

Council Supplementary Agenda

Place

Council Chamber, Town Hall, Wellington Street, Woolwich SE18 6PW

Date

Wednesday, 16 March 2022

Time

7:00 PM

This meeting is open to the press and public and they are entitled to take photographs, film or record the proceedings.

Councillors**Agenda**

- 7** **Petition Responses**
Appendices 1-4

- 9** **Public Questions**
Questions and Answers

- 10** **Members Questions**
Questions and Answers

Members are reminded that officer contacts are shown at the end of each report and they are welcome to raise questions in advance with the appropriate officer. This does not prevent further questioning at the meeting.

If you require further information about this meeting please contact the
Committee Services Officer:
Daniel Wilkinson
Telephone: 020 8921 5102
Email: committees@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Date of Issue Wednesday, 16 March 2022

Debbie Warren
Chief Executive

Petitioner:	Walker Syachalinga
Petition:	Pedestrian Safety on Sandy Hill Road and at Trinity Walk
Number of signatures:	177
The petition read as follows:	<p>The RA has received reports of concerns about the safety of pedestrians at Trinity Walk and when crossing Sandy Hill Road to Woolwich New Road. Residents had reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • vehicles failing to slow down or indicate when turning left from Woolwich New Road to Sandy Hill Road; • vehicles aggressively beeping at those crossing the road on foot; • vehicles using Trinity Walk as a shortcut and failing to slow down while driving across the estate. <p>As a result the RA is petitioning the Royal Borough of Greenwich to ask them to</p> <p>(1) install a pedestrian crossing at the junction between Sandy Hill Road and Woolwich New Road and</p> <p>(2) introduce traffic calming measures such as road humps across roads at Trinity Walk.</p>

Cabinet Member:	Environment, Sustainability and Transport
Ward(s):	Woolwich Common
Directorate:	DRES

Submitted to Council on:	27 October 2021
Presented by:	Councillor David Gardner

1. **Petition Response**

1.1

1.2

2 **Current actions being taken in relation to matter raised in petition**

2.1

Petitioner:	Vikki Barrie
Petition:	Delafield Road Parking Petition
Number of signatures:	89
The petition read as follows:	<p>I am very concerned about RBG's proposals on new parking restrictions. The removal of the 2-hour free parking and the expansion of the Charlton CPZ (the 'C' zone) will have a hugely negative impact on the residents of Delafield Road, and surroundings streets. It will become even more difficult for Delafield Road residents to park on our already over-crowded street.</p> <p>I call upon the council to retain the 2-hour free parking and to give the streets surrounding Charlton Station its own designated parking zone e.g. CS (Charlton Station).</p>

Cabinet Member:	Environment Sustainability and Transport
Ward(s):	Charlton
Directorate:	DCEC

Submitted to Council on:	26 January 2022
Presented by:	Councillor Linda Perks

1. **Petition Response**

1.1

1.2

2 **Current actions being taken in relation to matter raised in petition**

2.1

Petitioner:	Barbara Ward
Petition:	
Number of signatures:	39
The petition read as follows:	<p>The undersigned residents of Upper Colomb Street request that consideration is given to identifying and implementing an appropriate solution to the obstructed pathway outside 21/23 Colomb Street,(not including the removal of the tree).</p> <p>Residents also request a consideration of general neighbourhood accessibility including the overall position and useability of dropped kerbs within the locality</p>

Cabinet Member:	Environment Sustainability and Transport
Ward(s):	Peninsula
Directorate:	DCEC

Submitted to Council on:	26 January 2022
Presented by:	Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald

1. **Petition Response**

1.1

1.2

2 **Current actions being taken in relation to matter raised in petition**

2.1

Petitioner:	Sally Hughes
Petition:	A petition to Greenwich Council to listen to US and stop the West Greenwich 'low traffic neighbourhood'
Number of signatures:	422
The petition read as follows:	<p>We, the undersigned, call on the Royal Borough of Greenwich to admit that the West Greenwich Traffic Scheme has improved the amenity privileged residents of the 'Hills and Vales' at the expense of increased congestion and pollution on Blackheath Hill, Greenwich South Street and other overburdened boundary roads, such as Trafalgar Road, intensifying inequality and reducing life chances for the many that live there.</p> <p>The scheme obstructs vital journeys by the emergency services, holds up public transport, causes danger to pedestrians and reduces the livelihoods of essential workers. At the same time, the Council has failed to provide evidence to justify its actions and misled the government by claiming to promote 'safety' and COVID measures to justify the current Orders underpinning the scheme. We ask the Council to take appropriate action to put this right by ending the Scheme.</p> <p>We also call on the Council to acknowledge that the 'Greener Safer Greenwich' consultation does not directly address major problems, including hardship arbitrarily inflicted on many residents who depend on vehicles: blue badge holders; those with urgent or long-term conditions needing care and support from key workers, relatives and friends; people with disabilities; those who rely on public transport or trade vehicles; parents of small children; and school pupils. We ask the council to take into account, fairly and openly, the views of all those affected by the scheme, whether or not they benefit privately at this public expense.</p>

Cabinet Member:	Environment Sustainability and Transport
Ward(s):	Greenwich West and Peninsula
Directorate:	DCEC

Submitted to Council on:	26 January 2022
Presented by:	Councillor Aidan Smith

1. **Petition Response**

1.1

1.2

2 **Current actions being taken in relation to matter raised in petition**

2.1

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

I Question from Jeremy Phipps, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

The allowing of rat running between the bottom and top of Blackheath Hill (ie. via Hyde Vale and Crooms Hill) slows the ascent of the heavy diesels up the hill. There are many studies which show that slow, stop, start of these vehicles has a serious negative impact on the overall pollution in an area. Effectively they take longer to get up the hill and produce more pollution per metre travelled as they are slowed to a crawl.

