. If the eastern chicane was moved further northward, the distance between the two sets of chicanes might be too great to have the desired effect of reducing speed through the bend.

-----

**Supplementary Question**

9. Dr Roddis enquired why the apex of the Kings Hall Road bend in Drawing ESD-10630-1 appeared to be outside house number 128. Dr Roddis suggested that the road was much broader in reality and that the apex should really be outside house number 136 Kings Hall Road where he suggested the vast majority of accidents occurred.

**Reply**

The Portfolio explained that the design drawing had been drawn up by officers and that the item would be discussed by the Committee within the next hour.

-----

10. In view of the accidents associated with the traffic island outside 136/138 Kings Hall Road, what further measures will be required to protect these properties as the eastern chicane will now deflect any future vehicles involved in accidents into the gardens of these houses?

**Reply**

Consideration will be given to installing wooden posts with reflective features on the verge beside each of the two chicanes, to help direct drivers through them and to provide some protection to pedestrians and residents.

**Supplementary Question**

11. Dr Roddis referred to accident damage that had taken place to two trees and asked if wooden posts would be sufficient?

**Reply**

In reply the Portfolio Holder suggested that much would be dependent upon the speed of travelling vehicles.

-----

**Questions from Mr David Sawkins concerning item 8C, Kings Hall Road, Beckenham**

12. In 8 years we've paid £12,000 in Council Tax. How much of this has been spent on road safety in Kings Hall Road?

**Reply**

None, certainly directly. All such schemes are centrally funded by TfL LIPs monies.

-----

**Supplementary Question**

13. Referring to TfL funding, Mr Sawkins enquired whether the Council would accept additional funds for speed cameras.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder replied that the Council would not; speed cameras were installed on a strict basis related to KSI (killed or seriously injured) accident data.

-----

14. Why do the proposed schemes address only the bend and not the straight sections where speeds are higher and many crashes have occurred?

**Reply**

There have been relatively few crashes on the straight section of Kings Hall Road. This scheme is designed to address the issue of the many collisions that are occurring on the bend. However, the preferred option of the chicanes will help reduce speeds on the straight section of Kings Hall Road as well.

-----

**Supplementary Question**

15. Mr Sawkins referred to a need for anecdotal support regarding accidents to be accepted including photographs, commenting that collisions not causing death were unrecorded.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder explained that TfL funding is not provided for measures that are not focused on maximising the reduction of injury accidents, particularly serious and fatal accidents. *(Please also see reply to Question 19 below and the reply to Supplementary Question 20 below)*

-----

16. Is it regrettable that our children cannot cross our residential street to visit their friends?

**Reply**

It would be were it to be true, but whilst I of course accept that all suburban roads are busier at certain times of the day than at others, providing children are equipped with the correct skill sets and given training by responsible adults I don't believe for a moment that it is.

The Council's Road Safety Officers visit all the local schools to help equip children with Green Cross Code skills to keep them safer on the roads. There is however an even more important role to be played by parents and guardians in educating their children on related matters.

-----

**Supplementary Question**

17. Mr Sawkins referred to pedestrians contending with cars speeding at up to 50 mph and being driven in some cases on the wrong side of the traffic island.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder indicated that dangerous driving was widespread and in regard to Kings Hall Road he referred to previous measures that had been undertaken and to doing more now to make them effective.

**Questions from Mrs Sonia Yiapanis concerning item 8C, Kings Hall Road, Beckenham**

18. What is the statutory notice period for these proposals to be made public before going to meeting? Given the degree of interest regarding the new traffic scheme, why weren't residents notified as soon as this report was available on-line - we have been given very little time to respond.

**Reply**

Agendas and accompanying reports for Council Committee meetings are

required to be published at least five clear working days in advance of the meeting. For this meeting, the agenda and reports were published on Thursday 30<sup>th</sup> December 2010 and were available on the Council's website from 10pm that evening.

