To: Members of the
ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

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

A meeting of the Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee will be
held at Bromley Civic Centre on TUESDAY 11 JANUARY 2011 AT 7.30 PM

MARK BOWEN
Director of Legal, Democratic and
Customer Services.

Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
www.bromley.gov.uk/meetings

A G E N D A

PART 1 AGENDA

Note for Members: Members are reminded that Officer contact details are shown on
each report and Members are welcome to raise questions in advance of the meeting.

STANDARD ITEMS

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

To hear questions to the Committee received in writing by the Legal, Democratic and
Customer Services Department by 5.00pm on Wednesday 5th January 2011 and to
respond.

4 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD ON 9TH
AND 29TH NOVEMBER 2010 (Pages 5 - 38)
HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT

5 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING
To hear questions to the Environment Portfolio Holder received in writing by the Legal, Democratic and Customer Services Department by 5.00pm on Wednesday 5th January 2011 and to respond.

6 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS (Pages 39 - 42)
To note decisions of the Portfolio Holder made since the previous meeting of the Committee.

7 PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER
The Environment Portfolio Holder to present scheduled reports for pre-decision scrutiny on matters where he is minded to make decisions.

a BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11 (Pages 43 - 52)

b CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2ND QUARTER 2010/11 (Pages 53 - 58)

c TRADE WASTE COLLECTION SERVICE ANNUAL PRICE INCREASE
This report is to follow.

d BROMLEY TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ) REVIEW (Pages 59 - 64)

e MIDFIELD WAY SAFETY SCHEME - PROPOSED RIGHT TURN BAN (Pages 65 - 70)

f COURT ROAD ORPINGTON - FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR SHARED FOOTWAY (Pages 71 - 76)

8 MINOR TRAFFIC/PARKING SCHEME REPORTS TO THE ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER
The following minor traffic/parking scheme reports to the Environment Portfolio Holder are included on the agenda should Members wish to raise any pre-decision scrutiny questions on the reports.

a UPPER ELMERS END ROAD SAFETY SCHEME (Pages 77 - 84)

b STAPLETON ROAD - PROPOSED MINI ROUNDABOUT (Pages 85 - 90)

c KINGS HALL ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS (Pages 91 - 98)
PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF REPORTS TO THE EXECUTIVE

a CARBON MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME: PROGRESS REPORT 2009/10

As this report will also be considered by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee on 5th January 2011 and the Executive on 12th January 2011, the report is provided to Members under separate cover. Members are requested to bring their copy of the report with them to any of the meetings considering this item.

b CARBON REDUCTION COMMITMENT (CRC) SCHEME: 2010 ANNUAL REPORT

As this report will also be considered by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee on 5th January 2011 and the Executive on 12th January 2011, the report is provided to Members under separate cover. Members are requested to bring their copy of the report with them to any of the meetings considering this item.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ITEMS

10 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME, MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND CONTRACTS REGISTER (Pages 99 - 106)

DATES OF FUTURE ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE MEETINGS

1st March 2011
5th April 2011

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
This page is left intentionally blank
ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

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

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

Also Present:
Councillor Peter Fortune, Councillor Julian Grainger,
Councillor Alexa Michael and Councillor Colin Smith

47 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

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

48 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

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

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

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

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

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

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

55
51 QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS
OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE
MEETING

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

The questions and answers are appended to these minutes.

52 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS

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

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

54 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11

Report ES10156

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Report ES10160

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

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

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

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

The Portfolio Holder recognised members’ concerns and felt there should be a benchmark for the percentage of consultation responses required before
(resident demanded) schemes were implemented. If the response rates were too small then perhaps certain types of scheme should not be progressed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED that the recommendations are supported.
C) HOMESDALE ROAD, PROPOSED ZEBRA CROSSING

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

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

RESOLVED that the recommendations are supported.

D) ST GEORGES ROAD, PROPOSED ZEBRA CROSSING

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

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

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

RESOLVED that the recommendations are supported.

56 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME - MATTERS ARISING

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

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

Members also requested that scheme consultations should be considered substantively in the report due for the January meeting looking at traffic scheme design and consultation policy.
The Portfolio Holder would organise a small working party to be chaired by the Executive assistant to consider highway maintenance prioritisation, prepare a report and feed back to a future meeting.

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

RESOLVED that:

1. the draft work programme be agreed;

2. Review the progress report related to previous Committee requests is noted.

3. the Environment Portfolio contracts list is noted

4. The Portfolio Holder and a small group of members consider highway maintenance prioritisation; prepare a report and feedback to a future meeting.

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

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

The exempt minutes of the meeting held on 28\textsuperscript{th} September 2010 were agreed.

APPENDIX A

ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE, 9TH NOVEMBER 2010

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

Question 1

Displacement by parking schemes

At the last Full Council the Chairman was asked:
"In the last 12 months, for traffic or parking schemes considered by the PDS, please can the Chairman list those schemes that have: a) addressed the issue of displacement of vehicles b) provided an estimate of the number of cars to be displaced?"

While the answer provided for the Chairman started:
“All traffic and parking schemes consider the possible displacement of vehicles.”, there was no mention of schemes where displacement was actually quantified.

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

Reply

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

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

Question 2

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

a) When this scheme was scrutinised what was the estimate of the number of cars likely to be displaced from these roads?

b) What consideration did the report give to where these cars might displace to?

c) Following implementation, how many cars have been displaced by this CPZ?

d) How many of the cars so displaced will displace again if additional restrictions are introduced in roads such as Lancing and Bedford Roads?

e) Where might such further displacement move to?

Reply

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

There were a number of residents who had forecourt parking without crossovers. A number of residents took the opportunity of the pavement resurfacing work to apply for crossovers since bays would be across their
Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee  
9 November 2010

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

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

--------------

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

Question
Orpington Parking Scheme - displacement and traffic speeds

On 5th August, the Portfolio Holder agreed (amongst others) Resolution 2) that:
- "further flank wall parking .... might be added"

and added Resolution 3 that:
- "free spaces be found .... which might...":
  - "increase the available parking stock"
  - "... assist in speed management,"

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

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

Specifically, is he aware that:
i) restrictions along flank walls or similar are still included (e.g Park Avenue, Charterhouse Road)

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

iii) that yellow lines along the entire length of very long side roads would remain thus negating any speed management by parked cars during the restricted hours (e.g. Park Avenue, Hillcrest Road and almost all of Felstead Road)  
(note: Felstead Road would keep just 4 free spaces between Hillcrest & Park Ave.)
Reply

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

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

--------------

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

Reply

Please see my answer above.

--------------

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

Question 1

Would you spray weed infestation back of footway in:

i) Cotmandene Crescent from the Launderette around to the Star of India restaurant?

ii) Gutterline on highway adjacent to Whippendell Way through to Swanscombe House (apparently not listed on Kier cleansing schedule)?

iii) Large clumps of footway weed infestation outside OAP Mrs Coveney’s property at 7 Longbury Drive?

Reply

Yes.

--------------

Question 2

Would you enforce chest level overhanging low shrub/bramble vegetation on rear footway outside 1 & 11 Headley House, Longbury Drive and low branch
overhang to footway Tillingbourne Green junction Churchill Wood?

**Reply**

Yes.

---------------------

**Question 3**

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

**Reply**

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

---------------------

The Meeting ended at 9.20 pm

Chairman
ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

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

Present:

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

Also Present:

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

59 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillor Papworth.

60 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

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

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

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

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

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

63 ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO - PREVIOUS DECISIONS
Decisions of the Portfolio Holder taken since the Committee’s meeting on 9th November 2010 were noted.

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

65 LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (LIP) - DRAFT CONSULTATION

Report ES10173

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

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

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

66 BROMLEY TOWN CENTRE VARIABLE MESSAGE SIGN SYSTEM FOR CAR PARKING

Report ES10152

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

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

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

In discussion the Committee explored whether there was direct evidence that such a scheme had boosted economic activity or wellbeing elsewhere. Whilst this was difficult to quantify, they were told that those who had adopted such schemes continued to support them.
Whilst in the longer term the Committee were keen to see more encouragement of modal shift across to public transport and park and ride type approaches (and supported these being promoted through this signage in time) it was accepted that more immediately this would be a useful way to ensure that remaining parking spaces in the town were well-used. The Committee were also assured that care would be taken not to add to street sign clutter through this scheme, but that where possible existing and more confusing signage would be removed.

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

67 VEHICLE CROSSING TO THE REAR OF 75 KENWOOD DRIVE

Report ES10157

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

RESOLVED that the item be deferred.

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

Report ES10171

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

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

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

Report ES10176

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

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

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

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to approve that:

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

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

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

ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN

Report ES10174

Members considered a recommended structure and priority outcomes for the 2011/12 Environment Portfolio Plan. An actual draft Portfolio Plan would be
reported to the Committee on 5th April 2011 for consideration and then on to the Environment Portfolio Holder.

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

Councillor Turner requested that his vote against retention be recorded.

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

RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:

(1) note the report;

(2) produce a Portfolio Plan for 2011/12; and

(3) consider adding a specific item on minimising the financial impact of the Carbon Tax.

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

Report ES10175

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

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

The Committee also expressed an interest in the timetable and financial arrangements for the proposed anaerobic digestion plant; they noted that this initiative was being led by the current composting facility operator with Veolia having a role to agree an appropriate gate fee for using the facility. There were potentially some benefits in having this facility sited locally, thereby reducing the transport cost created by having to transport putrescable waste outside the Borough.
RESOLVED that progress against the 2010/11 Environment Portfolio Plan be noted and that an invitation should be extended to all Committee Members to attend an informal meeting on the Park and Ride objective.

