

COUNCIL Minutes

Place

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

Date

Wednesday 21 July 2021

Time

7.00 pm

Present

The Deputy Mayor
Councillor Leo Fletcher

Councillors:

Olu Babatola	John Fahy	Matthew Morrow
Geoffrey Brighty	Nigel Fletcher	Anthony Okereke
Clare Burke-McDonald	Patricia Greenwell	Pat Slattery
Matt Clare	Chris Lloyd	Danny Thorpe
Angela Cornforth	Odette McGahey	Miranda Williams
Charlie Davis	Sarah Merrill	

A webcast of the meeting of the Council is displayed on the Council's website <https://royalgreenwich.public-i.tv/core/portal/home> for a period of six months subsequent to the meeting.

Minutes

The Deputy Mayor reminded Council that advice had been given by Public Health that the meeting should last for no longer than one hour. The Deputy Mayor suggested an indicative timeline to which he would hold in dealing with the business of the meeting.

Item No.

1 **Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were given for the Mayor, Councillor Denise Hyland.

The Leader of the Council gave apologies for absence for Cabinet Members who would otherwise have attended but were self-isolating after being messaged by the NHS Test and Trace App: Councillors Adel Khaireh, Mariam Lolavar, Linda Perks, Denise Scott-McDonald and Jackie Smith.

The Deputy Mayor noted that due to the requirement to ensure a Covid-19 secure environment a reduced number of Members were present to co-operate with the guidelines recommended by relevant officers. All other members who were not present were recorded as having given apologies for absence; it was noted they had been obliged not to attend through no fault of their own.

Apologies for absence were given for Councillors Norman Adams, Sandra Bauer, Stephen Brain, Linda Bird, Peter Brooks, Ann-Marie Cousins, Gary Dillon, Spencer Drury, Bill Freeman, David Gardner, Matt Hartley, Ian Hawking, Mick Hayes, John Hills, Mark James, Rajinder James, Sizwe James, Averil Lekau, Clive Mardner, Christine May, Dominic Mbang, Maureen O'Mara, Gary Parker, Aidan Smith, David Stanley, Roger Tester, Ivis Williams

2 **Minutes**

Resolved -

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 23 June 2021 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

3 Mayor's Announcements

The Deputy Mayor sent congratulations to Councillor Chris Lloyd who was getting married at the weekend.

4 Declarations of Interest

Resolved –

That the list of Councillors' memberships as Council appointed representatives on outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies is noted.

5 Notice of Members wishing to exceed the 5 minute rule

The Deputy Mayor noted that that no requests to exceed the five minute rule had been received.

6 Submission of Petitions

The following petitions were presented at the meeting:

Subject and Number of Signatures	Presenting Councillor	Lead Department
Please repair the neglected pram sheds in the communal area (Kingsman Street) 8 signatures	John Fahy	Directorate of Housing and Safer Communities

7 Petition Responses

The Deputy Mayor advised that the responses to the petitions had been considered by the Highways Committee earlier that month.

Councillor Geoffrey Brighty, as the Councillor who had submitted the petition at Appendix I, queried what the next steps were to be if the proposed alleviation measures were not successful. Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport, indicated it was not possible to answer at the present stage.

The Deputy Mayor accepted a request from Tessa Nuttman to address the Council in relation to the petition response set out in Appendix 6 of report. Tessa Nuttman commented that the road had not been tarmacked in the

forty years she had lived there, and she indicated that there were parking problems. Mrs Nuttman requested that the road be tarmacked and widened. Councillor Charlie Davis, as the Ward Councillor who had submitted the petition, asked if the Cabinet Member could give a commitment to undertake improvements in the next year's work programme.

Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport, thanked Tessa Nuttman for her comments. Councillor Merrill said that while she could not give a commitment she and Officers would look at it as a matter of urgency.

Resolved -

That the action taken in response to petitions presented at recent meetings of the Council be noted.

8 Public Deputations on matters not otherwise on the agenda

The Deputy Mayor noted that that no requests for public deputations had been received.

