

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

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 5 April 2011

### **Present:**

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

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Peter Fortune, Councillor Colin Smith and  
Councillor Michael Tickner

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

There were no apologies.

### **100 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations.

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

There were no questions to the Committee.

### **102 PETITIONS**

A petition from Glenn Kelly, Staff Side Secretary, was also submitted to the Council on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2011 and this was considered by the Committee. The petition was headed as follows:

*“Save our services*

*Tell Bromley Council to keep off the grass*

*Stop the attack on your parks services*

*We the undersigned call on Bromley Council to drop their plans to cut the parks services and sack up to 50% of the parks staff “*

In line with the Council's Petitions Scheme, Councillor Colin Smith as Environment Portfolio Holder, responded on 20th March 2011. Following receipt of the Portfolio Holder's response and in view of the petition having exceeded 250 signatures, it was the wish of the petitioners to present the petition to the Environment PDS Committee as permitted under the Petition Scheme.

Mr Glenn Kelly addressed the Committee as head petitioner. He referred to the extent of Bromley's open spaces and the number of parks in the borough highlighting the current number of staff supporting the Parks service. He briefly highlighted the range of responsibilities covered and commented that the workforce was already overstretched. Mr Kelly also referred to the role of Park Keepers being long discontinued and to the vulnerability of about a third of the Park service workforce. As he saw it, Mr Kelly outlined the implications of a reduced workforce and referring to the Portfolio Holder's reply to the petition, sought the Portfolio Holder's support in maintaining existing resources. He also encouraged the use of Council reserves and referred to the provision of public services.

The Committee considered the points raised by Mr Kelly. Councillor Papworth felt that it was not the time to cut the Park Ranger service and park security but was against any use of the Council's reserves. He suggested that some of the Council's contingency funds could be diverted to the Parks service. The Chairman explained that it was not clear as yet where savings for the Parks service would come from. He referred to responsibility in taking tough decisions and taking account of the needs of the vulnerable; it was necessary for each Department to take its share of savings. The Council had agreed reductions across services ensuring that services for the vulnerable were not reduced. The Chairman suggested that details of the petition be noted and Mr Kelly thanked but that no action is taken and the outcome of the consultation awaited.

Councillor Kathy Bance sought clarification that no decision had been taken to cut the parks service and the Head of Parks and Greenspace explained that budget heads were known for the service and that formal consultation would begin shortly. Councillor Ian Payne commented that it was necessary to go to consultation and hear what others had to say. Councillor Lydia Buttinger explained that difficult decisions had to be made across services with every Department taking some savings. The Portfolio Holder commented that he did not support the use of reserves indicating that a reason for their maintenance was to ensure the provision of resources to protect vulnerable services in the future.

In concluding discussion and with the concerns expressed noted the Committee decided following a vote to take no further action on the petition.

**RESOLVED that no further action be taken by the Committee on the petition.**

At the Committee's previous meeting Members agreed to recommend that the Environment Portfolio Holder note the details of a Petition from Elena Tincu and Sian Thomas objecting to a parking permit scheme for certain roads surrounding Penge East station. This recommendation was one of five recommendations related to further consultation and consideration of possible permit parking/parking restrictions at a number of roads in the area (Report ES11020). By means of an update, details were provided of a Portfolio Holder decision related to the parking review, further details of which were recorded in the Decision Notice at item 7 of the agenda.

**103 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 1ST MARCH 2011**

The minutes were agreed.

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

Three questions had been received from Mr Colin Willetts for written reply. The questions and replies are at **Appendix A**.

**105 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS**

Members were provided with Decisions of the Portfolio Holder taken since the Committee's meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2011.

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

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

**Report ES11041**

Based on expenditure and activity levels up to January 2011, the controllable budget for the Portfolio was expected to be overspent by £777k at year end after allowing for transfers to and from central contingency for the waste underspend of Cr £756k and recession monies to cover the £316k net shortfall on parking income. A large overspend on winter maintenance was due to the UK experiencing the coldest December in 31 years and the South East in particular suffering two main snow events with as much as 60cm falling in some parts of the Borough.