72 WORKING GROUP REVIEW OF THE STREET CLEANSING CONTRACT

Report ES10170

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

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

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

APPENDIX

Appendix A

ENVIRONMENT PDS – 29th NOVEMBER 2010

QUESTIONS TO THE PDS CHAIRMAN FOR ORAL REPLY

Questions received from Councillor Julian Grainger

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

Reply

Yes

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

Reply

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

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

Supplementary question

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

-------------

Appendix B

QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ORAL REPLY

Questions from Mr Steven Georgiadis

1. In the light of no presented evidence of parking problems, just a request from 28% of residents, will the Portfolio Holder recognise that the
proposed scheme does not meet the terms of the borough’s Local Implementation Plan (LIP)?

**Reply**

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

**Supplementary Question**

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

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

**Reply**

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

**Supplementary Question**

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

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

**Reply**

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

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

**Question from Mr & Mrs Geoffrey Bristow**

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

**Reply**

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

**Questions received from Mrs Jenny McCarthy**

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

**Reply**

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

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

**Supplementary Question**

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

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

**Reply**

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

**Questions from Mr Gordon Snashall**
7. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

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

Reply

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

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

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

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

Reply

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

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

Supplementary Question

Mr Snashall suggested that the introduction of the revised scheme after April had not been democratic; the Portfolio Holder disagreed with this
view, pointing out that all households had their views sought, and that when the measures were reviewed after six months this would again be the case.

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

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

**Reply**

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

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

**Supplementary Question**

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

**Questions from Lynda and Christopher Taylor**

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

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

Safety and inconvenience to residents are incorporated within the plan.

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

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

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

Supplementary Question

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

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

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

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

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

Replay

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

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

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

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

**Background explanation**

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

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

**Reply**

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

**Supplementary Question**

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

**Questions from Mr Alan Belding**

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

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

Supplementary Question

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

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

Reply

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

Supplementary Question

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

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

Reply

Yes – I can confirm this is the case.

Supplementary Question

Mr Belding asked if it would have been reasonable to have discounted these votes; whilst understanding the point Mr Belding was making, the Portfolio Holder felt that this would not be defensible, because of the problems of adequately assessing or forecasting displacement that might occur.
Questions from Mrs Pat Price (supported by Mr Brian Hide)

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

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

Reply

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

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

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

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

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

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

Supplementary Question

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

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

**Reply**

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

**Supplementary Question**

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

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

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

**Reply**

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

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

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

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

**Pre-Tesco parking**

19. At the last meeting, the Portfolio Holder explained that amongst the reasons for proceeding with new restrictions around Orpington Town
Centre was that the new restrictions honoured a commitment to restore yellow line restrictions to the pre-Tesco arrangements.

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

A) Lancing Road (north & west side) from Bedford Road (1st jct) to Bedford Road (2nd jct)
B) Bedford Road (both sides) from Lancing Road to Court Road
C) Felstead Road from Nos 140 & 161 to Park Avenue
D) Hillcrest Road from Nos. 81 & 64 to Felstead Road
E) Park Avenue from Nos. 109 & 90 to Court Road
F1) Goddington Lane (north side) from Sevenoaks Road to the Scout hut.
F2) Goddington Lane (south side) from Sevenoaks Road to Durley Gardens
G1) Charterhouse Road (north side) from Sevenoaks Road to Cheltenham Road
G2) Charterhouse Road (south side) from No. 14 to Cheltenham Road

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

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

Reply

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

Supplementary Question

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

Displacement

20a) Is the Portfolio Holder aware that displacement resulting from the
proposed yellow line restrictions from these roads alone would be around 110 to 125 cars?

Reply

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

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

Supplementary Question

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

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

Reply

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

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

Supplementary Question

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

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

c) Given that some displaced cars are likely to park further along
Charterhouse Road, Repton Road and in Cheltenham Road, if residents there ask for new yellow line restrictions, will the Portfolio Holder support them? If so, where will the yellow lining around Orpington Town Centre end?

**Reply**

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

**Questions from Mr Jack Jarvie**

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

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

**Reply**

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

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

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

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

**Reply**

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

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

The April 2010 proposal cannot be re-instated as it sits outside of current
23. Would the Portfolio Holder agree with the following question/point?

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

Reply

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

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

Questions from Beverley Mack

Background explanation

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

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

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

Reply

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

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

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

Reply

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

Supplementary Question

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

-------------

Appendix C

QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR WRITTEN REPLY

Question from Mr Colin Willetts

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

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

**Question from Mr Jeff Thurgood**

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

**Reply**

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

**Question from Mr David Stark**

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

**Reply**

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

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

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

**Questions from Carole and David Hawkins**

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

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

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

Reply

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

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

Reply

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

-------------

The Meeting ended at 9.50 pm

Chairman
The Portfolio Holder for the Environment, Councillor Colin Smith, has made the following executive decision –

LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (LIP) - DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION
(Report ES10173)

Decision

(1) The Draft Local Implementation Plan be approved.

(2) The Director of Environmental Services be authorised to make any changes in consultation with the Portfolio Holder which appear to him desirable prior to submission of the Draft LIP to Transport for London (TfL).

Reasons

It is necessary to submit a Draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP) to TfL no later than 20th December 2010 and it is proposed to use the draft for consulting a range of statutory consultees and other stakeholders.

When comments have been received from TfL and others it is intended to seek approval of a final LIP in spring or early summer 2011.

Following a recent TfL notification of reduced funding for the borough 2011/12 to 2013/14, it is not possible to include the implications of this in the draft LIP given its production timetable; the draft LIP is therefore based on the original funding levels and decisions taken by Council in September 2010. A disclaimer to this effect is included the LIP Delivery Plan section.

---------------------------------------------
Councillor Colin Smith
Environment Portfolio Holder

Mark Bowen
Director of Legal, Democratic and Customer Services
Bromley Civic Centre
Stockwell Close
Bromley
BR1 3UH

Date of Decision:  8th December 2010
Implementation Date (subject to call-in):  15th December 2010
Decision Reference:  ENV10032
LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISION

The Portfolio Holder for the Environment, Councillor Colin Smith, has made the following executive decision -

MAIN ROAD BIGGIN HILL BANNED RIGHT HAND TURN INTO AND OUT OF SUNNINGVALE AVENUE
(Report ES10171)

Decision

The following be introduced - a banned right turn into Sunningvale Avenue from Main Road and a banned right turn into Main Road from the eastern arm of Sunningvale Avenue as described in paragraph 3.5 of Report ES10171 and shown in drawing number ESD-10654-1.

Reasons

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

Councillor Colin Smith
Environment Portfolio Holder

Mark Bowen
Director of Legal, Democratic and Customer Services
Bromley Civic Centre
Stockwell Close
Bromley
BR1 3UH

Date of Decision 8th December 2010
Implementation Date (subject to call-in): 15th December 2010
Decision Reference: ENV10034
LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISION

The Portfolio Holder for the Environment, Councillor Colin Smith, has made the following executive decision -

ORPINGTON PARKING REVIEW - THE RIDGE AREA
(Report ES10176)

Decision

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

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

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

Reasons

In August it was decided to make changes to the parking arrangements around Orpington following a review of parking in the area. It was decided to give special consideration to issues in The Ridge and surrounding roads and Report ES10176 provides information on the views of residents and local ward Members.

Councillor Colin Smith
Environment Portfolio Holder

Mark Bowen
Director of Legal, Democratic and Customer Services
Bromley Civic Centre
Stockwell Close
Bromley
BR1 3UH

Date of Decision: 8th December 2010
Implementation Date (subject to call-in): 15th December 2010
Decision Reference: ENV10035
LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISION

The Portfolio Holder for the Environment, Councillor Colin Smith, has made the following executive decision -

ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO PLAN 2011/12
(Report ES10174)

Decision

(1) The proposed structure of the Environment Portfolio Plan 2011/12 be agreed and the Plan should include reference to proposals for seeking to mitigate the impact of carbon tax in view of the financial imperative of finding ways to do this. The Plan should also refer to the continued enhancement of green spaces across the Borough.

(2) Said Plan to be written to minimise all non statutory contents and targets.

Reasons

A recommended structure and priority outcomes for a forthcoming Portfolio Plan are considered in advance. The next Portfolio Plan will focus on 2011/12, and a draft Plan will be completed in time for consideration at the Environment PDS Committee meeting on 5th April 2011 and subsequent decision thereafter.

---------------------------------------------

Councillor Colin Smith
Environment Portfolio Holder

Mark Bowen
Director of Legal, Democratic and Customer Services
Bromley Civic Centre
Stockwell Close
Bromley
BR1 3UH

Date of Decision: 8th December 2010
Implementation Date (subject to call-in): 15th December 2010
Decision Reference: ENV10036
1. **Reason for report**

This report provides an update of the latest budget monitoring position for 2010/11 for the Environment Portfolio based on expenditure and activity levels up to October 2010. There are significant variations highlighted in the report relating to waste tonnages and parking income. After allowing for the transfers to and from the central contingency there will be a nil variation for controllable budgets and an under achievement of income on non-controllable budgets of £43k.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Environment Portfolio Holder: -

2.1 Endorses the latest budget projection for the Environment Portfolio.
Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy. Sound financial management
2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council.

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: N/A
2. Ongoing costs: Recurring cost.
3. Budget head/performance centre: All Environment Portfolio Budgets
4. Total current budget for this head: £37.7m
5. Source of funding: Existing revenue budgets

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 224
2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory requirement. The statutory duties relating to financial reporting are covered within the Local Government Act 1972; the Local Government Finance Act 1998; the Accounts and Audit Regulations 1996; the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Government Act 2002
2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The services covered in this report affect all Council Taxpayers, Business Ratepayers, those who owe general income to the Council, all staff, Members and Pensioners.

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments:
3. **COMMENTARY**

3.1 The 2010/11 projected outturn is detailed in Appendix 1, with a forecast of projected spend for each Division compared to latest approved budget and identifies in full the reason for any variances.