This particular report was only just ready in time to meet the deadline for this committee date, and residents' views have been received during the design process. If more time had been available, a more formal consultation process would have been undertaken with residents before the report was published, so that their views could be reported to Members. In this instance a meeting has been organised such that Members and the Portfolio Holder can be clear on residents' views before any decision is made.

-----

19. In paragraph 3.5, why is the number of additional collisions - not included in the official statistics - not specified? Further to the request of Cllr Sarah Phillips at the last meeting, residents have reported at least 19 other incidents in the same period, which makes the 3 recorded injury collisions somewhat misleading.

### **Reply**

Across London (Bromley included) funds for road safety schemes are obtained from Transport for London on the basis of whether the funds will maximise the reduction of injury accidents, particularly serious and fatal accidents. Bromley supports this policy and after successful interventions the number of serious and fatal accidents has decreased in recent years.

The method of selecting sites involves finding clusters of similar accidents of any severity (sites with four or more accidents within a circle of 54 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> yards diameter), ranking these clusters by severity, then choosing potentially treatable sites. The only reliable data that can be used for this comparison of sites is that recorded by the Police from injury accidents.

I do not doubt that there have been many more crashes in Kings Hall Road than the three officially recorded. Similar accidents were not however taken into consideration when funding was made available for the original scheme, and as such cannot be considered when comparing 'like for like' before and after statistics.

-----

### **Supplementary Question**

20. Mrs Yiapanis felt that it would have been helpful to have asked residents to provide more evidence. Mrs Yiapanis explained that residents had taken time and effort to record accidents and it would have been helpful to have reported this information.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder explained that TfL held the necessary funds for measures to reduce accidents and these funds were directed primarily at measures to reduce accident deaths as these were the most costly to society. However TfL now allowed funding for measures in areas where there had been an identified cluster of accidents and there was therefore more scope to spend the funds. However, the Portfolio Holder explained that he had no power to direct the TfL money as residents might wish following any additional information.

-----

21. In paragraph 3.7 you state that "The speed of 34 mph for this type of road is relatively low". What "type of road" do you consider Kings Hall Road to be?

**Reply**

Kings Hall Road is a Local Distributor Road. The Police do not consider that enforcement is necessary at speeds of 34mph on roads of this nature.

-----

**Supplementary Question**

22. Mrs Yiapanis explained that she also had a personal interest in securing effective safety measures and damage had already been incurred to her front garden wall and she felt very exposed to future accident damage. She also asked why a road which included a nursery and school should be given the description of a distributor road and she felt that it should be treated instead as a residential road.

**Reply**

The Portfolio Holder explained that Kings Hall Road seemed to be used as a route to avoid Beckenham High Street. It was a fast road and in view of parking issues in the area the Portfolio Holder felt that it would be helpful to have more parking on Kings Hall Road which would have a calming effect on traffic. The latest measures outlined were an attempt to meet the reasonable expectations of residents. However there was no guarantee they would deliver expectations and as a local distributor road there would be more traffic than would be expected for a residential road.

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

**Questions from Councillor Tom Papworth**

23. To ask the Portfolio Holder for the Environment to provide a breakdown

of:

- (i) salting and gritting of roads and pavements in Crystal Palace ward during the recent snowfall?
- (ii) dates during which waste collections were "suspended" (missed) and the roads affected.

**Reply**

(i) **Roads**

All primary and secondary gritting routes throughout the borough were kept open during throughout the recent snow events. The following roads within Crystal Palace ward were also treated once the main roads were clear;

Crystal Palace Station Road  
George Groves Road  
Pleydell Avenue  
Trenholme Close  
Trenholme Road  
William Booth Road

**Pavements**

As part of Bromley's published winter service policy and plan, when snow conditions are forecast footway operations commence by pre-treating the first priority locations which include: pavements outside public transport interchanges; the Borough's primary retail centre's; footways in front of primary and secondary school entrances and 'walking bus' routes.