9 Public Questions

The Deputy Mayor stated that Council had received 5 written questions by members of the public. It was the ruling of the Mayor that due to the public health restrictions it was not possible to comply fully with A1.33 of the Council Procedures Rules and allow public to ask supplementary questions in person, however, they were able to do so in writing by 5pm 24 June. The questions and replies, together with the written supplementary submissions, are attached as Appendix A to the minutes.

10 Questions from Members

The Deputy Mayor stated that 13 written questions had been received from Members of the Council. The questions and replies, together with the supplementary submissions made during the meeting are attached as Appendix B to the minutes.

Under procedures for oral questions, the Deputy Mayor invited questions to Members of the Cabinet for response.

Councillor Nigel Fletcher asked the Leader of the Council whether provisions were being made for Council to meet in an alternative venue if

they had to continue to meet under current Public Health restrictions. Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, indicated that the health risks would be the same if the meeting was held at the Waterfront Leisure Centre, however there would be financial costs and there would be no facilities to webcast the meeting. Councillor Thorpe said it would have been better for the government to have continued with the use of virtual meetings.

Councillor Pat Greenwell requested a meeting with the Leader of the Council to discuss the future of the former Wide Horizons site. Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, referring to a previous proposal made by Councillor Greenwell said that it would not be in anyone's best interests for that valuable asset to be given to a charity in Bexley, and that instead they would continue to do all they could to bring the site back into use.

Councillor Charlie Davis referring to the petition response earlier in the meeting asked the Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport if she would commit to visiting Winchcomb Gardens with the petitioners. Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport, said that she would do so as soon as possible.

11 Matters for early debate

The Deputy Mayor noted that no requests for matters to be taken early had been received.

12 Report on the work of the Audit and Risk Management Panel during 2020-21

Councillor Chris Lloyd, Chair of the Audit and Risk Management Panel, presented the report.

Resolved –

That the report, setting out the issues considered by the Audit and Risk Management Panel during 2020/21 be noted.

13 Proposed changes to Part 3 of the Constitution - Contract Standing Orders

The Deputy Mayor moved the recommendation in the report.

Councillor Nigel Fletcher, Leader of the minority group, while supporting the introduction of more social value expressed a note of caution about changes such as removal of the word ‘economically’ from ‘economically advantageous tender’ which were felt to be more of a policy matter rather than a matter for the constitution.

Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, said that it was more than just changing the Contract Standing Orders it was about how they invested and grew their local economy and making sure that every single pound that the Council spent was invested in the borough and created and supported local jobs. He drew Members’ attention to section 4.9 of the report. The Leader informed Council that in 2020-2021 the Council spent £107 million in businesses in Greenwich which was an increase on the previous year. £52 million went to small and medium sized enterprises which was exactly the kind of jobs that they sought to support; £10 million was spent directly on the local voluntary and community sector who had been so vital to the borough during the pandemic. They would continue to focus on getting best value while investing more locally.

Councillor John Fahy, Chair of the Corporate Finance and Performance Scrutiny Panel, informed Council that the matter had been discussed by the Scrutiny Panel the previous week. Councillor Fahy thanked Officers for bringing the policy to fruition which would set the borough in good stead for the future.

The Deputy Mayor put the matter to the vote and with the majority group in favour and the minority group abstaining it was

Resolved –

That the changes to Part 4 of the Constitution (Contract Standing Orders) set out in Appendix C of the report be noted.

14 Motion “Low Traffic Neighbourhoods”

Councillor Nigel Fletcher moved the motion. He noted that they all recognised that there were strong public feelings on the Low Traffic Neighborhood measures, both for and against. At the heart of any political problem was how to balance opposing views, inevitably there had to be some degree of compromise. He emphasised that they had to maintain public consent for current measures and for future measures which meant consultation going beyond the roads within each scheme and also taking into effect the cumulative effect on the whole of the Borough, and that the

benefits expected from the measures had to be seen to work. He noted that when the government provided funding it was made clear that councils had to consult appropriately. He felt that it would be difficult now to secure the compromises needed for the Hills and Vales scheme.

In seconding the motion, Councillor Matt Clare said they were neither pro or anti any group in the matter. He said they needed to get the public on board and if they went too far without them they would create opposition to future schemes. They needed to bring about the required improvements without creating the levels of opposition that they had recently seen. It was essential then to have robust consultation.