Could the Council please explain why they believe reopening the rat runs is going to reduce the pollution on Blackheath Hill?

Reply -

I thank Jeremy Phipps for his question.

Air quality is only one factor in this decision. Monitoring data and feedback from local residents raised concerns about the impact of transferring local traffic to other areas and the issues identified in the EQIA including how it could affect people with disabilities.

We couldn't take this decision in isolation and we need to look at the impact any LTNs may have on the surrounding areas not just Blackheath Hill. Any future proposals will be subject to further consultation with local residents.

Alongside this we are developing our own Transport Strategy and associated policies to help us meet the targets within our Carbon Neutral Plan.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

2 Question from John Robb and Jessica Ballantine, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

Why dismantle the West Greenwich LTN before you decide what you are going to replace it with? Isn't that irrational? What's the urgency? Particularly when your own independent consultants, Steer, found that the LTN did not increase pollution levels on Blackheath Hill and has contributed only trivially to traffic on Maze Hill? Aren't you creating a needless and serious safety hazard and risking a waste of council funds if the eventual "joint solution" involves reintroducing a traffic barrier on a street like Maidenstone Hill?

Reply -

I thank John Robb and Jessica Ballantine for their question.

I have committed to engaging properly on this and providing a more holistic approach to tackling these issues borough wide not just for West Greenwich.

We will work on developing proposed alternative schemes.

We are developing a Transport Strategy and officers have already started progressing this.

This will support the delivery of The Carbon Neutral Plan, which includes high-level actions to reduce emissions from transport.

We also have various transport-related policies which are in development for car parking, electric vehicle charging and kerbside uses including Road Safety and Active Travel, this will help us prioritise these issues to help all residents of this borough.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

3 Question from Tim Anderson, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

How is the removal of the West Greenwich LTN compatible with RBG's 2030 Carbon neutral strategy and the stated need to reduce traffic by 40%?

Does the access of commuter traffic through our residential streets take priority over the safety of local residents?

Reply -

I thank Tim Anderson for his question.

As per Question 2

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

4 Question from James Montgomery, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

Why did RGB disregard the evidence of the Steer consultants - specifically, that the LTN did not worsen pollution on Blackheath Hill and was only one factor in the congestion in East Greenwich - and instead relied on "public consultation" that was flawed in its design and implementation? (Because, for example, anyone was allowed to vote, no matter where they lived?)

Reply -

I thank James Montgomery for his question.

As per Question 1

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5 Question from Shevaun Pearce, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Please could the Cabinet Member for the Environment, Sustainability and Transport advise what measures will be put in place in the short term to safeguard residents and visitors across West Greenwich?

Prior to the trial West Greenwich LTN, the previous Assistant Highways Director Graham Nash advised residents at the Engagement sessions that a 'do nothing' option was not an option and RBG had to act; residents subsequently received a letter in August 2020 advising the traffic was excessive and dangerous on the ill-equipped steep, narrow residential roads.

Please can the Cabinet Member advise the latest date a proposal on traffic reduction will be implemented for this area as we will once again be subjected to excessive and dangerous traffic? How is the Council comfortable with this?

Reply -

I thank Shevaun Pearce for her question.

The West Greenwich LTN was already in operation when I took charge of this portfolio. The council is committed to Road Safety of course.

It is so important that we tackle this issue holistically so that any changes we make remain in place for the long term.

We are going to engage properly on these issues and to ensure we provide a more holistic approach to tackle these issues borough wide not just for West Greenwich.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

6 Question from Eibhleann Radford, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

Why were black cabs granted access through the experimental LTN and not blue badge holders?

Reply -

I thank Eibhleann Radford for her question.

Black Cab or Taxis form an important part of car-free living, increasing the range of public transport, walking and cycling trips. Giving taxis priority access would be in-line with the priority afforded to taxis and public transport in other locations, including Bus Lanes and some No Entry points.

Blue Badges 'however, are assigned to a person and not a vehicle, are not required to be displayed while the vehicle is moving and not a recognised exemption for other moving traffic restrictions.

There is no practical and reliable way for the cameras / a camera operator to know if the occupants of any particular car are, or are not, people with a disability, and disability in itself is not an exemption from any type of moving traffic regulation.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

7 Question from Eibhleann Radford, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

Why is motorist convenience more important than reducing traffic, reducing air pollution, increasing health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists, the criteria set out in the consultation ?

Reply -

I thank Eibhleann Radford for her question.

The decision was made by weighing up the benefits of the scheme against the impacts. Throughout the process we have been clear that how well a scheme performs against the objectives of; creating better places to walk and cycle, improving road safety, reducing congestion, and improving air quality, must be considered within the context of the wider area to ensure the benefits of a scheme in one area do not unfairly impact residents in other parts of the borough.

The decision was not to prioritise the convenience of motorists and we recognise the need to reduce the volume of vehicles on our roads to achieve strategic objectives in terms of transport and climate change. The council will publish a Transport Strategy detailing the holistic approach to be taken to achieve these objectives while ensuring the impacts of individual schemes are considered along each other to avoid disproportionately impacting certain areas.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

8 Question from Fiona Moore, SE3, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

I applaud the council's target to reduce traffic 45% by 2030 - what's your plan to achieve that, and when will we see it?

Reply -

I thank Fiona Moore for her question.

We are developing a Transport Strategy and officers have already started progressing this.

This will support the delivery of The Carbon Neutral Plan, which includes high-level actions to reduce emissions from transport.

We will also have various transport-related policies which are in development for car parking, electric vehicle charging and kerbside uses including Road Safety and Active Travel, this will help us prioritise these issues to help all residents of this borough, providing overall traffic reduction.