3.2 Costs attributable to individual services have been classified as “controllable” and “non-controllable” in Appendix 1. Budget holders have full responsibility for those budgets classified as “controllable” as any variations relate to those factors over which the budget holder has, in general, direct control. “Non-controllable” budgets are those which are managed outside of individual budget holder’s service and, as such, cannot be directly influenced by the budget holder in the shorter term. These include, for example, building maintenance costs and property rents which are managed by the Property Division but are allocated within individual departmental/portfolio budgets to reflect the full cost of the service. As such, any variations arising are shown as “non-controllable” within services but “controllable” within the Resources Portfolio. Other examples include cross departmental recharges and capital financing costs. This approach, which is reflected in financial monitoring reports to budget holders, should ensure clearer accountability by identifying variations within the service that controls financial performance. Members should specifically refer to the “controllable” budget variations relating to portfolios in considering financial performance. These variations will include the costs related to the recession.

3.3 The controllable budget for the Environment Portfolio is expected to be balanced at the year end after allowing for the transfers to and from the central contingency for the waste underspend of Cr £756k and the recession monies to cover the £400k net shortfall of income in parking.

4. **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 The Resources Portfolio Plan for 2010/11 includes the aim of effective monitoring and control of expenditure within budget and includes the target that each service department will spend within its own budget.

4.2 Bromley Council seeks to provide value for money, remaining amongst the lowest Council Tax levels in outer London, and focusing on the priorities set out in Building a Better Bromley.

4.3 The four year financial forecast report highlights the financial pressures facing the Council. It remains imperative that strict budgetary control continues to be exercised in 2010/11 to minimise the risk of compounding financial pressures in future years.

4.4 Chief Officers and Departmental Heads of Finance are continuing to place emphasis on the need for strict compliance with the Council’s budgetary control and monitoring arrangements.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The table below summarises the financial position for the controllable budget of the Environment Portfolio and takes account of the savings in waste tonnage transferred to the central contingency sum as well as the utilisation of the central contingency sum for the recession related costs (parking): -
### SUMMARY OF VARIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall of parking income due to the recession</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of waste tonnage mainly due to the recession</td>
<td>(822)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other minor variations</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings in waste tonnage transferred to Council's central contingency</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall of parking income to be met from Council's recession fund</td>
<td>(400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net variation after allowing for transfers to and from the central contingency</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation in non-controllable budgets</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net variation projected for overall Environment Portfolio Budget (Appendix 1)</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Applicable Sections:** Legal, Personnel

**Background Documents:** 2010/11 budget monitoring files within ES finance section
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## Environmental Services Portfolio Budget Monitoring Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Service Areas</th>
<th>2009/10 Actuals</th>
<th>2010/11 Original Budget</th>
<th>2010/11 Latest Approved</th>
<th>2010/11 Latest Projection</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Last Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td></td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer &amp; Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,044)</td>
<td>(5,715)</td>
<td>(5,702)</td>
<td>(5,302)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,2,3,4</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Protection - ES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,567)</td>
<td>(4,253)</td>
<td>(4,028)</td>
<td>(3,628)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Emergency Planning</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Scene &amp; Green Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,675)</td>
<td>5,736</td>
<td>5,849</td>
<td>5,849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area Management &amp; Street Cleansing</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>5,652</td>
<td>5,725</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Regulation</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,103</td>
<td>Waste Services</td>
<td>16,504</td>
<td>16,521</td>
<td>15,699</td>
<td>(822)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(796)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport &amp; Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,252</td>
<td>28,743</td>
<td>28,668</td>
<td>27,660</td>
<td>(808)</td>
<td>(782)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>8,663</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>9,069</td>
<td>9,121</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highways Planning</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Permit Scheme</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(166)</td>
<td>(282)</td>
<td>(282)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic &amp; Road Safety</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport Strategy</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONTROLLABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,804</td>
<td>34,866</td>
<td>34,417</td>
<td>34,417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NON CONTROLLABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,469)</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXCLUDED RECHARGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES PORTFOLIO TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,332</td>
<td>38,212</td>
<td>37,739</td>
<td>37,784</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reconciliation of latest approved budget £'000

**Original budget 2010/11**

- Review of management overheads: 222
- Contract price inflation above 2.3%: 302
- Adjustment for single status: 27
- Repairs & maintenance - inflation & savings adjustment: 24
- Underspend on waste tonnage returned to central contingency: 756
- Net drawdown from recession fund for parking shortfall of income: 400
- Part year savings relating to rollout of kitchen waste collection service: 200

**Latest Approved Budget for 2010/11**

Latest approved budget 2010/11: 37,739
Environmental Services - Pre-DMT Budget Monitoring Notes – 31 October 2010

1. Bus Lane Enforcement £0k

The number of contraventions has increased over recent months resulting in a projection of an overachievement of income of £16k. At this moment in time it is not anticipated that this increase will continue to the end of the year, although the situation will be closely monitored. This is offset by Dr £16k less income being received for tickets issued last year.

2. Off Street Car Parking Dr £510k

Off street car parking is expected to be at least £510k below budget due to the continuing effects of the economic climate. From April to October there was a shortfall of £276k for the Hill, Westmoreland and Civic Centre car parks compared to budget, but in line with the actual received for the same period last year. If usage continues at this level, it is projected that the full year shortfall for these car parks will be £460k. Income from the other surface car parks is also below budget and a shortfall of £50k is projected for the year. Notable items include car parks within West Wickham £15k and Orpington College £5k.

3. On Street Car Parking £0k

A balanced budget is projected for on street parking.

A surplus of £50k is being projected from Orpington parking after allowing for £30k loss of income due to road works.

A full-year deficit of £60k is projected within Bromley CPZ partly offset by additional income of £20k within Petts Wood & Beckenham. There are other deficits across the smaller parking zones totalling £10k.

4. Parking Enforcement Cr £110k

A surplus in income of £110k is being projected. There continues to be a small increase in tickets issued from the mobile and static CCTV cameras due to more effective utilisation of resources £56k partly offset by less income (Dr £28k) being received for tickets issued last year. The performance of the parking contractor has improved significantly during the first part of the year and has led to a surplus of £122k being projected again partly offset by £40k less income being received for tickets issued last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of variations within Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit in income from off street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus income within parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enforcement - PCN numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reported variation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recession fund held within the central contingency will meet the shortfall of income for parking. The adjustment will be made at the end of the financial year.

5. Markets £14k

Due to the recession the number of market stall holders has reduced and a deficit in income of £14k is being projected.
6. Waste Management Cr £822k

Disposal

Refuse Disposal tonnages are continuing to drop. Tonnage is 7,700 below the budgeted amount for April – October resulting in an underspend of £565k. At this stage it is projected that the year end variation will be 11,500 tonnes, (although this could be as high as 13,000 tonnes), with a projected full year underspend of £840k. However, if the year-end variation results in 13,000 tonnes, this could increase the variation to £956k.

Collection

Currently, there is a projected overspend of £25k within the collection contract mainly due to kitchen waste trial.

Other items

£20k additional costs incurred for business rates at the incineration site following legislative changes.

£65k extra income is being projected for trade waste delivered and collected which is partly offset by the £28k income deficit from other sales, special and clinical collections and the deficit of £10k projected for the income from the sale of recycled paper due to a small reduction in tonnage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>£'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in disposal tonnages</td>
<td>(840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit in paper recycling income</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen waste trial</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business rates at incineration site</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional income for trade waste collected &amp; delivered</td>
<td>(65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit on other income</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total reported variation</strong></td>
<td><strong>(822)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Highways Dr £52k

Agreement has now been reached with Thames Water about the level of sample inspection billing for last year and as a result the bad debt provision raised for 2009/10 is not sufficient to cover the full loss of income, leaving a shortfall of income for 2009/10 of £52k once invoices are revised.

Similarly, following the agreement £32k of invoices raised in quarter 1 of 2010-11 will be cancelled as the improvement notices are no longer chargeable.

It is anticipated that there will be reduced expenditure within carriageway repairs of £32k to partly off-set the income deficit. The balance will be met from the underspend within Waste Services.
8. Non-controllable variations Dr £43k

Any variations within the non-controllable section are reported in detail to the Resources PDS as these budgets fall under the control of Property Department, not Environmental Services.

For information here, the variations relate to shortfalls within property rental income budgets across the division. Property department are accountable for these variations as well as any movement within repairs and maintenance budgets.
1. Reason for report

On 3rd November 2010, following scrutiny by the Executive and Resources PDS Committee on 27th October, the Executive received a report summarising the current position on capital expenditure and receipts following the 2nd quarter of 2010/11. The Executive agreed a revised Capital Programme for the four year period 2010/11 to 2013/14 and this report highlights changes agreed by the Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Environment Portfolio. The revised programme for this portfolio is set out in Appendix A.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Portfolio Holder is asked to note and confirm the report.
Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy. Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services. The capital review process requires Chief Officers to ensure that bids for capital investment provide value for money and match Council plans and priorities.

2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council.