A £46k under achievement of income on non-controllable budgets was also projected.

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

**B) COMMUNITY NURSERY DEVELOPMENT**

**Report ES11034**

Members considered a report to the Portfolio Holder seeking approval for the Brook Lane former allotment site (Plaistow and Sundridge Ward) and land south of Cranworth Cottages, between Nos. 17 – 43 Leaves Green Road (Darwin Ward), to be used as a community horticultural nursery and supporting growing area until such time when the land might be sold for development.

For the past year, the Parks and Greenspace Service had delivered the 'Park Time' and 'Grow Time' pilot health initiatives funded by the local Primary Care trust (PCT). Based at the Cray Valley, the programmes sought to improve people's health through involvement in landscape maintenance work and growing projects. Both groups were now formally constituted sitting under the "Friends of Parks" umbrella. Those interested in conservation and horticulture worked with the "Park Time" team and clients of the "Grow Time" team learned to run an allotment site and grow produce.

As a next stage of development it was intended that the programme become sustainable without relying on the Council's financial resources. The vision was to expand the programme to work across all Wards, providing additional maintenance to Bromley's parks and open spaces. Grow Time and Park Time clients needed an area large enough to grow shrubs, trees and plants, as new stock or replacements to help populate Bromley Council's flowerbeds and shrubberies. Training and tools etc would be funded externally through the PCT and other agencies. Existing clients had also raised funds to provide necessary seeds. Surplus land off Leaves Green Road would be used to "grow on" plants once they had left Brook Lane so ensuring they became hardy before planting in parks by the Grow Time and Park Time volunteers.

In time a trading arm would be developed to enable self sufficiency and a viable social enterprise could potentially evolve. The project would be supported by the Friends of Parks and Streets, the Allotments and grassroots sports providers. Adequate external funding would be sought to meet costs at both sites for years 1 and 2 and the project was not expected to require any LBB funding other than 16 hours of officer time per week.

In discussion, Councillor Scoates explained that he would not want to see any hard standing on the Leaves Green site and was concerned that there might be future development on the site which was on green belt land. He advocated the land remaining as a Community Nursery if approved or continuing in its present state should Community Nursery use be rejected. Councillor Lydia Buttinger was also concerned that the Leaves Green site might be sold for development in the future and cautioned that no action should be taken to prejudice the site as green belt land. She encouraged the

Portfolio Holder to take further advice in regard to the protection of the site as Green Belt land.

Councillor Tom Papworth also indicated that should the sites be marketed for development in the future, it might be difficult to remove the Community Nursery interests and there could also be strong feeling from Community Nursery supporters.

Councillor Michael Turner expressed his support for the Brook Lane site being used as community nursery. Members were also advised of an intention to have a café on the site in the future which would also provide a “window” for plants and other produce. The Chairman referred to the “Branching Out” Scheme to help those suffering from conditions such as depression. Referring to allotments not sited on Council land and to help reduce any Council subsidy for them, the Chairman suggested that the allotments holders could take an interest in the Community Nursery development potentially by supporting a social enterprise both financially and through management or just by utilising some of the horticultural stock produced.

Councillor Ian Payne supported the Community Nursery proposal and suggested that any construction on the Brook Lane site be single storey. He also enquired whether there was any direction on what could be constructed on the site.

In concluding debate it was agreed that the recommendations should be supported and should the Environment and Resources Portfolio Holders agree the Community Nursery proposal it was also recommended that the two sites should not be sold for development in the future; the Leaves Green site should continue to be protected as green belt; and the Brook Lane site retained as open space.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Environment and Resources Portfolio Holders be recommended to agree that the former Allotment Site at Brook Lane, Downham and Land South of Cranworth Cottages, between Nos. 17 – 43 Leaves Green Road, Leaves Green be used to establish community horticulture nursery facilities;**

**(2) the Environment Portfolio Holder agrees to the proposed community horticulture nursery, and growing area, subject to adequate external funding being secured; and**

**(3) should the Community Nursery proposal be approved, the two sites should not be sold for development in the future; the Leaves Green site should continue to be protected as green belt; and the Brook Lane site retained as open space.**

## C) PARKING ENFORCEMENT AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

### Report ES11016

Members considered a report to the Portfolio Holder examining options for tackling a number of outstanding parking enforcement and management issues. An update was also provided on how the findings of the 2008/09 Parking Working Group had been addressed to date.