We also will need assistance from the Government as the car is still dominant, with the shift to electric vehicles we will see better air quality but congestion will still be an issue.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

9 Question from Fiona Moore, SE3, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Local authorities, as you said in an answer to a question from the public last month, "have a responsibility for improving and protecting the health and wellbeing of residents"; and "for planning and commissioning public health services and activities, to prevent avoidable ill health and premature death". How is Greenwich Council planning to protect us against (a) the huge recent increase in air pollution from queues of idling rush-hour traffic in residential streets in Greenwich, and (b) the risk that Silvertown Tunnel brings yet more traffic (especially HGVs) and congestion, causing yet more air pollution?

Reply -

I thank Fiona Moore for her question.

As per Question 8

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

10 Question from Stella Bye, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

With regards to the recent decision to remove the West Greenwich LTN, please explain why the overall responses which included consultation responses from outside Greenwich borough and across the UK were used. Please confirm how RBG scrutinised the responses to remove out of borough responses as well as any duplications.

Reply -

I thank Stella Bye for her question.

The analysis of the public consultation was provided as appendices to the report (found [here](#)) and the addendum report (found [here](#)). Responses were analysed and where a postcode was given, responses were broken down according to the following three areas; from within the LTN, from the nearby Westcombe Park and Maze Hill area, any other postcodes.

Responses were analysed and duplicates were removed.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

11 Question from Stella Bye, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Petitions against Formal Consultation Process - RBG claimed 52% of overall respondents objected to the LTN and this included petitions submitted outside of the official consultation process. Please confirm how Change.org and other petitions can be legally used against this formal consultation. Also how did RBG remove duplications against the formal public consultation responses and discount those from out of borough.

Reply -

I thank Stella Bye for her question.

The 53% figure comes from responses to the official consultation process and does not include petitions. The petitions were considered alongside the official consultation process, and it is acknowledged that it is likely people would have both responded to the consultation and signed one of the petitions.

Petitions were received both for and against the scheme and the analysis did not seek to remove duplications in terms of people responding both via the official consultation and a petition.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

12 Question from Simon Radford, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

Why did the council give equal weight to the local residents and external respondents to the [LTN] consultation?

Reply -

I thank Simon Radford for his question.

Throughout the process we have been clear that how well a scheme performs against the objectives of; creating better places to walk and cycle, improving road safety, reducing congestion, and improving air quality must be considered within the context of the wider area to ensure the benefits of a scheme in one area do not unfairly impact residents in other parts of the borough.

The impacts of the scheme extend beyond the immediate area, and this was reflected in the consultation responses, with a large number of responses coming from the Westcombe Park/ Maze Hill area. It was appropriate to give weighting to responses from other areas as they were affected by the scheme.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

13 Question from Simon Radford, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Please confirm which specific 'protected characteristic' as identified in the Equality Act 2010 and set out in the equality impact report by steer, led the council to conclude the current LTN is non compliant?

Reply -

I thank Simon Radford for his question.

The EQIA identified that the scheme may affect older and/or disabled people.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

14 Question from Sarah Phipps, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Why was the consultation on the West Greenwich LTN put out to the wider area and other consultations were not? ie Gloucester Circus, Circus Street, Park Vista, Woodland Crescent etc.

Reply -

I thank Sarah Phipps for her question.

As part of the Streetspace Programme, it was essential that we consulted on these measures with residents of this borough.

The size and potential impacts of the scheme were extensive compared to the isolated highway amendments referred to in the question.

The methodology of these consultations previously were undertaken without electronic platforms such as Commonplace, and were manually undertaken.

An electronic facility makes it far easier to conduct these types of consultations. They are open to the public but the letter distribution zone was isolated to the surrounding area.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

15 Question from Sarah Phipps, SE10, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Would the Council reopen Gloucester Circus to help alleviate the high rat running in Crooms Hill?

Reply -

I thank Sarah Phipps for her question.

The modal filter at the junction with Gloucester Circus and Crooms Hill has been in-place for over 6 years.

The Borough has no plans to open or remove this filter, as the streets will return to their state pre introduction of the LTN.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

I **Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport**

Can the Cabinet Member state what representations and discussions has the Council had with TfL and the Mayor of London since 2015 on:

- a. Measures to mitigate the potential environmental and traffic effects of the Silvertown Tunnel on the Borough?
- b. Other potential additional river crossings?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

As I explained at the last meeting We are doing everything we can to mitigate and measure the impacts of this scheme in line with the Development Consent Order (DCO).

The Royal Borough also has a role in the Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group, a consultative body established by the DCO, which TfL must consult on certain matters relating to monitoring and mitigation. Through these roles we are working to make sure impacts on Greenwich are minimised and appropriately managed

I Chair the meetings with the Silvertown Community Liaison Group, in which we discuss these issues face to face to try and address the public's concerns.

The Council entered into a legal agreement with TfL which secured additional measures not included in and included within the DCO. These include:

- £700,000 of Neighbourhood Enhancement funding for walking and cycling improvements.
- Road safety funding, including for four School Crossing Patrols.

- Agreements on the scope of the noise barrier in the Siebert Road and Westcombe Hill area.

We have a role, set out in the DCO, as the local planning authority and local highway authority, to provide consent, agreement or approval to certain detailed matters relating to the project. This includes plans that relate to managing the impact of construction.

TfL is undertaking air quality monitoring and updating its modelling in line with the requirements of the DCO. We will continue to work to ensure TfL's monitoring, and updated modelling, is robust.

Construction vehicles have to comply with the higher standards set out in the DCO and related plans.