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost Net additional cost of £16k
2. Ongoing costs: Non-recurring cost.
3. Budget head/performance centre: N/A (Capital Programme)
4. Total current budget for this head: £Total £24.8m for Environment Portfolio over four years 2010/11 to 2013/14
5. Source of funding: Capital grants, capital receipts and revenue contributions

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: No statutory requirement or Government guidance.
2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A
3. COMMENTARY

Capital Monitoring – variations reported to the Executive on 3rd November 2010

3.1 A revised Capital Programme was approved by the Executive on 3rd November, following a detailed monitoring exercise carried out after the 2nd quarter of 2010/11. Further information is provided in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 and the revised Programme for the Environment Portfolio is attached as Appendix A. A summary of the variations agreed by the Executive is set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010/11 Estimate</th>
<th>2011/12 Estimate</th>
<th>2012/13 Estimate</th>
<th>2013/14 Estimate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Programme (Executive 21/7/10)</td>
<td>9,126</td>
<td>5,774</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>24,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hill Car Park – strengthening works (Executive 29/9/10)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London (TfL) – revised grant allocations (see para 3.2)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-161</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>-288</td>
<td>-389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in government grant allocation – playbuilder (see para 3.3)</td>
<td>-595</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion of residual budget for Station Road Car Park (see para 3.4)</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen waste trial (see para 3.5)</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme rephasing</td>
<td>-277</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Environment Capital Programme</td>
<td>9,122</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>24,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Transport for London – revised support for highway schemes (overall reduction of £389k)

Provision for transport schemes to be 100% funded by TfL was originally included in the Capital Programme 2010/11 to 2013/14 on the basis of the bid in our Borough Spending Plan (BSP). Notification of an increase of £111k in 2010/11 had been received from TfL, but a total reduction of £500k has been made in later years to reflect revised forecasts of the level of TfL funding in those years. TfL grant allocations change frequently and any further variations will be reported in subsequent capital monitoring reports.

3.3 Reductions in government grant allocation for play facilities in parks (reduction of £595k)

Notification had been received of reductions in government support for a number of capital initiatives, including a reduction in the playbuilder grant from £1,123k to £528k. The Executive agreed that the budget be reduced by £595k.

3.4 Deletion of residual budgets in respect of completed schemes

A number of schemes had been completed under budget or had been identified as being no longer required and the Executive agreed that these be deleted from the programme. This included £200k in respect of the provision for miscellaneous works relating to the sale of Station Road Car Park.

3.5 Kitchen Waste Trial – extension of pilot (addition of £920k)

On 3rd September, the Executive considered a report “Recycling and Composting for all – Phase 2” and agreed to an extension to the current kitchen waste collection trial. The Executive approved the total estimated cost (£920k), to be met from the contingency provision (£380k) and the remainder (£540k) from LPSA funding. The forthcoming LAA Reward Grant will be split between revenue funding and capital funding and the Executive agreed in November that it
would be more appropriate to include the scheme in the Capital Programme and to allocate £540k of the LAA Reward Grant funding to the kitchen waste scheme.

3.6 Scheme Rephasing

The estimated spending profile of capital schemes was examined and revised, as a result of which a total of £277k has been rephased from 2010/11 into 2011/12.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Capital Programme monitoring and review is part of the planning and review process for all services. The capital review process requires Chief Officers to ensure that bids for capital investment provide value for money and match Council plans and priorities.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 These were reported in full to the Executive on 3rd November 2010. The Capital Programme for the Environment Portfolio 2010/11 to 2013/14 has increased by £16k since July as a result of variations approved by the Executive as set out in the table in paragraph 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Applicable Sections:</th>
<th>Legal and Personnel Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Documents:</td>
<td>Departmental monitoring returns October 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Access Contact Officer)</td>
<td>Approved Capital Programme (Executive 03/11/10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHEMES FULLY FUNDED BY TRANSPORT FOR LONDON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Bus Priority Network (LBPN)</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Route Network</td>
<td>1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Routes to Schools</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELTRANS</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Awareness</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley Town Centre Access Plan</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mph Zones</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop accessibility</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downie &amp; Environ WHS bid Access Plan</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Local Safety Schemes</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bridge Strengthening - Assessment</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Structural Maintenance - Principal Roads LBB</td>
<td>1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training and publicity</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELTRANS</td>
<td>1529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Improvements off London Cycle</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL - Borough Support</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Area Accessibility - Orpington Town Centre</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel initiatives</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled parking zones</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEPT</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling on Greenways</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Transport Priorities (not allocated)</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Access</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL - New funding streams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>3448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors</td>
<td>6392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>4036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smarter Travel</td>
<td>2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Based Scheme</td>
<td>4288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCHEMES FULLY FUNDED BY TfL</td>
<td>33359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADS - GENERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Message Signing - Bromley Town Centre</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road safety schemes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley Town Centre - transport and parking strategy</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ROADS - GENERAL</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAR PARKING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road Car Park - Misc works relating to sale</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hill Multi-Storey Car Park - strengthening works</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CAR PARKING</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playbuilder capital grant</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PARKS</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnuts Centre - elevated ramp repair</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter maintenance - gritter replacement</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental improvements</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Management Programme</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpington Public Realm improvements</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen waste collection - extension of trial</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER</td>
<td>4640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO</strong></td>
<td>39563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Reason for report**

1.1 This report details the findings of the parking review carried out to establish whether the Bromley Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) is still fit for purpose.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 The Portfolio Holder agree that no major changes are made to the shape, size or subdivisions of the Bromley CPZ;

2.2 The Portfolio Holder agree that the various individual parking requests received from residents and Members during the Review are subsequently addressed as separate proposals, along with proposals to install new parking bays in locations identified.

2.3 The Portfolio Holder agree that officers review the shared use bays in the town centre.
Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy. Existing Policy

2. BBB Priority: <please select>. Quality Environment

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No cost

2. Ongoing costs: N/A.


4. Total current budget for this head: £297,000 of which £150,000 is allocated to this scheme. An uncommitted balance of £116,000 is available.


Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): One.

2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 100 staff hours to prepare and consult on this scheme.

Legal


2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This scheme will mainly benefit local residents; businesses and shoppers to Bromley Town Centre.

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes.

2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: No response has been received from Members of Bromley Town Ward, but other local Members who attended the consultation meeting are not in favour of any major changes to the CPZ.
3. **COMMENTARY**

**Current CPZ**

3.1 There are currently 3 CPZ’s within the Bromley Area: zone ‘A’ covers the main Bromley Town Centre and is mainly made up of commercial and residential properties; zone ‘B’ is predominately residential properties to the north of the town centre and zone ‘C’ is predominately residential properties to the south of the town centre (see attached plan). Bromley’s two rail stations are within the Bromley CPZ area. There are a number of free parking bays in zones ‘B’ and ‘C’, which means that the area is popular for people working or undertaking leisure activities within Bromley Town Centre.

3.2 The CPZ times of operation vary between the inner and outer zones. Zone ‘A’ (inner) is operable between Monday to Saturday from 8.30am to 6.30pm and on Sundays between 10.00am and 5.00pm. The outer zones ‘B’ and ‘C’ are operable from Monday to Saturday from 8.30 am to 6.30pm. Within Zone A there is a mix of parking comprising Pay & Display, Permit Holders Only bays and some Share Use bays. The majority of Pay & Display, Permit Holders and Shared Use bays are enforceable for the duration of the controlled parking periods. In the outer zones, permit bays are only restricted between Noon and 2.00pm on Monday to Saturday.

**Purpose of this Review**

3.3 The Bromley CPZ was regularly reviewed after it was installed, but was last reviewed in 2000. As Bromley town centre is the main commercial heart of the Borough, officers considered that another review should be carried out, and this has been done this year. The purpose of the review was to see if parking could be better managed for the benefit of commuters and visitors to the town, along with residents in the CPZ or just outside the CPZ. Possible changes to be considered were:

- Changing the overall size of the CPZ (to help manage displaced parking)
- Changing the subdivisions of the CPZ – i.e. creating more than the 3 zones (to prevent intra-zone commuting – i.e. people using their residents’ permit to park near amenities)
- Increasing the number of on-street spaces in the CPZ (especially as the Westmoreland Road MSCP is due to close)

The review was also an opportunity to ensure that all signs and markings in the existing CPZ were fully compliant with current regulations.

3.4 A parking stock survey was undertaken for two reasons; (i) to quantify the current on-street parking stock and (ii) to identify areas where additional parking could be provided, the results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Pay &amp; Display</th>
<th>Shared Use</th>
<th>Permit Holders</th>
<th>Free Bay</th>
<th>Possible new bays</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner A</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North B</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2741</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>418</strong></td>
<td><strong>382</strong></td>
<td><strong>4343</strong></td>
<td><strong>1337</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>6494</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was not much scope to provide additional bays as capacity was maximised at the time of the original CPZ design. However, additional parking might be accommodated in Farwig Lane, Station Road, Ethelbert Road, Hayes Road, Aylesbury Road and North Street.

3.5 Parking surveys were also undertaken to ascertain the parking capacity of each street throughout the day. A snap shot of the level of commuting between zones was also analysed and the results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250m to 500m</td>
<td>500m to 1000m</td>
<td>Over 1000m</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250m to 500m</td>
<td>500m to 1000m</td>
<td>Over 1000m</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Although the number of intra-zone commuters identified from the parking surveys is quite low, the locations where regular intra-zone parking is taking place tend to be limited to areas where demand for parking is already high, due to both high levels of permit take up and/or limited capacity. This makes the impact on some residential streets quite high, resulting in localised annoyance.

3.7 However, this is probably not justification for a re-zoning of the Bromley CPZ. As the scale of intra-zone commuting is fairly small, changing the zones and all the related permits would be an expensive exercise that would provide little benefit.

Consultation

3.8 Ward Members have been consulted from Bromley Common & Keston Ward, Bromley Town Ward, Copers Cope Ward, Bickley Ward, Hayes & Coney Hall Ward, Plaistow & Sundridge Ward and Shortlands Ward. Members from Hayes & Coney Hall, Plaistow & Sundridge, Shortlands and Bickley Wards attended a meeting in October to discuss the findings of the review.

3.9 The general view of Members was that issues identified during the research should be addressed as individual matters, but there was little support for a major overhaul of the CPZ. However, a Bickley Ward Councillor has asked for consideration to be given to an extension of the CPZ into the area beyond Tylney Road to Bird In Hand Lane. Members have also asked that the shared use bays in Zone ‘A’ be reviewed, as they can cause confusion for visitors.