Councillor Sarah Merrill proposed an amendment to the motion, as published. Councillor Merrill noted that the government timescales had been too short and consultation had had to take place while schemes were in place. Councillor Merrill emphasised that the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods would not in themselves solve the traffic problems or air quality problems, they needed to look at the borough as a whole. There was a lot of freight and commercial vehicles using their roads and the longer plan was to develop a proper transport strategy across the whole borough; another problem was school time traffic. She indicated that modelling was being planned for both traffic and air quality. She highlighted that a Working Party was to be set up. A public meeting for residents in east and west Greenwich was being planned for September.

In seconding the amendment, Councillor John Fahy commented that making transformation happen was what they were trying to do. The steps being taken were small steps leading to bigger steps in the long term in addressing climate change; it was not a case of us and them, it was about all of us.

Councillor Nigel Fletcher did not accept the amendment.

Councillor Chris Lloyd spoke in support of the amendment. He noted the effect of the Low Traffic Neighbourhood scheme in his Ward. He acknowledged the actions that the Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport was taking. He said councils needed to take leadership in seeking to improve air quality.

Councillor Charlie Davis suggested that consultation was now taking place because of poor by-election results and because it was seen that the Low Traffic Neighbourhood schemes had had an awful impact in the borough.

In closing the debate on the amendment, Councillor Nigel Fletcher felt the minority group were providing leadership on proposing workable schemes for promoting cycling and walking in the borough and improving air quality. The minority group would not be supporting the amendment as it did not mandate the things that were required but he was encouraged to hear that the Cabinet Member was consulting more.

The Deputy Mayor put the amendment to the vote and with the majority group in favour and the minority group against it was carried.

In closing the debate, Councillor Sarah Merrill recalled how last autumn Boris Johnson had told everyone to get in their cars and drive; that had been a huge contributor to the problems that they were facing in the Greenwich area with people driving into town rather than get the train.

The Deputy Mayor put the amended motion to the vote and with the majority group in favour and the minority group abstaining.

Resolved -

Council notes the strong feelings that continue to exist on the impact of existing and proposed Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in the Borough and is mindful of the conditions set by central government when funding was allocated in November. In order to meet these conditions, the Royal Borough of Greenwich had to:

- Implement proposals to manage traffic under Experimental Traffic Orders
- Allow for comments to be received during the first six months while the scheme is in operation
- Take any final decision on the future of the scheme no more than eighteen months before the measures are abandoned, amended or made permanent

Council believes that while it is essential that congestion and pollution is reduced in the borough, we also need to be mindful that some people have no choice but to use a car. In devising traffic schemes, we need to be flexible and monitor the impact that different traffic measures are having across the borough.

Council therefore commits to working with residents to develop a sustainable transport strategy that will consider all modes of transport and address the current and future transport challenges faced by the borough.

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm

Chair

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

With the announcement of ANPR being applied for emergency services access, the idea of opening Hyde Vale for 2 hours in the morning peak to alleviate traffic on Maze Hill has been mooted by the Council.

Please note that West Greenwich is a small residential area (compared to East Greenwich for instance) with hardly any protection against large traffic volumes and vehicle sizes besides the LTN. The streets to/from A2 are interconnected by 2 streets including King George Street and Burney Street so excessive traffic on one road impacts the others. The proposal to re-open Hyde Vale or any other street in the area would invite rat runs throughout West Greenwich. So opening Hyde Vale with ANPR at the bottom would also result in rat runs accessing Royal Hill/Blissett St /Greenwich High Street via General Wolfe Rd/Crooms Hill and onto King George Street; latter is essentially a single lane road. Heavy traffic would run past 3 school entrances on Royal Hill, King George Street and Crooms Hill.

Please can Cabinet Member confirm the Council's plans for managing and mitigating rat runs which will appear throughout West Greenwich area before and during the proposed morning peak re-opening of Hyde Vale, that will protect the safety of school children and other pedestrians and cyclists?

Please can Cabinet Member discuss what other mitigations within East Greenwich have been considered. We are aware that you have written to Greenwich Park but have you explored re-opening Park Vista westbound in the short term also in the morning peak to relieve standing traffic on Maze Hill in the morning peaks, caused by the very short traffic lights which prevent turns onto Trafalgar Road rather than the excessive volumes on narrower roads in West Greenwich.