We will be visiting both schools in the area to look at what further measures we can be put in place if necessary and we will also be reviewing our own Air Quality Monitoring opportunities too.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

2 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Linda Perks, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

Can the Cabinet for Finance and Resources state -

- a. if the Council undertook a review of its CIL charging schedule in 2018 (as recommended by the Viability Assessment in 2014, and committed to by the Council at the time), and what the outcome was?
- b. In view of the upcoming review, if the Council has made an estimate of how much additional CIL funding would have been received by the Council to date had it set its residential rates, not at the current £70psm flat rate, but at the higher levels found to be viable in the higher value areas of the Borough?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

I can confirm that no review of the CIL charging schedule was undertaken in 2018.

In the setting the CIL rate in 2015 the borough adopted a single charging zone approach, as permitted by the CIL regulations and statutory guidance. The residential rates secured in 2015 through Examination in Public were the maximum rates that could be secured at that time, with the Examiner even imposing a reduced rate in the Northeast of the borough due to viability concerns, which resulted in the two-rate schedule currently being charged.

There has been no analysis estimating CIL receipts if alternative rates had been adopted, as any such analysis is meaningless given the decision at the Examination In Public and the fact no alternative levy was agreed by the Inspector. The Council's focus is on reviewing the CIL Charging Schedule, which is now underway.

The current CIL rates are subject to indexation, so the primary residential rate currently being charged in the Royal Borough is £90/sqm, once indexation is taken into account.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

3 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Linda Perks, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

What is the total amount of additional funding received to date from the Government to cover the costs of dealing with the impact of the Pandemic?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

The total amount of additional one off funding received to date from the Government to cover the costs of dealing with the impact of the Pandemic is £75m (excludes amounts in respect of businesses).

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

4 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

Will the Cabinet Member give a breakdown by ward of how much has been spent on highway and pavement repairs over the last four years?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

The asset management database holding the information on highway maintenance works and spend doesn't currently allow for filter by electoral wards. As a result of this question, we will be contacting the systems supplier to see if this filter can be integrated to cater for similar requests in the future.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

5 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Linda Perks, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources / Councillor Mariam Lolavar, Cabinet Member for Business Economic Growth

Can the Cabinet Member report the combined total sum of government-funded Business Support grants administered by the Council and paid to affected businesses in the Borough to support them during the pandemic and lockdown restrictions:

- a. By type of grant
- b. By Council ward

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

The Royal Borough of Greenwich Finance team has administered 6 discreet mandatory Government grants since April 2020. These have included

- Small Business Grant fund which supported small business in the borough - £19.7 m paid
- Retail Hospitality and Leisure Grants £16.3m paid
- Christmas Support payments to pubs £69k paid to help them over the Christmas of 2020/21
- Local Restriction Support grants £8m paid following enforced closure in November 20 – March 21.
- Restart Grants to help businesses re open in 1 April 21 - £10m paid
- Omicron Hospitality & Leisure Grant which specifically supported the hospitality and leisure sectors from December 21 to date. £1.2m paid

In summary, over £55m has been distributed in the Royal Borough of Greenwich excluding discretionary grants (the latter is presented following Table 1).

Table I	April to July 2020			December 2020	November 2020	January to March 2021		April to July 2021	January to March 2022	
Ward	Small Business Grant Fund	Retail, Hospitality and Leisure Grant Fund Under £15k RV	Retail, Hospitality and Leisure Grant Fund Over £15k RV	Christmas Support	November 2020 Local Restriction Support Grant (LRSB) Closed	LRSB Jan 2021 1st 6 weeks	LRSB Jan 2021 2nd 6 weeks	Restart Grant	Omicron Hospitality and Leisure Grant	Totals
Abbey Wood	34	14	11	1	13	14	14	18	4	123
Blackheath Westcombe	51	10	18	1	33	38	37	38	11	237
Charlton	76	13	2	2	16	17	17	19	3	165
Coldharbour and New Eltham	83	10	14	1	36	38	39	40	11	272
Eltham North	120	31	20	3	70	77	76	79	15	491
Eltham South	133	35	57	7	113	119	119	134	37	754
Eltham West	31	6	2	0	14	15	15	18	6	107
Glyndon	62	5	9	3	25	33	34	38	10	219
Greenwich West	177	30	118	16	180	199	198	210	65	1,193
Kidbrooke with Hornfair	38	7	10	3	21	22	22	21	7	151
Middle Park and Sutcliffe	33	12	4	0	21	27	27	29	6	159
Peninsula	199	31	86	11	170	198	197	226	64	1,182
Plumstead	175	19	37	0	78	88	88	95	11	591
Shooters Hill	18	7	9	3	18	18	19	19	9	120

Thamesmead Moorings	56	9	18	1	13	16	16	17	1	147
Woolwich Common	118	28	19	8	61	65	63	68	15	445
Woolwich Riverside	565	54	91	9	230	268	263	292	46	1,818
Totals	1,969	321	525	69	1,112	1,252	1,244	1,361	321	8,174

Discretionary Grants

The Royal Borough of Greenwich has received a number of Business Grants since November 2020 to date – this response focuses on the ones managed by the Business Team. We have received 4 allocations of ARG funding totaling **£10,573,934** this consists of an initial allocation of £5,758,840 and 3 subsequent ARG top up allocations of £2,557,804, £1,820,843 and £436,447 respectively.

As of 27 February 2022, 3,253 grants had been awarded totaling **£9,663,699** as reported to BEIS. Since then we have paid an additional £711,000 to 80 business (which are not recorded in the ward distribution below). This leaves a balance of **£199,235** which will be distributed before the end of March 2022.

The table below provides a snapshot of the distribution of grant payments made by ward. The final batch of applications under the ARG schemes are currently being processed and all the remaining grant funding will be awarded by the 31 March 2022.