3.10 Although there has been no formal consultation of residents in the Bromley area, there have been a number of road-specific requests during the period of the review, such as for double yellow lines, fewer free bays or more bays overall. None of these have been addressed, pending the outcome of this review. It is recommended that these requests be investigated to see if any can be actioned and the outcome of these will be reported separately, if necessary.
Any local alterations subsequently proposed would involve consultation with Ward Members, local residents and businesses.

3.11 During internal consultation with the Parking Enforcement team, a request has been received to make changes to the shared use bays in the town centre, as enforcement of these has generated a high level of complaints from motorists who do not understand the regulations, even though the signage is correct.

Recommendations

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

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

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Policy T5 of the Unitary Development Plan states: “The Council will seek to improve the environmental quality, capacity and safety of local roads where appropriate, either by minor improvement or suitable traffic management schemes”.

4.2 Bromley’s agreed Parking and Enforcement Plan refers to the need ‘to regulate the location and use of on-street parking facilities where this is necessary to safeguard the efficiency and safety of the road network for all road users, to support the local economy, or to meet the needs of residents or other priority users.”

4.3 In “Building a Better Bromley 2020 Vision – Quality Environment”, two stated issues to be tackled are: (i) Promoting safe parking provision; and (ii) Improving the road network for all users.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no financial implications at this stage, however any net cost/income changes resulting from the investigation into the individual schemes will be addressed as and when the schemes are developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Applicable Sections:</th>
<th>Legal and Personnel Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Access via Contact Officer)</td>
<td>Individual parking requests list.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Reason for report

1.1 Following a series of traffic accidents at the junction of Midfield Way and Sevenoaks Way, it is proposed that action is taken to remedy this situation. The proposed solution is that right turns into Sevenoaks Road from Midfield Way be banned.

1.2 It is also proposed to review lighting on the approaches to the junction.

1.3 This report seeks the approval of the Portfolio Holder to allow the banning of right turn movements from Midfield Way into Sevenoaks Road.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the Portfolio Holder agrees the plan to ban right turn movements from Midfield Way into Sevenoaks Road, St Pauls Cray, as detailed in drawing labelled ESD10720-1.
Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy.
2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost £33,200
2. Ongoing costs: N/A. There will be no additional enforcement costs and minimal impact on income.
4. Total current budget for this head: £587,000 of which £40,000 is allocated to this safety scheme. An uncommitted balance of £33,200 is available for this scheme.
5. Source of funding: Transport for London

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1
2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 50

Legal

2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Midfield Way junction with Sevenoaks Road is a busy intersection. This proposal will make the location safer for motorists and for residents who live nearby.

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Councillor John Ince has said that this proposal is very welcome.
3. **COMMENTARY**

3.1 In May 2009 it was identified that there are more accidents occurring at the junction of Midfield Way with Sevenoaks Way than might be expected at a junctions of this type and capacity.

3.2 Between June 2005 and April 2010 there have been 13 collisions at this junction. Eight of these collisions involved vehicles turning right from Midfield Way into Sevenoaks Way. Five of these collisions resulted in serious injuries.

3.3 Complaints have been received from local residents concerning delays caused whilst other drivers attempt to negotiate a right turn from Midfield Way at this junction. Local residents have also contacted the Council to suggest that this junction is dangerous, and there are often crashed cars parked on the verge in front of their houses. Additionally, Councillor John Ince has said that he has personally seen two small shunts at this junction.

3.4 During a site visit in May 2010 it was observed that vehicles attempting to turn right from the side road were causing delay to the heavily congested Sevenoaks Road (A224), as they edged out and prevented traffic from turning right into Midfield Way.

3.5 A considerable volume of vehicles emerging from Midfield Way turn right into Sevenoaks Way. By banning a right turn the junction would be made safer for all who use these roads. Drivers wanting to travel south towards Orpington would be asked to turn left and use the Crittalls Corner roundabout, although this would increase their journey by few hundred meters. Alternatively, drivers would use other roads, such as Chipperfield Way, to reach Sevenoaks Way further south.

3.6 Banning right turns, as shown in drawing ESD10720-1, would reduce the number of collisions at this junction and will improve the flow of traffic on Sevenoaks Way.

**Consultation**

3.7 Pre-consultation documents were sent out to Ward Members inviting their comments. A positive response was received from Councillor John Ince.

3.8 On 18th October 2010 Local Schools and Residents were asked for their views on the proposed right turn ban. One hundred and fifty questionnaires were delivered. Thirty one responses were received.

**Summary of Consultation Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of questionnaires circulated</th>
<th>No of questionnaires returned</th>
<th>In favour</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>31 (21%)</td>
<td>27 (87%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments received and responses**

The main concern of the four opposing residents (representing 13%), were as set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed rebuilding of the rail bridge in Chislehurst Road will create huge traffic jams in Sevenoaks Way &amp; Cray Ave, as the St Mary Cray rail bridge will be the only Way to drive to Orpington. The accident problem will not be as great as the traffic will</td>
<td>There is no evidence that traffic will be at a stand-still during reconstruction of Chislehurst Bridge, although initial congestion on surrounding routes is anticipated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be at a stand-still most of the time.

**Why not enlarge the junction, or make a roundabout.**

The building of a roundabout at this location would be a more expensive option requiring more land space and would also change priorities.

**This is a waste of money. 95% of traffic turns left anyway. As regards the cycle track, I have lived in Midfield Way for over 60 years and the number of bicycles observed has been minimal. Most accidents I have known about have been due to cars moving along Sevenoaks Way at excessive speed.**

A traffic count shows that an average of four out of every ten vehicles turned right from Midfield Way. It is proposed that cars should turn left towards Crittalls Corner. The cycle track is intended to separate cyclist from left turning vehicles. A pelican crossing is in place on Sevenoaks Way to aid school children and residents.

I am against the ‘no right turn’ because I believe it will create rat run through residential streets. If cars go down Grays Farm Road as an alternative, there is a school located there. By diverting traffic you increase traffic past yet another school. No child has been run over here. (Sevenoaks Way)

It is expected that some drivers may find alternative routes through to Orpington; however, it is not believed that this will cause much increased traffic flow past Grays Farm Primary School.

It would be good if you could make Valley Rd one way entry. Cars come down Valley Rd very fast.

The only consideration here is to ban the right turn movement from Midfield Way; it is not considered that it is appropriate to make any changes to Valley Road.

**Conclusions**

3.9 In light of the projected accident savings and the responses to consultation, officers seek the approval of the Portfolio Holder to allow the banning of right turning vehicles from Midfield Way into Sevenoaks Road.

4. **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 In “Building a Better Bromley 2020 Vision – Quality Environment”, two stated issues to be tackled are: (i) Promoting safe Motoring; and (ii) Improving the road network for all users.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The estimated cost of this scheme is £33,200 and will be funded from the Transport for London Casualty Reduction budget. £40,000 was available for this scheme and £33,200 is available as an uncommitted balance.

6. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 A Traffic Management Order will be required under Section 9 of the Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Applicable Sections:</th>
<th>Policy and Personnel Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Documents:</td>
<td>Consultation document filed in room N87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Access via Contact Officer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. **Reason for report**

1.1 Officers have identified a range of issues and opportunities for improving facilities for walking and cycling adjacent to Orpington By-pass. Bromley identified funding from TfL in 2010/11 to investigate improvements along this route, stretching from the boundary with Kent County Council to Goddington Park. The subsequent full report is now available.

1.2 This report seeks the approval of the Portfolio Holder for officers to move forward with proposals funded from the TfL 2011/12 budget to progress designs for these proposals, in consultation with Ward Members.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That approval is given by the Portfolio Holder for the adjacent footway to Orpington bypass to become shared use, from Hewitt’s roundabout to its junction with Park Avenue, subject to detailed design.

2.2 That approval is given by the Portfolio Holder for officers to design and build schemes to improve facilities for walking and cycling parallel to the Orpington By-pass, as listed at paragraph 3.7.
Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy.
2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost £135k provisionally allocated
2. Ongoing costs: Recurring cost. n/a
4. Total current budget for this head: £345,000 of which £135,000 is allocated to this scheme. An uncommitted balance of £135,000 is available for this scheme.
5. Source of funding: Transport for London

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1
2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: not yet known

Legal

2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All pedestrians and cyclists who use this road.

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Ward Members have been sent copies of the Study Report. Any comments received will be presented at Committee.
3. **COMMENTARY**

3.1 Currently £135k has been assigned from the LIP funding for Cycling and Walking schemes 2011/12 for the development and implementation of measures to improve routes for pedestrians and cyclists alongside the Orpington by-pass. A Study Report has been produced which covers the area / route under investigation and is now available. The route commences at Goddington Park and primarily passes along a corridor south east towards Hewitt’s roundabout with access to Knockholt Station also recommended for improvement. Maps are within the Study Report showing the current bus services, existing circular walks & public rights of way and local trip generators.

3.2 Due to the economic climate there are likely to be more people walking and cycling in the Borough. Current surveys across the borough support this view. To address this, officers have investigated this corridor and have developed plans in to improve conditions here. Many improvements are considered to be needed along this road. At present there are no specific cycle facilities along this busy road, and officers recommend any improvements to the footway are of a shared nature. General road safety upgrades are required at existing substandard road crossings, along with improved signage. Formal and informal crossing points also require significant upgrading, as does the lighting. This scheme will have the benefit to motorists of removing the majority of cyclists from the main carriageway, thus helping motorised traffic flow more freely.

3.3 **Links to other schemes:** Various local safety schemes have been previously approved by the Environment Portfolio Holder, along this corridor (see background documents). A previous report on the corridor from Goddington Park to Bexley borough (London Greenways) has already been submitted (see background papers). Greenways are attractive and appealing routes for walking and cycling which are intended to encourage people to travel in ways that benefit their health and the environment plus reduce traffic congestion. London Greenways was a TfL funded programme, overseen by Sustrans, to deliver greenways throughout London.