During the last snow event which commenced on 30<sup>th</sup> November, our first priorities were followed as part of the Borough's stated plan. However, after several days of repeated attention and as soon as it was practicable, we refocused our attention on our secondary priority pavements which included specific sections of footway such as: secondary and other tertiary shopping areas; hospitals and outside medical surgeries and hills, in that priority order.

The following street names feature a pavement area prioritised for treatment during the recent snow event within the Crystal Palace ward:

Anerley Hill (hill, shops, transport interchange – Anerley),  
Anerley Park (hill, school),  
Anerley Road (hill, school, shops, transport interchange – Anerley),  
Belvedere Road (hill),  
Crystal Palace Park Road (hill),  
Crystal Palace Parade (transport interchange – bus terminus),  
Church Road (shops),  
Cintra Park (hill),  
Croydon Road (shops),

Crystal Palace Station Road (transport interchange – Crystal Palace),  
George Groves Road (school),  
High Street Penge (hill, shops, transport interchange – Penge West),  
Lawrie Park Road (hill),  
Ledrington Road (transport interchange – Crystal Palace),  
Madeline Road (hill, school),  
Milestone Road (hill),  
Patterson Road (hill),  
Tudor Road (hill),  
Versailles Road (hill, school)  
Waldegrave Road (hill),  
William Booth Road (hill, school).

(ii) See question 2 of the Oral questions. Please also note that “suspended” does not mean the same thing as “(missed)”.

-----

### **Questions from Mr Colin Willetts**

24. Following a complaint 30/12/10 from senior citizen Mrs Neilson of 127 Lullingstone Crescent, apparently the gents toilet has been closed for the last five weeks and in her own words the ladies toilet was ‘ wringing wet’ and very dirty and is being used by both sexes. i) could you tell us why this has been closed for this amount of time? ii) and when will it be reopened? She also asks iii) would it possible to modernise the existing toilet cubicle/s for disabled use?

### **Reply**

(i) & (ii) The male toilet in Cotmandene Crescent was closed at the beginning of November due to fire damage and remained closed for approx. 4 weeks. It was recorded as being open when inspected on 10<sup>th</sup> December. The toilets (male and female) were then closed again on the 21<sup>st</sup> December due to frozen pipes but they were re-opened again on Boxing Day and have remained open since.

(iii) There are no plans to modernise these toilets in the future for disabled use.

-----

25. Could the Portfolio Holder refill salt bin no 465 and salt bin no 135 located either end of Cotmandene Crescent shops and could he also provide a salt bin for the senior citizens housing complex in Watringbury Close to be located adjacent nos 34?

### **Reply**

Regarding the first part of your question, orders were placed on 20<sup>th</sup>

December 2010 to refill both bins.

Regarding the second part of your question, there are no plans to do so at this time as the two existing salt bins in Wateringbury Close ; one at the northern end of the road and the other at the junction with Longbury Drive are deemed sufficient to treat the areas in question.

The bigger problem is that the contents of the Borough's salt bins are increasingly being stolen, rendering the bins less effective and reliable than anyone would prefer when they are most needed.

For this reason I will be interested in exploring the possibility of expanding the Council's 'Snow Friends' initiative with local residents to see whether we can find secure salt/grit storage locations in the immediate area to ensure such supplies remain available when most needed.

-----

26. As Assistant Secretary of the Little Chislewick Residents Association I have been requested to ask of the Portfolio Holder, could he supply 2 salt bins for the Leasons Estate, one to be located at Wynford Grove junction, Saxville Road and the other to be located at Robin Way junction, Saxville Road?

**Reply**

At this stage no.

The contents of Salt bins are increasingly being stolen rendering the bins less effective and reliable than anyone would prefer when they are most needed.

I will however be interested in exploring the possibility of expanding the Council's 'Snow Friends' initiative with Mr Andrew Wilson, Chairman of the Little Chislewick RA, to see whether we can find secure salt/grit storage locations in the immediate area(s) to ensure such supplies are available when most needed.

-----

The Meeting ended at 10.26 pm

Chairman