In respect of the Local Restrictions Support Grant (Open) scheme, the Royal Borough of Greenwich were awarded **£731,815** of which **£591,255** was spent leaving a balance of £140,560. It should be noted that this scheme closed at the end of June 2021, whilst there was a residual balance of £140,560 this was due to an over estimation by the government of the number of businesses eligible for the grant, which was a national issue and not one unique to Greenwich. Through this scheme 522 grant payments were made and the table below shows the distribution of grants paid by ward.

Table 2	ARG Payments	Number of LRSG Open Grants Paid	Totals
Ward			
Abbey Wood	63	9	72
Blackheath Westcombe	79	21	100
Charlton	120	7	127
Coldharbour and New Eltham	87	15	102
Eltham North	180	13	193
Eltham South	160	58	218
Eltham West	46	7	53
Glyndon	77	7	84
Greenwich West	563	104	667
Kidbrooke with Hornfair	52	12	64
Middle Park and Sutcliffe	55	17	72
Peninsula	330	100	430
Plumstead	216	28	244
Shooters Hill	80	8	88
Thamesmead Moorings	180	10	190
Woolwich Common	165	26	191
Woolwich Riverside	800	80	880
	3,253	522	3775

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

6 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

What is the Council is doing to assist electric vehicle-owners without off-street parking, who cannot conveniently charge their cars on the street without paying higher prices at charging points or causing a trip hazard by running cables across pavements?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

The Royal Borough's new Carbon Neutral Plan sets out proposals to expand electric vehicle charging facilities and develop a road map for charge point provision. Technical work is ongoing on this 'road map' and we will continue to work to secure funding for as many new electric vehicle charging points as possible.

The council will be developing a Transport Strategy and alongside this strategy a key document will be our EV Strategy and Delivery Plan.

Approximately 1% of vehicles in Greenwich are currently electric (~ 1,500 vehicles out of 80,000 total), supported by a network of circa 300 public charging points. This can be considered a good ratio of chargers to vehicles but as more electric vehicles will circulate in the city, the number of charging points will need to grow as well. Following the predictions made by TfL, London can expect 34-49% of all vehicles to be electric by 2030 and we can expect this to apply to Greenwich.

These are our targets but we also need to secure adequate funding to deliver these improvements.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

7 Question from Councillor Charlie Davis, to Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council

On the 8th December 2021, the Leader agreed to delegate the decision relating to the 'Eltham Controlled Parking Zone' to himself from the Cabinet Member. Can the Leader inform Council on when he plans to take this long overdue decision?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

The Constitution does not authorise the Leader to make Traffic Management Orders and therefore the decision report will not be issued to myself as Leader. Consequently, it would be for the appropriate Cabinet Member or Chief Officer to make the decision.

As you will be aware, there have been several extensive consultations in this area proposing parking changes and a final decision will need to be made on how to progress with this scheme. I am aware that the relevant report is being finalised by officers and will be reported for a decision as soon as possible.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

8 Question from Councillor Charlie Davis, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Good Growth

Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether the Council have any plans to bring forward the regeneration of the former tram sheds on Eltham High Street?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

As part of Property Asset Strategy we are reviewing our corporate property portfolio and assessing the liabilities, benefits and options for all our sites, including this one. The cost of bringing this site back into use is likely to be considerable, so the asset review will need to consider these costs and the options that could bring this site back into a suitable use.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

9 Question from Councillor Charlie Davis, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Good Growth

Can the Cabinet Member confirm the total amount the Council spent developing the initial business plan for Plumstead Power Station prior to agreeing at Cabinet to work with Mo-Sys at the site?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

The Council submitted a bid to the GLA Good Growth Fund and successfully secured £2.51m of regeneration funding to be spent in Plumstead alongside Royal Borough match funding of £2.51m. This was approved by Cabinet in March 2018.

This funding included an allocation of monies to support the regeneration of Plumstead Power Station. The Council appointed Architecture00 to support the Council and explore the best way to bring Plumstead Power Station back into use.

The power station is a Grade II listed heritage building and the Council undertook a number of structural and related surveys which helped form part of the strategy developed up to RIBA Stage 2 to create a business, event and workspace hub. This strategy and underlying building information allowed the production of marketing information which was sent out to potential workspace providers and local businesses. Cabinet have recently approved an in principle agreement to work with Mo-SyS - a local company with global reach and a proven track record in innovation, growth and the generation of employment and high-tech businesses.

The cost of this initial business plan work totalled £382,020 - all met from the Good Growth Fund. This cost should be seen in the context of securing around £4.5 million investment in an important Heritage Asset and ensuring that it has a real long-term use. Mo-Sys' proposals look to bring around 4,600 sqm of valuable workspace back into use – as well as upgrading external areas.

Critically, the project will help secure high-skill creative jobs in our Borough for many years to come.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

10 Question from Councillor Charlie Davis, to Councillor Adel Khaireh, Cabinet Member for Culture and Communities

Can the Cabinet Member provide an update to Council on the work required at Slade Pond? Additionally, can the Cabinet Member give a deadline for when this work will be completed?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

As you may recall in response to your previous question on this matter, due to the weight and location of the tree, a crane is required to assist with lifting the tree out of the pond. Officers have approached a number of crane contractors to quote for this element of the work but unfortunately, they have all declined due to the restricted access of the location. Officers have recently approached additional crane contractors requesting quotes and are currently awaiting a response. It is envisaged that once a suitable crane company has been secured the arboricultural team will work with them to safely remove the tree from the pond with the minimum impact on the pond, its habitation and the surrounding vegetation.