Since the Working Group reported a number of parking management issues had arisen including some related to the effectiveness of enforcement. Proposals designed to address the issues were outlined in Report ES11016.

Introduce charges for Plaistow Lane car park - the car park was currently free but well used by all-day parkers. It was proposed to introduce a pay and display scheme based on a 30p per hour rate, with a maximum charge of £3 per day for vehicles left for 6 hours or more. Charging times would be Monday to Saturday 8.30am to 6.30pm. To reduce the risk of displacement, free parking would be allowed for up to 2 hours for a single session once per day. This charge was comparable to other car parks serving smaller railway stations with some local shopping provision.

Convert time-limited parking bays to Pay & Display – it was proposed that the following locations be converted to Pay & Display: Carlton Shopping Parade, Orpington, Croydon Road Shopping Parade (by Elmers End Green), Beckenham, Main Road, Biggin Hill and Mottingham Road, Mottingham. Charges would be set at 30p per hour in line with other similar schemes at small shopping parades, and as with all other on-street locations the tariffs would be linear based. In discussion however Members were advised that the recommendation related to this proposal had been withdrawn as consultation was continuing. Members were also advised that proposed pay and display parking restrictions for Main Road, Biggin Hill, in place of time limited parking bays, would not now be taken forward.

Extension of CCTV parking enforcement to Petts Wood using existing cameras - Petts Wood was enforced by traffic wardens only and it was proposed that traffic enforcement cameras be used within the area to enhance traffic enforcement and support local retailers and visitors by deterring opportunist drivers causing delays to local transport, hindering loading and unloading for retail units and creating unsafe areas for pedestrians. Public Protection division would have priority control of the cameras to support community safety (as they had with all other CCTV cameras in the borough). As with the previous proposal, Members were advised that the related recommendation had been withdrawn as consultation was continuing.

Charges for Blue Badge holders in car parks – a number of organisations were being consulted on the possible introduction of charges for blue badge holders in the Council's car parks. Following the receipt of comments, an equalities impact assessment would be undertaken on the implications of

introducing such charges. It was intended to provide a further report on the outcome of consultation and the impact assessment. Formal consultation would also be necessary in relation to any subsequent Traffic Regulation Order.

Extend CCTV enforcement hours to include evenings and Sundays – there were core hours for CCTV enforcement although restrictions to deter illegal parking remained in place outside of these times, particularly in town centres. CCTV enforcement would concentrate primarily on certain more serious contraventions and it was proposed to increase enforcement hours by CCTV to ensure that evening and Sunday restrictions could be managed, particularly within Bromley, Beckenham, Orpington and Penge town centres. As in core hours of enforcement, Bromley CCTV operators would continue to have priority control of cameras for the detection and prevention of crime.

Additional CCTV vehicles - two further mobile CCTV vehicles had recently been purchased which would assist in improving safety around schools through deterrent and active enforcement of parking restrictions.

Re-deployable cameras - an investigation had been undertaken of the capabilities and functionality of fixed re-deployable cameras which could be relocated around the borough to record and/or relay CCTV images, particularly images of parking contraventions outside schools. The technology would allow more schools to be enforced simultaneously at a potentially lower cost than existing mobile CCTV enforcement. However, operational and budget constraints currently prevented the requirement for a qualified CCTV officer to be present or very near the location when enforcing so preventing this from being an option. Officers would nevertheless continue to investigate the technology and seek to resolve the operational and legislative issues.

Bank holiday enforcement in CPZ residents' permit bays – a review of the enforcement of residents' permit bays in CPZs on Bank Holidays, indicated that the number of PCNs issued for parking in permit bays in CPZs was low. In respect of new Permit schemes, appeals over PCNs issued on Bank Holidays were dealt with sympathetically on the first occasion.