Reply -

I thank Simon Radford for his question.

The COVID-19 emergency continues to bring about changes in travel patterns unprecedented in recent history. The network in this area has seen significant changes made by the Royal Borough, TfL and the Royal Parks and it has limited capacity to cope with disruption from incidents.

Whilst the measures in West Greenwich have benefitted that area, they may have had an impact on the surrounding road network. The Royal Borough is working to understand what more it can do to manage the traffic, health and road safety impacts on the surrounding road network, whilst pursuing its healthy and sustainable transport objectives

I have asked for options to be considered for modifying the West Greenwich experimental traffic reduction scheme to:

- improve access to emergency services and waste vehicles; and
- consider the possibility of allowing motorised vehicles access to Hyde Vale for a short period in the morning only.

The aim of these modifications, if made, would be to offer a more equitable approach to managing through traffic in the area. They would help to redistribute the traffic from some roads currently experiencing high traffic volumes during the morning peak.

In assessing these options, their impacts will be carefully considered, including any impacts on road safety.

It is not anticipated that the option of allowing traffic access to Hyde Vale for a short period in the morning only would have the area-wide impact suggested as most of the area would still be protected by modal filters. The Hyde Vale modal filter would also remain in-place for the rest of the day, with through traffic permitted for a minimal period only.

It was always made clear that the LTN in West Greenwich was experimental and was subject to modifications at any point. It is vital that we listen to people's experiences and adapt the scheme to provide the best balance, based on what we hear.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

2 Question from Sarah Montgomery, SE12, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

Will the Council be representing its residents by submitting a response to the Lewisham Council consultation on the Lee Green LTN that closes on 8th August to highlight the negative impact the scheme has had on the residential Greenwich roads bordering the scheme? If not, why not?

Reply -

I thank Sarah Montgomery for her question.

I can confirm that RBG will be submitting to Lewisham Council's Consultation.

Supplementary Question -

What will the high-level response to this consultation be and will it reflect the 62% of Greenwich residents opposed to the scheme?

Reply -

Greenwich supports fair and equitable low traffic neighbourhoods. Engagement with the public identified strong concerns from our residents about the effect of the Lewisham and Lee Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood on Greenwich. The revisions made by Lewisham Council in November 2020, appear to be helpful measures to manage traffic in the area more equitably, at this exceptional time. However, there remains significant concern about the displacement of traffic into Greenwich, including roads like Horn Park Lane, Abergeldie Road, sections of Westhorne Avenue, Scotsdale Road, Crathie Road, Weigall Road and Ravens Way. This could increase further still as traffic levels rise again, now national restrictions have eased.

We urge Lewisham Council to continue to work with Greenwich on this important issue. We would be keen to see any traffic data supporting Lewisham Council's decision and its assessment of the potential impact of its

proposals on Greenwich. We also look forward to seeing the results of Lewisham Council's consultation

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

3 Question from Shaun Slator, SE18, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Good Growth

On a RBG Zoom meeting on 13 July called Sustainable, Resilient and Vibrant Neighbourhoods, I learned that RBG is spending money on bringing fibre broadband to Woolwich. What is the cost of this? How much does that equate to per household? How long has the Council been working on this project?

Reply -

I thank Shaun Slator for his question.

Ensuring that residents and businesses have access to the highest connectivity speeds is a priority for the Council. We recognise that digital connectivity is critically important to our Borough, and will become ever more so. This has been very evident during the Pandemic and the associated lockdowns, with more and more residents working and learning from home and engaging with friends and family online, and with businesses transacting digitally. Connectivity speeds and resilience vary across the Borough generally fall short of what is required both now and in the future.

The Council is responding in two ways. Firstly, through an investment in a joint venture with a commercial provider, to provide fibre to the premises. The first phase of which is focused on the wider Woolwich area. The choice of area was based on analysis of currently levels of connectivity across the Borough. Subject to the outcome of the first phase, coverage will be extended to further areas of the Borough.