Officers are also arranging a site meeting with the Friends of Plumstead Common to discuss the works required.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to provide an accurate timescale for the work at this time.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

11 Question from Councillor Geoffrey Brighty, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

Can the Cabinet Member confirm the costs of the West Greenwich LTN scheme ("Hills & Vales") and the number of drivers fined together with the total amount charged in fines during its operation ?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

Cost of West Greenwich LTN to date (05/03/2022)
£288,401

Date to latest reporting Period (28th Feb 2022):
PCNs Issued - 9,697
Total Paid - £511,575

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

12 Question from Councillor Geoffrey Brighty, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

Can the Cabinet Member say why, when making the decision to scrap the West Greenwich LTN scheme, that decision referred to beginning the process of developing an alternative LTN for West Greenwich – and West Greenwich only. What happened to a Borough-wide transport strategy ?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

We are developing a Transport Strategy and officers have already started progressing this.

This will support the delivery of The Carbon Neutral Plan, which includes high-level actions to reduce emissions from transport.

We will also have various transport-related policies which are in development for car parking, electric vehicle charging and kerbside uses including Road Safety and Active Travel.

The Local Implementation Plan sets out how the Council will deliver the Mayor's Transport Strategy locally but we need a policy which sets out how we can meet our own targets.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

13 Question from Councillor Geoffrey Brighty, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Can the Cabinet Member advise what measures have been taken to make sure drivers know that Hyde Vale and Crooms Hill are open to through traffic again ?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

We have started to dismantle the LTN by prioritising the removal of cameras, signage associated with this and advanced warning signage.

Signs to inform drivers of the use of these roads/routes are deemed unnecessary and advanced warning of the removal of the closures wouldn't be appropriate.

We do not have any plans to erect signs to encourage traffic to use these roads, equally by keeping the camera signs up in this location it would be the wrong thing to do, as the Police could penalise people for passing this signage.

Works to remove the remainder of the LTN is coming to a close, and it will take time for the changes to bed in, we will be monitoring this over the coming weeks.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

14 Question from Councillor Geoffrey Brighty, to Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement

While there has rightly been a focus on combatting violence against women and girls including domestic violence can the Cabinet Member set out what the Council is doing to make it easier for male victims of domestic abuse to seek help and advice ?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

Although the demand for domestic abuse (DA) services predominantly comes from women, RBG has taken proactive steps to ensure that services are indeed available for male victims, and that men are equally offered a high level of support.

RBG has ensured that commissioned services and processes are in place to respond to male victims as well as females. Actions include:

- Ensuring that the Greenwich Domestic Violence & Abuse (GDVA) helpline (which is commissioned by RBG) provides advice, guidance, and floating support to all victims equally, regardless of gender, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity. In addition, the GDVA website is currently undergoing a redesign to it make it less female centred and enable male victims to feel more confident that the support is there equally for them too.
- Ensuring the provision of Independent Domestic Abuse Advocates (IDVAs) for male victims who are referred to MARAC (the fortnightly meeting for high-risk cases of domestic abuse) as well as females. This is delivered by Victim Support IDVAs, who provide practical support and guidance, including safety planning, support with legal measures and guidance on housing etc. Victim Support is also able to support male victims into the London-wide commissioned male refuge provision if needed.
- Ensuring enforcement action against female domestic abuse perpetrators is at the same level as for male perpetrators, depending (for both sexes) on evidence and risk.

- Treating all male and female victims equally if they apply for rehousing as a result of domestic abuse in the provision of other forms of temporary and long-term accommodation.
- Ensuring all domestic abuse training delivered by the Safer Communities Team (provided to a wide range of council and partner services) includes a focus on the difficulties that may face male victims, to ensure they are not overlooked. For example, the training highlights to professionals that male victims are over twice as likely than women (29% compared to 12%) to not tell anyone about the partner abuse they are suffering from; only 10% of male victims will tell the police (compared to 26% of women) and only 23% will tell a person in an official position (compared to 43% of women). We also highlight the barriers that male victims may face due to societal views of masculinity.

RBG's response to Domestic Abuse sits under the Violence Against Women and Girls Strategic partnership group due to the predominant number of female victims. However, to ensure that male victims are not being overlooked and all agencies take male victims who disclose DA as seriously as they would female victims, the needs of male victims of DA is periodically on the agenda for discussion and monitoring. This is reflected by an increase in referrals of male victims to the MARAC from the previous year: 2020/21 - 6.3% male victims (93.7% female) to 2021/22 - 10.8% male victims (89.2% female).

Our stats show for the twelve months Feb 2021 to Jan 2022 show that the MARAC offered support to 76 male victims in this period. The highest number of referrals came from the police, who are more likely to identify victims at points of crisis, but encouragingly also from a variety of other agencies, showing that some male victims are feeling more confident to disclose and that services are recognising them as victims.

Working with the wider Safer Greenwich Partnership, we will continue to review how we support all victims and how to make it easier to report domestic abuse.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

15 Question from Councillor Matt Clare, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Good Growth

In the recent storms a sizable piece of the O2's roof blew away. Fortunately this was not onto nearby roads where a terrible accident could have occurred as the size of the material would have blinded one or more vehicles or caused loss of control, it could also have hurt pedestrians (albeit many people heeded warnings to stay inside).

To be crystal clear council and council officers could not be held responsible as this was unforeseen when the O2 was built as the Millennium Dome in the late 1990s.

However, with extreme weather becoming more frequent and this recent breach having now occurred what action is the council taking with the O2's owner/operator to reduce the risk of a re-occurrence, perhaps with fatal consequences?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

The recent O2 storm damage wasn't referred to us as a dangerous structure, so RBG Building Control have not had any involvement. The Council understands that the O2 have sought advice from private sector engineers as the situation was dealt with promptly and is still ongoing. The O2s engineering advisors will be investigating the mode of failure and effecting remedial works and any necessary improvements. Regarding on-going remediation, repairs do not generally fall under Building Control, so the Council is not directly involved with the repair. If the O2 undertakes any substantial improvements [over and above repairs] these may constitute notifiable building works. If that is the case, an application would need be made to RBG Building Control at that time, or an Approved Inspector.