Parking Permit Fees - there were a number of anomalies in the pricing structure of parking permits for residents and it was recommended that for future new schemes an annual price of £35 be set for all residents' permits where enforcement was no more than four hours in any day, and that for any zone operating for more than four hours (normally all day), an annual fee of £75 would be charged, subject to any future review of permit prices. This would improve the clarity and efficiency of administering permit schemes across the borough whilst remaining consistent with the current range of charges. It was also proposed that Business permits be charged at a higher annual rate of £150 and the use of introductory permits be discontinued.

Councillor Turner expressed opposition to the introduction of charges at the Plaistow Lane Car Park. He felt that this could adversely affect the nearby shopping parade where there were already empty shops. The availability of local free parking was a great boon to shoppers and also to those residents

experiencing difficulties parking outside of their home. Councillor Buttinger was also reluctant to support the proposed charges as currently presented.

In relation to charging for blue badge holders at Council car parks, Councillor Papworth suggested that responses from organisations consulted at paragraph 4.4.10 of report ES11016 could be predictable and there might be adverse publicity should it be decided to proceed with the proposal. Councillor Bance expressed her opposition to the measure and Councillor Payne indicated that problems caused by adverse publicity could outweigh benefits; instead he would like to see more enforcement against blue badge offences. The Chairman explained that the Parking Working Group had taken a view that charging Blue Badge Holders in Council Car Parks would encourage the Badge Holders to park on street and on yellow lines and that he remained of the view that the unintended consequences due to changes to resident behaviour following the introduction of charges would be sufficiently detrimental that the cost benefit would not be realised. Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher suggested that care be taken on the proximity of disabled parking bays at Council car parks e.g. in relation to parking machines.

In regard to converting on-street time-limited parking bays to pay and display bays at certain locations, the Chairman suggested the use of mobile phone and other payment options as available pay and display machines might be needed elsewhere. Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher on the other hand questioned the need for mobile phone payment as the bays would be for short stay.

In concluding debate it was agreed that recommendations 2.1, 2.4 and 2.6 be supported. It was also agreed that recommendation 2.5 be supported with a request for the Committee's comments to be noted. Councillor Turner and Councillor Buttinger asked that their opposition to recommendation 2.1 be recorded.

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

**2.1 introduce charges based on a 30p per hour rate for the Plaistow Lane car park as set out in section 4.1 of report ES11016;**

**2.2 extend the hours of enforcement by CCTV cameras as set out in section 4.5 of report ES11016;**

**2.3 note the Committee's comments and receive a further report, following sufficient consultation and the completion of an impact assessment, on the possible introduction of charges for blue badge holders within Council off-street car parks, as set out in section 4.4 of report ES11016; and**

**2.4 standardise the cost of Resident's CPZ Permits for any future new schemes at £35 and £75 with the cost of Business Permits charged at £150 as outlined in section 4.9 of report ES11016.**

**D) VEHICLE CROSSING TO THE REAR OF 75 KENWOOD DRIVE,  
BECKENHAM**

**Report ES11037**

A report to the Portfolio Holder sought a decision on an application for a vehicle crossing in Quinton Close, Beckenham, to serve the rear of 75, Kenwood Drive.

Councillor Michael Tickner attended the meeting for this item and addressed the Committee. He spoke on behalf of Quinton Close residents noting that the width of the close was no wider now than when the matter was considered by the former Environmental Services Committee on 29<sup>th</sup> November 1995. Councillor Tickner described Quinton Close and urged the Committee to support a recommendation that the application be refused. Councillor Tickner outlined his reasons for this approach and noted that little had changed since 1995.

In discussion questions on the matter were raised by Members and comments from the Head of Transport Strategy included background concerning the highway verge and comment on highway rights/powers for the verge. Members were advised that should the application be refused such a decision should be taken on highway considerations alone.

Members concluded their consideration by recommending that the Portfolio Holder refuse the application on the grounds that (1) the creation of such a crossing in Quinton Close would constitute a serious loss in the amenity value of the highway verge and (2) the property is already adequately served for residential purposes by its existing crossing into Kenwood Drive and a further crossing is considered to be inappropriate.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to refuse the application for a vehicle crossing on the grounds that (1) the creation of such a crossing in Quinton Close would constitute a serious loss in the amenity value of the highway verge and (2) the property is already adequately served for residential purposes by its existing crossing into Kenwood Drive and a further crossing is considered to be inappropriate.**

**E) PUBLIC TOILET PROVISION**

**Report ES11013**

Details were outlined of savings proposals related to Public Toilet provision and the introduction of the Community Toilet Scheme in additional locations.