3.4 The Study Report is intended to provide a framework for improving facilities and safety for pedestrians and cyclists using any part of this route. Officers intend to include some of this facility within new healthy circular walking / circular cycling routes. Bromley currently have seven healthy walking routes and it is hoped to take this up to twelve across the Borough. Consequently officers have been looking for more opportunities to improve road safety and facilities for walkers and cyclists. Bromley received funding in 2010 to investigate improving facilities for walking and cycling parallel to Court Road. The main object of the study was to identify a safe walking and cycling route through from Goddington Park, to its boundary with Kent County Council at Hewitt’s roundabout using, wherever possible, a network of “greenways”. Parking and safety issues will be included within the scope of study. The area of the study is shown in the attached map.

3.5 As the Study was looking at road safety it was considered appropriate to include collision details in this report. Over the last 3 years (Sept 07-Aug10) there have been 19 collisions along the section under study, with 5 resulting in serious injury and the others in slight. Details of these collisions will be used at detailed design stage of each aspect of this scheme that is taken forward.

3.6 This report seeks the approval of the Portfolio Holder for officers to progress the designs of the aspects of the scheme listed below, in consultation with Ward Members, and bring detailed design options to Members when these are ready.
3.7 Works programme for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Works required and reason</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Est (£k)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 All route</td>
<td>Refurbishment of existing path, as surface is very poor with rutting and pot holes</td>
<td>2.74 kms</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Highway</td>
<td>Short lengths of new path to refuge, to improve crossing safety.</td>
<td>10 m</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Near The Highway</td>
<td>New path to Bus Stop, currently mud and grass, to improve the walking surface.</td>
<td>45 m</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Near Warren Road east</td>
<td>Extend path to refuge to improve crossing safety</td>
<td>70 m</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Near Hewitt's Roundabout</td>
<td>New path to join existing sections, currently mud and grass, to improve the walking surface.</td>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 All route</td>
<td>Upgrade lighting, current lighting is substandard.</td>
<td>2.74 kms</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 This proposal offers added value in terms of renewing the footway surface and the street lights.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 In “Building a Better Bromley 2020 vision – Quality Environment” one of the stated issues to be tackled was: Improving the road network for all users.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 At this stage estimated costs have been used in the development of this works programme, within the attached report. £135k has been provisionally allocated from the TfL ‘Corridors and Neighbourhoods’ Cycling and Walking Schemes funding for 2011/12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Applicable Sections:</th>
<th>Legal and Personnel Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Documents:</td>
<td>1. Court Road Feasibility Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Warren Road Junction with Court Road ES10165 – Road safety scheme Dated 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Chelsfield Village review of signage and Lines ES10136 (Gateway treatment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Reason for report**

1.1 Following a series of traffic accidents at and near the zebra crossing in Upper Elmers End Road, near junction with Altyre Way, it is proposed that action is taken to remedy this situation. The proposed solution is to extend the existing refuge in the middle of the existing zebra crossing and to introduce tight turn pocket into Altyre Way.

1.2 This report seeks the approval of the Portfolio Holder for these changes.

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 That the Portfolio Holder agrees to the plan to improve the existing crossing and to introduce right turn pocket in Upper Elmers End Road as detailed in drawing number 60157163/Altyre/Pre/005.

2.2 That the scheme construction costs of £24.5k be met from the Transport for London budget for Casualty Reduction Schemes.

2.3 That authority to make any further minor modifications which may arise as a result of any construction work to be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services.
Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy.
2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost £24,500
2. Ongoing costs: Non-recurring cost. N/A
4. Total current budget for this head: £567,000 of which £70,000 is allocated to this safety scheme. An uncommitted balance of £53,500 is available for this scheme.
5. Source of funding: Transport for London

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1
2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 50

Legal

2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This proposals will make the location safer for all road users whom wish to cross the road safely and motorist passing or using the junction.

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: No comments have been received from local ward Members. Any comments received will be reported verbally at committee.
3. **COMMENTARY**

### Site Description

3.1 Upper Elmers End Road runs approximately east to west in the study area near its junction with Altyre Way. It is a relatively wide road (approximately 12.5m) with shopping parades on both sides. This location is close to shops and extensive on-street parking exists beyond the shops in both directions; there are pay and display parking places on both sides of the road. There is a junction with Altyre Way on the southern side at the eastern end of the shopping parade. There are also bus stops on both sides of the carriageway and a zebra crossing approximately 40m to the west of Altyre Way. There is significant pedestrian and vehicular activity in the study area and considerable potential for conflict.

3.2 Altyre Way is a relatively narrow road and enters Upper Elmers End Road at a T-junction. There are ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions on the corners of Altyre Way but visibility for vehicles waiting at the give-way line is still restricted to some extent by parked vehicles in Upper Elmers End Road just to the east of the junction. Motorists have been observed to creep forwards beyond the give way line and wait in the middle of the road to ‘gap-seek’.

3.3 The zebra crossing is approximately mid-way along the shopping parade and has a central refuge approximately 1.8m wide with a painted metal frame. The refuge has illuminated bollards. The lighting provision for the zebra crossing is considered to be adequate, though unlikely to meet the criteria for zebra crossings recently introduced. Despite the usual zig zag markings, visibility for pedestrians at the zebra crossing is restricted by parked vehicles in the pay and display parking places on the northern side and to a lesser extent by parked vehicles to the east of Altyre Way on the southern side.

### Accident Review

3.4 A set of accident data was obtained covering the three years to 31 December 2009. Accident locations are plotted on drawing no. 60157163/Prel/001.

3.5 A total of nine personal injury accidents occurred during the three year period in this section of road, resulting in 15 casualties, 5 of which were seriously injured and the remainder slightly injured.

3.6 Three of the accidents (3,5 and 7) occurred on the zebra crossing, two of which resulted in pedestrians suffering serious injury and the other slight injury. The two seriously injured pedestrian casualties were elderly. Vehicles were travelling westbound in two of these accidents and eastbound in one.

3.7 Two accidents (6 and 9) occurred at the junction with Altyre Way, resulting in 2 casualties. Casualties were motor cyclists, one was seriously injured and the other slightly injured.

3.8 Two accidents (1 and 2) occurred to the west of the shopping parade. One of these involved a collision between a bus and a car on a bend resulting in one serious injury and six slight injuries. Excessive speed of the car has been identified on the accident report. In the other accident a car travelling eastbound hit a parked car and the driver suffered slight injury.

3.9 One accident (8) occurred at the bus stop opposite Altyre Way when a passenger lost his footing alighting a bus and fell. He suffered serious injury.

3.10 One accident occurred when a car slowed to turn left into a private drive and a motor cycle collided with the rear of the car causing slight injury to the motor cyclist.
3.11 Six of the accidents occurred in light conditions and three in dark. Seven accidents occurred in dry conditions and two in the wet. There are no patterns to the times (dark or light) of accidents or driving conditions (wet or dry) but the clusters of accidents at the zebra crossing and at the junction with Altyre Way suggest that there are problems at these locations.

3.12 The cluster of accidents at the zebra crossing would suggest that there should be improvements aimed at raising the conspicuity of the crossing and improving visibility between pedestrians and vehicles.

3.13 Visibility at the junction between Upper Elmers End Road and Altyre Way on Upper Elmers End Road may also be a contributory factor to the two accidents at that junction. Slowing vehicles on Upper Elmers End Road at this location will help improve safety here.

Proposal

3.14 A proposal has been prepared aimed at improving road safety, particularly at the zebra crossing and on the approaches to it. The proposal is shown on drawing number 60157163/Altyre/Pre/005 and is described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Wider Refuge</td>
<td>This proposal involves removal of the existing 1.8m wide refuge and provision of a 4.0m wide refuge. This would make the island more conspicuous but fewer crossing stripes may reduce visibility of the crossing overall. However the crossing distance for pedestrians would be reduced under this proposal and the narrower approaches to the crossing should also result in a lower speed of approach of vehicles. A right turning pocket is also proposed at the junction with Altyre Way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation

3.15 Ward Members have been consulted, but no feedback has been received. Residents and businesses have not been consulted, as the scheme will have no major impact on them as it is simply a proposal to upgrade the crossing.

Conclusion

3.16 It is therefore recommended that the proposals set out in 3.3.1 are taken forward.

4 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The Environment Portfolio Plan 2009-2012 states: In the coming year we will implement a programme of accident reduction measures in key locations.

5 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The estimated cost of this scheme is £24,500 and will be funded from the Transport for London Casualty Reduction budget. £70,000 was available for this scheme and £53,500 is available as an uncommitted balance.
1. Accidents plotted are all reported personal injury accidents for 3 years to Dec 09 provided by TIL.


Key

▲ Accident location and reference number
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1. Reason for report

This report outlines the background to the proposal for a mini roundabout at the Stapleton Road junction with Sevenoaks Road, aimed at improving traffic flow. The report explains the consultations that have been carried out, the feedback, and subsequent proposed scheme design. The report seeks a decision from the Portfolio Holder on the proposed amendment to the Stapleton Road junction with Sevenoaks Road, Orpington.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Portfolio Holder approves:

2.1 That the proposed improvements to Stapleton Road / Sevenoaks Road shown on drawing number 60157163/Fig1 be implemented, subject to detailed design.

2.2 That the estimated scheme cost of £20,000 be met from the Transport for London (TfL) budget for Locally Determined Schemes.

2.3 That authority to make any further minor modifications, which may arise as a result of the detail design, be delegated to the Director of Environmental Services.
Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy.
2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost £20k
2. Ongoing costs: Non-recurring cost. None
4. Total current budget for this head: £289,000 of which £40,000 is allocated to this scheme. An uncommitted balance of £33,500 is available for this scheme.
5. Source of funding: Transport for London

Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1
2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 20 staff hours to prepare and consult on this scheme

Legal

2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): The proposed scheme would help maintain the free flow of traffic and help towards improving road safety at the junction.