RBG Building Control will follow up with the O2.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

16 Question from Councillor Matt Clare, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

It is now over seven years since the opposition first pushed for Santander Cycles to be extended to Greenwich.

In the last two years the extension to Canada Water and increased distances between docking stations has made reaching Greenwich far cheaper.

Last year the council leadership responded favourably to the opposition's suggestion of raising a combination of private sector (e.g. developers and leisure businesses), public crowdfunding, TfL and potentially council funding. What progress has been made in this area?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

The Council continues to lobby TfL for an expansion of the Santander scheme, knowing the benefits it would bring to residents and visitors. TfL has displayed an openness to discussions, but has made no clear intention of expanding Santander to Greenwich.

Due to the current geographic footprint of the scheme, this would also require docking stations in the London Borough of Lewisham before it could be rolled out in Greenwich.

London Councils has been working with TfL to draft a pan-London bylaw with the intention of managing dockless cycle hire operation. This requires pan-London approval before the bylaw comes into effect. We are pursuing dockless cycle hire as another way of addressing bike access for residents and hopes to engage with providers once the bylaw comes into effect.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

17 Question from Councillor Matt Clare, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Since 2018 the opposition has been calling for Greenwich council to partner with a one-way car hire provider (Of which one is present in over a dozen London boroughs).

A full council term has passed with no tangible progress made. Admittedly Covid posed significant challenges for part of that period but this was 2 years nearly from us first raising the issue.

An opportunity has been missed to take many polluting cars off of our roads, free up street space and actually save our residents money through being able to give up owned cars for lower cost car hire.

Covid has shown many households that they no longer need to own a car. Latest data shows up to 20 cars are taken off the road by putting a one-way car hire vehicle in proximity.

When will Greenwich residents finally see one way car hire available in our Borough ?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

The council will be developing a Transport Strategy and in developing this strategy will engage with Car Club operators to understand the best model for car clubs in the borough to meet our strategic objectives. The strategy will provide the policy framework for the rollout of further car club bays.

This will be supported by the Council's Parking Strategy, which will set out how kerbside space in the Borough will be managed to help meet the strategic objectives set out in the Transport Strategy. The Kerbside Management Plan will consider how to prioritise the competing demands placed on our kerbside and address how new models of mobility, such as one-way car clubs, could be accommodated in kerbside management.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

18 Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Linda Perks, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

Following the Chancellor's announcement of cost of living support package in February, can the Cabinet Member provide an update on the distribution of £150 Council Tax rebates for Greenwich households in Bands A-D? When will payments be made, and how many/what proportion of payments are possible via BACS? Secondly what are the Council's plans for the use of the separate discretionary funding, announced alongside the £150 rebate, for households who are struggling with the cost of living in other bands, or who do not pay Council Tax?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

Households in Bands A-D that pay their Council Tax via direct debit will receive Council Tax rebates of £150 from April 2022. In order to prevent any payments in error the Royal Borough will await receipt of the first council tax instalment for 2022-23 to have been taken from the live direct debit instruction prior to making an award of the Council Tax Rebate via BACS. It is estimated that some 52% of households (53,173) in Bands A-D pay their Council Tax via direct debit. Whilst we encourage those that do not currently pay by direct debit, to do so, we are developing a process which will enable those that do not pay by direct debit to request payment via web / phone.

In respect of the Discretionary Fund we are exploring options such as giving additional support to those households in Band E; those in receipt of Local Council Tax Support in Bands E-H and those not liable for Council Tax but responsible for paying energy bills.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

19 Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement

What representations has the Cabinet Member made to MOPAC or the Mayor of London, since I raised the issue at January's Full Council, about reports of a pilot programme under development that would see police officers in Greenwich, Bexley and Lewisham employ 'alternatives' to arrest when young people under the age of 25 are found in possession of cannabis?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

The pilot programme you refer to was something being explored by the London Borough of Lewisham with the support of MOPAC and in consultation with the police.

At this stage, no actual pilot proposal has been shared with us formally at Royal Greenwich or neighbouring Bexley. As a borough, we have already made representations that any such proposal, if brought forward, would need formal engagement and careful consideration by the relevant lead members supported by Council officers.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

20 Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Can the Cabinet Member provide an update on her engagement since January with London City Airport on its current redesign of airspace and flight paths? And can she share the Council's written representation to the London City Airport consultation for local authorities (ending mid-January 2022) that was promised in January? What are RBG's next steps in representing residents' concerns, as a key stakeholder of the Airport, on noise and air pollution that have worsened significantly since the introduction of Concentrated Flight Paths in 2016?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

The airport is expecting a significant increase in air traffic this year.

Because of the pandemic, the number of flights was low over the last two years. Between October and December 2021 there were 7,486 flights compared to 1,550 for the same period in 2020. Pre-Covid, there were around 20,000 flights.

London City Airport, like other UK airports, is planning to change its flight paths because air traffic controllers are moving from using a ground-based system to a satellite system to guide aircraft. This will mean narrow, concentrated flight paths known as Performance-Based Navigation (PBN).

London City had already introduced PBN routes in February 2016 when it concentrated all its flight paths, leading to a 5-fold increase in complaints. It is required now to look again at these routes in order to co-ordinate its flight paths with those of other airports in London and the SE, and particularly with Heathrow and Biggin Hill.

Earlier this year London City consulted key stakeholder groups on some creative concepts to replace the currently unpopular routes. These included

the provision of respite so that most communities could get a break from the noise.