It was proposed that 13 on street and 2 park public toilets be closed with an additional 8 park toilets transferred to business/community management or operated with reduced opening times.

Savings would be made through reduced cleansing and maintenance costs with the outstanding budget being used to clean and maintain toilets remaining open. A proportion would also be used to operate and develop the Community Toilet Scheme and support new management arrangements in parks.

The programme of closures and changes to management arrangements would begin from June 2011 following a further analysis of the feasibility of introducing the Community Toilet Scheme in all locations and consultation with local businesses and ward Councillors.

At the start of discussion Members were handed details of costs associated with public toilets in the borough. This information was originally appended to a previous report.

Councillor Papworth supported the recommendations and Councillor Payne referred to toilet facilities provided by retailers not party to the Community Toilet Scheme. Councillor Scoates referred to public toilets being of assistance to ramblers etc in more rural parts of the borough; he felt that the Community Toilet scheme should be in place before closing identified public toilets.

The Portfolio Holder indicated that the Community Toilet Scheme could also benefit the business model of retailers. Retailers could increase their custom and competition could increase a desire for participation in the scheme.

It was also suggested that retailers who so wanted should be part of the Scheme without being paid by the Council.

Councillor Papworth suggested that a closed public toilet should not only display a closed sign but also display directions to the nearest available toilet. The Assistant Director (Street Scene and Greenspace) also referred to negotiations with cafes and friends of parks concerning new cleaning arrangements for park toilets.

Concerning a proposed closure of the Cudham Recreation toilets, Councillor Scoates commented that he would like to enquire with the local Residents Association whether they would like to take on the upkeep and cleaning of the facilities.

The Chairman also noted a letter he had received during the meeting from Mr Nick Goy.

Members agreed to support the recommendations to the Portfolio Holder with a view taken that the extra budget provision of £20k for community toilets be kept under review – if further proposals were to be brought forward to consider increasing this financial support, as appropriate, to deliver additional facilities.

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

- (1) the continued phased closure of public toilets and introduction of new cleaning arrangements in others, to achieve the £223k of savings required, as set out in paragraph 3.7 of report ES11013; and**
- (2) continue with funding and further expansion of the Community Toilet Scheme across the borough.**

## **F) WASTE SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS**

### **Report 11049**

Proposed changes were outlined to current Waste Services arrangements.

On Food Waste Liners, the provision of free liners via local libraries had proved so popular that it was no longer financially sustainable. This provision was in addition to a planned six monthly delivery of free liners to residents.

As part of the Council budget savings, costs of supplying free liners from 2012/13 onwards had been removed and the scheduled October 2011 delivery would have been the final free delivery (unless sponsorship could be identified). However to mitigate the problem in the short term, the planned April delivery of liners would also incorporate the October delivery so providing a final distribution to each household of two rolls or 100 liners each.

To ensure residents were able to obtain liners without an unsustainable budget pressure on the Council, it was proposed to sell liners via the libraries and Council offices at an initial price of £2.00 per roll of 50 covering not only the actual cost but additional administration costs.

Members were also informed of an arrangement in Oldham between the local authority and Co-op stores for the provision of liners and the Co-op had indicated during initial discussions that it was interested in replicating the offer in Bromley. Discussions with other retailers would continue with the aim of finding methods of subsidising the cost of providing liners to residents at the lowest possible cost.

Collection of food waste from flats was not currently covered where bulk communal containers were provided for refuse and dry recyclables. However it was proposed that funding from the London Waste & Recycling Board (LW&RB) be used to expand the Composting for All (CFA) service to all such flats. The cost of delivering communications to affected residents and the cost of delivering the containers would be funded from existing Waste budgets; the additional collection costs would be balanced by savings achieved in diverting the food waste away from landfill.