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Councillor Grainger has had input regarding the proposal and design and is supportive of the proposal.
3. **COMMENTARY**

**Description**

3.1 Stapleton Road forms a standard priority junction with the A223 Sevenoaks Road, Orpington.

3.2 The A223 Sevenoaks Road forms one of the main distributor roads to/from Orpington town centre. There are bus stops on both sides of the carriageway approximately 25m south of the Stapleton Road junction. In addition there is a pedestrian island in the mouth of Stapleton Road.

3.3 It has been observed that drivers can experience problems entering or exiting Stapleton Road. There is currently no ‘right turn’ pocket on Sevenoaks Road and as a result any driver waiting to turn into Stapleton Road can interfere with the free flow of traffic. This junction is therefore a cause of congestion. In 2008 Ward Members asked officers to investigate ways of relieving this congestion.

**Personal Injury Collisions**

3.4 Collision data for the period Sept 2007 to Aug 2010 inclusive has been used to review this site. A total of three injury collisions occurred at this junction in the study period. Two collisions resulted in slight injuries, whereas one led to serious injuries. Two involved vehicles turning within Sevenoaks Road and one involved a pedestrian crossing at the junction.

**Proposals**

3.5 Having reviewed these collisions and the observed problems on Sevenoaks Road it is proposed to install a mini-roundabout to improve turning movements and the free flow of traffic. The feature should also help to reduce driver speeds and be of benefit to road safety. For the mini-roundabout to be installed minor changes to the existing kerb lines are also proposed. A full traffic survey with associated traffic modelling has not been conducted as the proposal is for a relatively low cost measure.

3.6 The scheme proposals have been put forward to Ward Members and their comments have been incorporated into the draft design and subsequent consultation.

3.7 Councillor Grainger has given input to the options discussed during the design process and the engineer has incorporated these views in the design. There is general support for the proposed amendments at the junction, on the basis that further investigation is also carried out to see whether valuable road space could be acquired if the footway can be diverted along the eastern side of Sevoanoaks Road such that it runs at the top of the bank behind the trees, rather than the minor re-route of the footway as shown in the design drawing. This will be investigated as part of any subsequent detailed design of this scheme.

3.8 The proposed changes to the Stapleton Road junction include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Improvements – Stapleton Road j/w Sevenoaks Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed mini roundabout with new and improved signage to warn of the junction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing refuge in Stapleton Road is narrow so the opportunity will be made to replace it with a wider pedestrian refuge, which will be of benefit to pedestrians crossing the mouth of the road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Associated amendments to the road markings.

Minor amendments to the existing footways and kerb lines. The existing kerb line in Stapleton Road both sides to re-aligned so that the give-way lines in Sevenoaks Road are not too far apart.

The eastern kerb in Sevenoaks Road is realigned to allow some deflection on the southbound approach.

Consultation

3.9 As there will be no major changes and only minor alterations, consultation has only been carried out with the directly affected residents in Stapleton Road and Sevenoaks Road. Consultation has also been carried out with the Ward Members on the proposed scheme and they have had input into the scheme design.

3.10 Consultation with the affected residents was carried out in late December 2010 with a deadline of 10th January 2011 for any comments and objections to the proposal. Any comments and objections received will be reported on the night of the committee.

Recommendation

3.11 The proposed changes will be of benefit to road users in terms of improved flow of traffic at busy times and in terms of safety. The changes will help to improve the operation of the existing junction. The changes shown in the plan attached should therefore be implemented.

4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The Environment Portfolio Plan 2009-2012 states: In the coming year we will implement a programme of accident reduction measures in key locations.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The estimated cost of the scheme is £20,000 and will be funded from the TfL budget for Locally Determined Schemes for 2010/11, which has a total of £40,000 set aside for this project. An uncommitted balance of £33,500 is currently available.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The necessary Traffic Management will be required for implementation, if approved.

Non-Applicable Sections: Personnel Implications

Background Documents: Consultation letters filed in Room N87
(Open via Contact Officer)
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1. SUMMARY

1.1 Following the installation of safety measures in the Kings Hall Road area in 2008 there have been further collisions on the bends in Kings Hall Road, which are also of concern to residents.

1.2 Officers have investigated possible further measures to reduce the speed of drivers passing through these bands.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That the Portfolio Holder approves that Option 2 outlined in paragraph 3.11 should be adopted.

2.2 That the Portfolio Holder agree that scheme costs be funded from the underspend from the Warren Rd / Court Rd safety scheme, subject to agreement from TfL.
Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing policy.

2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Estimated cost Option 1 - £14,000, Option 2 - £23,000

2. Ongoing costs: Recurring cost. ~ £500


4. Total current budget for this head: £567,000. There is a projected underspend from the Warren Rd / Court Rd safety scheme of £40,000, which will be used to fund this scheme in Kings Hall Road, subject to the agreement of TfL. £1.9m for footway maintenance.


Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 1

2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: 36

Legal


2. Call-in: Call-in is applicable

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Depending on the types of measures are implemented (if any) some crossing facilities will be lost, although traffic speeds should be reduced as a result.

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes.

2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Cllr Getgood is supportive of either measure.
3. COMMENTARY

3.1 In 2007 it was identified that there had been a larger than expected number of injury collisions in the Kings Hall Road area, in the three years to 2006. Subsequently a safety scheme was consulted upon and the scheme was installed in March 2008, comprising central islands, a priority give way feature on Kings Hall Road and an improved crossing facility on Lennard Road which narrows the carriageway slightly. Associated new road markings and mini roundabouts, at the junctions with Reddons Road, Lennard Road and Bridge Road were also installed.

3.2 As well as the mini-roundabouts, a feature of the safety scheme in Kings Hall Road itself was a number of traffic islands and associated central hatch markings.

3.3 The effectiveness of the scheme was investigated in 2009 and a report was presented in September 2009. In the post-scheme consultation in 2009, a majority of residents stated that they were not happy with the scheme, especially not with the islands on the bend.

3.4 As a result of that investigation a further measure was installed to reduce speeds on the bend in Kings Hall Road, namely vehicle speed activated signs either side of the bend. However, it was not possible to fully determine the effectiveness of the scheme in respect of accidents, as very little post-scheme collision data was available at that time. It was therefore agreed that a further review be carried out once more post-scheme collision data was available.

Accident data

3.5 Accident data is now available for a period of 17 months from when the scheme was substantially complete. During this period there have been three recorded injury collisions on or near the bend in Kings Hall Road. We are aware from the reports made by residents that a number of other collisions have occurred on the bends, particularly adjacent to the island outside house number 136.

Traffic Speeds

3.6 A speed survey was undertaken in early October 2010 and was compared to the results of a speed survey undertaken by the police in May 2009. Both surveys were taken at the same location outside No. 84 for a period of two weeks and the results are shown below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>May '09</th>
<th>Oct '10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastbound</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total vehicle count</td>
<td>44,472</td>
<td>44,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. vehicles in excess of limit</td>
<td>16,273</td>
<td>16,309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total average speed</td>
<td>29 mph</td>
<td>29 mph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 85th percentile speed</td>
<td>34 mph</td>
<td>34 mph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westbound</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total vehicle count</td>
<td>43,513</td>
<td>42,773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. vehicles in excess of limit</td>
<td>18,614</td>
<td>10,831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total average speed</td>
<td>30 mph</td>
<td>28 mph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 85th percentile speed</td>
<td>34 mph</td>
<td>32 mph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 The 85th percentile speeds are the best indicator of whether speeds are high. The survey results show there has been a decrease in the westbound direction for 85th percentile speeds by 2mph since the installation of the speed activated signs. The speed of 34mph for this type of road is relatively low. The 85th percentile speed is a good indication of the speeds the majority of cars
would be travelling at the upper end of the scale, with 34mph being a speed at which the traffic police would be unlikely to take enforcement action.

3.8 However, despite the speeds not being excessive, there is no doubt that collisions continue to occur on the bend.

**Proposals**

3.9 As a way of slowing drivers on the approaches to the bend, and helping ensure that they drive through the bend with more care, two options for further changes have been considered by officers.

3.10 **Option 1**: This scheme comprises of high-friction surfacing through the bend and both approaches, which will aid drivers in negotiating the bend itself. Chevron signs would also be installed for both approaches giving advanced warning of the bend along with timber posts with reflective discs to highlight the presence of the bend. The islands outside No.116/118 & 136/138 would be removed and the central hatching would be replaced with hatching with a buff coloured background, to emphasise the narrow running lanes.

3.11 **Option 2**: This scheme comprises two double chicane features on both approaches to the bend. This arrangement affords the drivers already on the bend right of way and as such drivers approaching the bend must stop, or at least slow down, and are forced to do so by the arrangement of the chicanes. All other features are included as outlined in option 1, however it would be necessary to remove a further traffic island outside No.100/102 to accommodate the chicanes.

**Consultation**

3.12 At the time of writing the report the consultation process has not been completed. The results of any consultation will be reported at committee.

**Conclusions**

3.13 Subject to the results of any further consultation and in light of safety audit recommendations, both of which are to be presented at committee, officers would recommend Option 2, as it is more likely to slow vehicles on the approach to the bend.

4 **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 In “Building a Better Bromley 2020 Vision – Quality Environment”, a stated issue is the need to maintain our progress in improving road safety.

5 **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The estimated costs of the two options are £14,000 for option 1 and £23,000 for option 2. There is a projected underspend from the Warren Rd / Court Rd safety scheme of £40,000, which will be used to fund this scheme in Kings Hall Road, subject to the agreement of TfL.