At the meeting this month, it was highlighted that stakeholders favoured the sharing of routes to provide respite, planes to be kept higher for longer, a reduction in fuel and climate emission, a separation of routes so that, wherever possible, the same area was not overflowed by planes from different airport and collaboration with other airports.

The next steps are that London City airport will present its outline plans to the Civil Aviation Authority for approval this summer. If approved, the airport will start work on detailed plans. These will probably go out to public consultation in late 2023 or 2024.

I am happy to meet with Councillor Hartley to discuss further.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

21 Question from Councillor Pat Greenwell, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport

Many of our local football pitches are strewn with empty plastic bottles and cans. Can we as a Council approach the clubs and remind them of their responsibility towards helping the environment?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for his question.

The Council strongly encourages football teams that book our pitches in parks to leave the pitches clean after their use and we plan to review our pitch booking conditions so that teams are penalised if they fail to do this.

Most of the football teams that formally book our park pitches do leave them clean. However, there are also a lot of teams and groups of friends that use our parks and parks pitches for casual play (where no pitch bookings are made) and it is these teams/groups that tend to leave our pitches littered on occasions.

The Parks, Estates and Open Spaces Department works with “Parks for London” and “Keep Britain Tidy” on anti-littering campaigns and will consider if we can include our football pitch cleanliness as part of these campaigns. These campaigns include new signage, web and social media messages to promote awareness of the importance to keep our green open spaces litter free, for the enjoyment of other visitors and benefit for the environment.

We will also request that colleagues in Safer Spaces that are authorised to issue fixed penalty notices for littering can carry out some spot checks.

The Sport and Leisure team will also make contact to the wider sports network to remind them all, their users and members that bottles and cans need to be disposed of appropriately.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

22 Question from Councillor Pat Greenwell, to Councillor Mariam Lolavar, Cabinet Member for Business Economic Growth

The 'Love your High Street' campaign is very welcome in Eltham. However the large wooden sign at the top of the High Street is looking less welcoming. Would it be possible to have a site visit to discuss what can be done please?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for her question.

I can advise that the wooden Eltham sign was installed by a Highways contractor as part of the £6.6 million Eltham High Street Improvement Scheme. The sign is a decorative feature, and the highway is not dependent on the lighting that comes from it. On an initial inspection of the sign, it was evident that the lighting within each letter is independent, meaning each letter would need to be dismantled to gain access to the electrical components to inspect them and determine the problem.

An engineer from our Term Contractors will attend the site this week and provide an update on the repairs required, an estimate of timescales and a quote for the cost. As this is a straightforward technical matter, which is in hand, a site visit would not be beneficial at this time.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

- 23 Question from Councillor Pat Greenwell, to Councillor Anthony Okereke, Cabinet Member for Housing / Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment Sustainability and Transport**

Has RBG considered the 'Solar Together London' scheme for social and private housing?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for her question.

As part of our drive for achieving zero carbon in 2030 and cabinet funding approval to facilitate this, we will be installing solar photovoltaic panels (PV) on our housing stock. We are currently surveying all our properties including blocks of flats with a view to carrying out feasible energy efficiency and retrofitting works. Solar Together London scheme will be considered and it will be one of our options to deliver our zero carbon target.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

24 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Good Growth

Can the Cabinet Member provide an overview of the process to reopen the cafe in the Eltham Centre? Is the Cabinet Member happy with how this process?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

As explained in previous responses to questions on this subject, the process to select an operator for the Café at the Eltham Centre is to market the lease opportunity for the space to seek proposals from potential operators.

The marketing of the café space commenced earlier this year as planned and is due to close at the end of March 2022. The lease being offered is based on typical commercial terms for a space like this and the marketing is open to all interested parties via the agent, which in this case is Fleurets.

The process is in line with industry norms and includes specific Council requirements such as London Living wage and as such, I am happy with the arrangements.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

25 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Miranda Williams, Cabinet Member for Health and Adult's Social Care

Many residents are finding it hard to make appointments to see their local GPs face to face or visit loved ones in hospitals or care homes. Has the Cabinet Member taken any action to address these problems and is there anything more that can be done at a Council level?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

I have been working with the NHS and with RBG commissioners of care homes to deliver improvements. Restrictions were in place to protect the most vulnerable and whilst restrictions are easing, COVID-19 still exists and we need to continue with safety measures.

All practices across the Borough are now offering face to face appointments as well as telephone and electronic consultations. They also have access to additional workforce roles including Clinical Pharmacists, Social Prescribers and Advanced Practitioners all of which enhance capacity and accessibility. In addition, the local GP Federation (a single organisation made up of all borough GP Practices working together) is now providing daily additional capacity which can be accessed via the patients registered practice.

On the 24 February 2022 the Government guidance on visiting arrangements in care homes was updated and there are now no nationally set restrictions on visiting care homes. Visiting is an integral part of care home life and we now encourage care homes to continue to offer visits in a risk managed way to ensure the ongoing safety of residents. Whilst we still support additional safety measures such as planning visits in advance to manage the number of visitors at any one time and ensuring visitors do not enter if they are unwell; we now support visiting both inside and outside of the home. This includes enabling visits in the home to take place in a room they are most comfortable in, such as their bedroom, visits without time limits and enabling physical contact, as long as infection control measures are in place, such as visiting in a ventilated space, using appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) for the visit, and hand washing before and after visiting.

Similarly, visitors are being encouraged at hospital but again with restrictions to ensure people remain safe. For example, all adult inpatients, including those having a planned procedure or surgery, can have two named visitors, but only one by the bedside at any one time. Visitors are encouraged to take safety measures including booking their visit by calling the ward, wearing a face covering and showing proof of a negative lateral flow test taken within the last 24 hours to be able to enter