Concerning textile collections, it was suggested that a potential income of some £180k could be available per annum. Officers had been contacted by several locally-based textile companies suggesting options to improve and expand the current service mainly provided by charity groups. Options

included a revision of current arrangements, tendering the revised service options (to include local SMEs, voluntary organisations and charities) or re-focussing service provision with service providers working as a sub-contractor to Veolia. Portfolio Holder authority was sought to develop such contacts with a view to bringing a further report on options for revising the current service level.

Concerning the proposed charge for cornstarch liners the Chairman suggested that arrangements be made for the liners to be posted for a suitable additional fee. The Head of Waste Services explained that it was also acceptable for residents to wrap their food waste in newspaper. Referring to any exploration of the option of the Council taking over operation of textile collections in the borough, Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher expressed a view that that any charity organisations involved in collecting textiles should continue to receive the income for their charity rather than the option being one for Bromley to increase its income. Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher asked for her opposition to recommendation 2.3 of report ES11049 to be recorded.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(1) the Environment Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree -**

**(a) the expansion of the CFA service to include all properties in flats serviced by bulk containers for refuse and recyclables, with no changes to the existing frequency of refuse collections, utilising funding provided by the London Waste & Recycling Board, with effect from October 2011;**

**(b) the implementation, with immediate effect, of a charge of £2 per roll of 50 cornstarch liners, with sales points available at libraries and other council offices; and**

**(c) the commencement of negotiations with the Waste Management contractor and other potential contractors to explore options for the Council to obtain an income from the operation of the textile recycling service in the borough.**

**(2) the Executive be recommended to agree that funding of the £521k grant be allocated to support expansion of the CFA scheme.**

**G) IMPACT OF WINTER DAMAGE ON THE PLANNED HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME 2011/12**

**Report ES11033**

Severe winter conditions had led to accelerated deterioration of some sections of the Network. In certain circumstances required patch repairs for pot holes had been particularly extensive and better value for money could be

achieved by developing resurfacing schemes. The roads in most need of planned maintenance had therefore changed.

The prioritisation process in recent years had relied on data from detailed annual condition surveys on a third of the borough each summer supplemented with other information. However in view of the severe winters it was proposed to undertake an additional condition survey of every road in the borough during the spring, the results of which would form the basis of the 2012/13 works programme. Remaining schemes from the approved 2011/12 programme would be completed along with a number of additional schemes - a revised 2011/12 programme was appended to report ES11033.

The condition survey would also allow additional schemes to be identified for inclusion in the 2011/12 programme and these would be included in the annual highways report for the autumn. In the meantime it was proposed that the Director retained delegated authority, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to include additional schemes in the programme where roads had deteriorated and would otherwise require substantial expenditure on reactive maintenance.

Members supported the recommendations with support also expressed for drawing down £419k of Government funds for the repair of pot holes and road patching.

**RESOLVED that:**

- (1) the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree -**
  - (a) the amended initial tranche of the 2011/12 planned highway maintenance programme at Appendix 2 of Report 11033;**
  - (b) that a report be presented in the autumn detailing the remainder of the 2011/12 maintenance programme and the provisional programme for 2012/13; and**
  - (c) delegated authority being retained by the Director of Environmental Services, in consultation with the Environment Portfolio Holder, for amending the approved programme where necessary.**
- (2) The Executive be recommended to draw down £419k of Government funds for the repair of pot holes and road patching.**

**H) DRAFT ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2011-14**

**Report ES11042**

Advice was sought on whether the scope of the draft Environment Portfolio Plan for 2011/14 was set at the right level to outline priorities and enhance accountability or whether the final Plan should have a narrower focus.

It was intended that the final draft of the Plan, following input from the Committee and Portfolio Holder, would be presented to the Committee's first meeting of the new municipal year to facilitate:

- accountability for the achievement of 2010/11 targets;
- understanding of the Portfolio's objectives for the coming year; and
- the setting of milestones and local performance expectations for 2011/14

The approach recommended was that of consistency with the priorities of the 2010/13 Portfolio Plan but with some changes to reflect the restructuring of the Environmental Services Department in 2010. Alternatively, it was suggested that the Portfolio Plan could focus on a shorter list of high level priorities and the 2010/11 list of Building a Better Bromley commitments, including performance to the end of Quarter 3, was provided to illustrate the potential for such an alternative approach.