5.2 If Option 2 is chosen there would be minor on-going running costs associated with the maintenance of the extended footway, in the region of £500 p/a, which would be funded from the footway maintenance budgets (£1.9m) within Transport and Highways.
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1. Reason for report

1.1 Members are asked to review the Committee’s work programme for 2010/11 and to consider:

- progress on decisions from previous meetings of the Committee;
- the Contracts summary for the Environment Portfolio.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the Committee:

(a) Review the draft work programme attached as Appendix 1;

(b) Review the progress report related to previous Committee requests as set out in Appendix 2; and

(c) Note the Environment Portfolio contracts listed in Appendix 3.
Corporate Policy
1. Policy Status: Existing policy.
2. BBB Priority: Quality Environment.

Financial
1. Cost of proposal: No cost
2. Ongoing costs: N/A.
4. Total current budget for this head: £37.7m and £3.366 million of LIP funding from TfL
5. Source of funding: N/A

Staff
1. Number of staff (current and additional): 224 fte
2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A

Legal
1. Legal Requirement: No statutory requirement or Government guidance.
2. Call-in: Call-in is not applicable.

Customer Impact
1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Whole Borough

Ward Councillor Views
1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? N/A.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A
3. **COMMENTARY**

3.1 **Forward Programme**

3.1.1 The table in Appendix 1 sets out the Environment Forward Programme for 2010/11, as far as it is known. The Environment Forward Programme indicates which division is providing the lead author for each report. The Committee is invited to comment on the schedule and propose any changes it considers appropriate.

3.1.2 Other reports may come into the programme. Schemes may be brought forward or there may be references from other Committees, the Portfolio Holder or the Executive.

3.2 **Previous Requests by the Committee**

The regular progress report on decisions previously taken by the Committee is given at Appendix 2. This list is rigorously checked after each Committee meeting so that outstanding issues can be addressed at an early stage.

3.3 **Contracts Register**

Information extracted from the current Contracts register, in a format which addresses the responsibilities of the Environment Portfolio, is attached as Appendix 3. Future contracts are marked in *italics*. The Appendix indicates in the final column when the Committee’s input to contracts will next be sought. Unless otherwise stated this is the date when contract approval, or approval to an extension, will be sought.

4. **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 Each PDS Committee is required to prepare a forward work plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Applicable Sections:</th>
<th>Financial, Legal and Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Documents:</td>
<td>Environment PDS agendas and minutes for the years 2006/07 to 2010/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Access via Contact Officer)</td>
<td><a href="http://sharepoint.bromley.gov.uk/default.aspx">http://sharepoint.bromley.gov.uk/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1

**ENVIRONMENT PDS COMMITTEE**

**FORWARD PROGRAMME FOR MEETINGS 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment PDS – 1 March 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forward Work Programme, Matters Arising from Previous Meetings and Contracts Register</strong></td>
<td>C&amp;SS Routine report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Monitoring 2010/11</strong></td>
<td>Finance For pre-decision scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TfL Funded Work Programme for 2011/12 – 2013/14: Revision following the Comprehensive Spending Review</strong></td>
<td>T&amp;H For pre-decision scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Toilet Scheme</strong></td>
<td>C&amp;SS For pre-decision scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relocation of Bromley Charter Market</strong></td>
<td>SS&amp;G For pre-decision scrutiny by R&amp;R PDS – 15 Feb 11 For pre-decision scrutiny by Env PDS – 1 Mar 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Update on Parking Working Group</strong></td>
<td>C&amp;SS Env PDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chislehurst Bridge replacement</strong></td>
<td>T&amp;H Environment PDS: 1 March 2011 E&amp;R PDS: 23 Feb 2011 Executive: 2 March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPZ Review of Parking Permit Fees (Borough wide)</strong></td>
<td>T&amp;H For pre-decision scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penge: Results of Parking Consultation</strong></td>
<td>T&amp;H For pre-decision scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petts Wood CPZ Review – Result of Consultation</strong></td>
<td>T&amp;H For pre-decision scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elmstead Lane Zebra crossing</strong></td>
<td>T&amp;H For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ravensbourne Avenue, Beckenham – PSW 2nd resolution</strong></td>
<td>T&amp;H For information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment PDS – 5 April 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forward Work Programme, Matters Arising from Previous Meetings and Contracts Register</strong></td>
<td>C&amp;SS Routine report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Portfolio Plan</strong></td>
<td>C&amp;SS For pre-decision scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval of the Council’s Final Local Implementation Plan (LIP)</strong></td>
<td>T&amp;H For pre-decision scrutiny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment PDS – May 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forward Work Programme, Matters Arising from Previous Meetings and Contracts Register</strong></td>
<td>C&amp;SS Routine report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment PDS – September 2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forward Work Programme, Matters Arising from Previous Meetings and Contracts Register</strong></td>
<td>C&amp;SS Routine report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2

**Progress Report on Previous Requests of the Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDS Ctte Minute &amp; Date</th>
<th>Committee Request</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.06.10</td>
<td>Examine feasibility of residents and businesses taking responsibility for watering hanging baskets</td>
<td>This has previously been trialled in a few locations with uneven results – commitment to maintain baskets not universally fulfilled. Resources may be available to support a pilot if a suitable area could be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.06.10</td>
<td>Bring a report forward setting out design and consultation policy for traffic schemes</td>
<td>Scheduled for 11 January PDS Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.09.10</td>
<td>Review policy on parking vouchers and season tickets</td>
<td>Will be considered as part of charging policy review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.11.10</td>
<td>Officer support be provided to a member working party examining highway maintenance</td>
<td>Working party will be established by the Portfolio Holder and can be supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.11.10</td>
<td>One-off informal meeting for Members to be held as part of the feasibility study on a park and ride scheme</td>
<td>Meeting will be organised once feasibility work has commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.11.10</td>
<td>Action to minimise risk of financial penalties under the Carbon reduction Commitment to be set out in the 2011/12 Portfolio Plan</td>
<td>This will be included in the draft Portfolio Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3

### Contracts Register Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Extension granted to</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Total Value £</th>
<th>Annual Value £</th>
<th>Environment PDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Consultancy</td>
<td>01.04.06</td>
<td>31.03.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aecom</td>
<td>1.25m</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting Consultancy</td>
<td>01.04.06</td>
<td>31.03.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. S. Atkins</td>
<td>319,000</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Consultancy</td>
<td>01.04.06</td>
<td>31.03.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aecom</td>
<td>1.94m</td>
<td>649,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Consultancy (inc. Lighting and Highways)</td>
<td>01.04.11</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>TFL Framework</td>
<td>TFL Framework</td>
<td>1.2m (If used for maximum length of 6 years)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Contract review April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gully Cleansing</td>
<td>01.08.05</td>
<td>31.07.09</td>
<td>31.07.11</td>
<td>Conways</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Cleaning</td>
<td>29.03.05</td>
<td>28.03.10</td>
<td>28.03.12</td>
<td>Keir</td>
<td>19.6m</td>
<td>4.52m</td>
<td>Gateway report:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E&amp;R PDS 05.01.11; Env PDS 11.01.11; Executive 12.01.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of surface vegetation from Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>01.05.10</td>
<td>30.04.12</td>
<td>Option for one year extension</td>
<td>Holwood GM Ltd</td>
<td>19.850</td>
<td>59,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Abandoned Vehicles</td>
<td>01.10.10</td>
<td>30.09.12</td>
<td>Option for a one year extension</td>
<td>Pick a Part</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>31,980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Hire</td>
<td>05.11.06</td>
<td>04.11.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>London Hire</td>
<td>674,383</td>
<td>112,383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Route design (Pan-London contract)</td>
<td>01.01.08</td>
<td>01.01.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mott Macdonald</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Route design (Pan-London contract)</td>
<td>01.01.08</td>
<td>10.01.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting Maintenance</td>
<td>01.04.07</td>
<td>31.03.11</td>
<td>31.03.13 Further extension possible to 31.03.15</td>
<td>May Gurney</td>
<td>7.1m</td>
<td>1.8m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection of Street Works</td>
<td>01.04.10</td>
<td>01.04.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>B&amp;J</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>312,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Description</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Value (Overall)</td>
<td>Value Per Year (Last Year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance hire</td>
<td>05.11.07</td>
<td>04.11.13</td>
<td>London Hire</td>
<td>2.03m</td>
<td>339,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground maintenance</td>
<td>01.01.08</td>
<td>31.12.13</td>
<td>Safeplay</td>
<td>369,300</td>
<td>61,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot Security</td>
<td>01.04.10</td>
<td>31.03.15</td>
<td>N/A Sight and Sound</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
<td>24.02.02</td>
<td>23.02.16</td>
<td>N/A Veolia</td>
<td>9.19m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Collection</td>
<td>01.11.01</td>
<td>23.02.16</td>
<td>N/A Veolia</td>
<td>37.3m</td>
<td>6.21m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>01.10.06</td>
<td>30.09.11</td>
<td>Vinci Park</td>
<td>10.79m</td>
<td>2.16m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; repair of vehicles</td>
<td>01.04.10</td>
<td>31.03.17</td>
<td>Option for 2 year extension</td>
<td>KCC</td>
<td>940,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Maintenance – Minor &amp; Reactive</td>
<td>01.07.10</td>
<td>30.06.17</td>
<td>Option for one year extension</td>
<td>O'Rourke</td>
<td>17m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Maintenance – Major</td>
<td>01.10.10</td>
<td>30.09.17</td>
<td>Option for one year extension</td>
<td>FM Conway</td>
<td>26m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arboriculture</td>
<td>18.07.08</td>
<td>17.07.17</td>
<td>Gristwood and Toms</td>
<td>5.12m</td>
<td>568,860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>01.01.08</td>
<td>31.12.17</td>
<td>English Landscapes</td>
<td>26.1m</td>
<td>2.75m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Site Monitoring</td>
<td>28.07.10</td>
<td>27.07.17</td>
<td>Option for 2 year extension</td>
<td>Enitial</td>
<td>952,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Security</td>
<td>01.04.10</td>
<td>31.03.20</td>
<td>Ward Security</td>
<td>4.2m</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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