The national performance framework had changed since the 2010/13 Portfolio Plan was drafted and the following indicators were affected:

- NI 17 (perception of problems with litter, graffiti, etc) had been abolished with the Place Survey;
- NI 194 (Council NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions) had been abolished;
- NI 195 (street cleansing) data was now held by Keep Britain Tidy rather than DEFRA;
- NI 198 (children's travel to school) was derived from the School Census, under review by the DfE; and
- NI 199 (children's satisfaction with parks) was abolished with the Tellus survey

To reflect a local priority - Condition of Footway Surface - a non-statutory indicator was highlighted for consideration of inclusion in the Plan; the former indicator measuring residents' satisfaction with the service was no longer collected due to the abolition of the national Place Survey.

The Committee continued to want some form of benchmarking so that it could assess the performance of the Portfolio plus judge the value for money delivered by the services offered and it was content with the scope and content of the draft Portfolio Plan as presented. The Committee would consider replacing the existing benchmarking methods with a superior method, if available, to establish residents' satisfaction with all the services delivered by the department.

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

**(1) the scope and content of the draft Portfolio Plan to facilitate accountability for measuring progress and value for money; and**

**(2) the receipt of a further report recommending a final draft of the Portfolio Plan, including 2010/11 performance data, and the setting out an appropriate level of specific milestones and local performance expectations for the period 2011/14.**

**107 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE EXECUTIVE**

**A) IMPLICATIONS OF THE FLOODING AND WATER MANAGEMENT ACT 2010**

**Report ES11017**

Members considered action necessary by the Council following the introduction of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (FWMA).

As a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) Bromley would be required to assume a leadership role in managing flood risk and would be accountable for ensuring effective management of flooding incidents due to surface water and groundwater.

In December 2010 the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) announced new grants that would be provided to local authorities to fully cover their costs in putting in place and carrying out the new responsibilities under the FWMA. For LB Bromley the grant would be £141,600 in 2011/12 and £252,700 in 2012/13.

The FWMA required all LLFAs to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a strategy for local flood risk management in its area. The LLFA had responsibility for ensuring that a strategy was in place but local partners could agree how to develop it in the way that suited them best. Although the duties related to all Council departments it was proposed that responsibilities for the FWMA be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services.

The FWMA required LLFAs to produce a Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) and Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) and the 'Drain London Forum', co-ordinating work for the whole of the capital, received £3.2m from DEFRA In 2009 to develop a SWMP and PFRA for each of the boroughs. LBB would be required to submit their SWMP and PFRA to the Environment Agency in June 2011 but as these would not be available from Drain London until May 2011 it was recommended that the documents be reviewed by the Director of Environmental Services in consultation with the Portfolio Holder prior to their submission. Details were also provided of future tasks that the Council would be required to carry out in its LLFA role.

A sum of £141,600 had been set aside in the Council's 2011/12 Central Contingency Sum. With the additional duties imposed on the Council from the FWMA it would be necessary to provide additional resources to manage the responsibilities and it was proposed that £110k be drawn down from the 2011/12 Central Contingency Sum.

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

- (1) note the duties, roles and responsibilities within the Flood and Water Management Act;**
- (ii) delegate all responsibilities for the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 to the Director of Environmental Services; and**
- (iii) release a sum of £110,000 from the 2011/12 Central Contingency Sum to implement the proposals detailed in report ES11017.**

**108 ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY ANNUAL REVIEW:  
2010/11**

**Report ES11027**

Members were apprised of progress made on environmental sustainability during 2010/11 reflecting a renewed emphasis on integrating Council environmental management with the efficiency agenda.

Highlights of Bromley's 2010/11 environmental sustainability activity included:

- successful preparation for the Carbon Reduction Commitment scheme;
- decreasing operational carbon emissions by 14.5% (2009/10 compared with 2006/07);
- delivering further cost and carbon savings through the Carbon Management Fund;
- expanding the Environmental Champions Network to further green the workplace;
- celebrating residents' achievements at Bromley's Environment Awards 2010;
- contributing to the Bromley Sustainable Schools Forum; and
- working with partner organisations in the Bromley Environment Working Group.

**RESOLVED that:**

- (1) the environmental sustainability activities set out in the annual review be noted; and**
- (2) a further environmental sustainability review be presented to the Committee in April 2012 to allow PDS Members to scrutinise progress made during 2011/12.**

**109 SELECTION, DESIGN AND CONSULTATION POLICY FOR TRAFFIC SCHEMES**

**Report ES10185**

In relation to traffic schemes in the Borough a report was provided on matters concerned with scheme selection, design and consultation procedures.

It was noted that the final sentence of paragraph 3.48 of the report should be corrected to read: *“Members are asked to endorse this process and to suggest any improvements”*

At paragraph 3.33 of the report reference was also made to examples of public consultation being made available at Committee. Accordingly, consultation examples were tabled for Members and it was agreed that they would be taken away for consideration with the item brought back for discussion at the Committee’s next meeting in June.

The Head of Traffic and Road Safety outlined the number of questionnaires sent out with each consultation tabled along with the rate of return as follows:

<u>Consultation</u>	<u>Number of Questionnaires circulated</u>	<u>Response Rate</u>
Main Road/Sunningvale Avenue, Biggin Hill	100	33%
Lennard Road Proposed Zebra Crossing	110	70%
White Horse Hill Area/ Red Hill - Local Safety Scheme	320	14%
Avalon Road Area Local Safety Scheme	2650	11%
Proposed Right Turn Ban, Midfield Way, St Pauls Cray	150	21%
Southborough Road, Width Restriction Scheme	Not consulted on – information leaflet only	Not consulted on
Crown Lane, Bromley Traffic Improvement Scheme	110	37%

Copers Cope Controlled Parking Scheme	1847	17%
Review of Parking Arrangements, Petts Wood Area	4800	30%
Turners Meadow Way – Controlled Parking Zone – Review	110	61%

**RESOLVED** that consideration of Report ES10185 on the Selection, Design and Consultation Policy for Traffic Schemes be deferred to the Committee's next meeting for consideration.

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

**Report ES11032**

Members noted a draft work programme for 2011/12 along with progress on requests from previous meetings and a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio.

It was explained that the Committee's first meeting for the 2011/12 Municipal Year was likely to be on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2011 (*Democratic Services note: this was confirmed following the General Purposes and Licensing Committee meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2011*).

**RESOLVED** that:

- (1) the draft work programme for 2011/12 be noted;**
- (2) progress related to previous Committee requests be noted; and**
- (3) a summary of contracts related to the Environment Portfolio be noted.**

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

**112 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF PART 2 REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

**A) CONTRACT EXTENSION - INSPECTION OF STREET WORKS  
2010**

**Report ES11026**

Members considered a report to the Portfolio Holder seeking approval to extend by a further year the contract to deliver inspection and enforcement duties prescribed in the New Road and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA), the London Permit Scheme for Road Works and Street Works (LoPS) and the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA).

**APPENDIX A**

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

**Question 1**

Could the Portfolio Holder i) replace missing parking plate in Curtismill Close junction with Curtismill Way (reported on 16/1/11)?, & ii) rectify/replace damaged signpost Dawson Avenue junction Broomwood Road (reported 25/1/11)?

**Reply**

I am advised that these issues have been addressed.

-----

**Question 2**

Could the Portfolio Holder give me the approximate number of households in Cray Valley West using the food waste recycling bins?

**Reply**

A participation survey was carried out in the extended trial area of 27,500 properties in June 2010, and this demonstrated participation rates varying from 74% to 85% with an overall average of 79% across the borough.

I would anticipate Cray Valley West's current take up sitting somewhere within this range.

-----

**Question 3**

Could the Portfolio Holder rectify lamp column outside Treval steel fabricators in Cray Avenue nr jcn Poverest Road which has been 'dayburn' for the last 3 weeks?

The site has been attended and no fault was found at that time.

-----

The Meeting ended at 10.17 pm

Chairman