Secondly, by encouraging the private sector to invest by removing barriers through, for example the issuing of wayleaves to access council land and properties. Council officers are currently actively engaged in discussions with many of the main broadband providers about bringing fibre-based broadband to housing estates in the Borough, some of which, like Strongbow Crescent and parts of Abbey Wood, experience very poor levels of connectivity. It is expected that work on some estates will be completed this year.

We believe this 'mixed-economy' approach of actively investing alongside a commercial provider, as well as encouraging other providers to invest in the Borough best meets the Council's aim of securing high speed digital connectivity.

The Council intends to invest £1M in the Joint Venture to be matched by the private sector partner. This is an investment made on the market economy operator principle ie it is intended to generate a commercial return. Funding comes from Local London which secured funding through the Strategic Investment Pot to improve connectivity across the Local London Boroughs, and CIL. The specific number of households that will be covered by the first phase of the Joint Venture (and therefore the cost per household passed) will be determined via the outcome of the section process.

The Council formally agreed the approach at the end of 2019 and since that time has been engaged in a complex selection process. It is anticipated this will be concluded by September enabling work to start at the end of 2021.

Supplementary Question -

Your answer mentions a cost of £1m for the first phase. Can you please outline how many phases there are (including a projected end date) and the total cost to RBG across these phases?

Also, you state that work will start at the end of 2021 and that the work will be completed on some estates this year. Why has it taken 2 years of planning for work which would be completed in such a short space of time, if it was such a priority for the Council?

Reply -

I thank Mr Slater for his supplementary question following my response to his original question.

At this stage the Council has made a commitment to progress Phase One of the digital connectivity project, utilising funding secured by the Council. The implementation of subsequent phases will be dependent on the evaluation of Phase One, and availability of funding. At this time, it is not possible to say how many further phases there might be, nor the timescale.

The process of open selection of a commercial partner and the formal agreements relating to the Joint Venture are complex and inevitably take time. It is not a simple process, and has involved the drafting of extensive documentation, evaluations of submissions and lengthy negotiations. It is appropriate for each step to be done thoroughly. The planned timetable also coincided with the Covid Pandemic and associated lockdowns, which has impacted on Council staff and bidders, leading to deadlines being extended.

Once the JV Partner is in place, it is expected that the detailed design and build will take approximately nine months. My reference to works being completed on some estates by the end of the year, relates to other work the Council is doing to facilitate private sector deployment of fibre broadband in the Borough.

I hope this clarifies the position.

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

4 Question from Paul Billington, SE18, to Councillor Anthony Okereke, Cabinet Member for Housing

In the latest quarterly report published by the Housing Ombudsman, it revealed that Greenwich Council was one of six social landlords that had been issued with a “Type I” non-compliance failure order for not complying with its complaints handling code. This is where they relate to the landlord’s unreasonable delays in either accepting or progressing a complaint through its process.

In the Ombudsman’s own words, “the issuance of failure orders shows landlords in “real-time” problems with their complaints handling”. What steps are the Council taking to ensure such complaints are dealt with effectively, not being ignored - as has clearly happened here - and more importantly, dealt with, in view of this rebuke by the Housing Ombudsman?

Reply -

I thank Paul Billington for his question.

The Housing Ombudsman issues “Type I” complaint handling failure orders when a landlord has unreasonably delayed accepting or progressing a complaint through this process. The Housing Ombudsman issued a “type I” order to the Royal Borough of Greenwich on 13th April 2021. The order arose due to a failure to produce a timely response to a “stage I” complaint.

The reason for this late response was a backlog of work due to staff shortages during the pandemic, which we are working towards reducing. RBG has been in regular contact with the complainant and the matter is ongoing.

We are building capacity to maintain and improve the resilience of our complaint handling teams, which remain an ongoing priority for us. Through our Housing digital programme, we will build greater resilience into our systems and complaints handling process.

All complaints are important to us and when we fall short of the high standards our residents expect of us, we endeavour to address any shortcomings as soon as possible. We aim to resolve cases with our residents without the need to involve the Housing Ombudsman.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5 Question from Paul Billington, SE18, to Councillor Matthew Morrow, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People

Can the Council provide details - grouped by primary and secondary school - of any instances of 1) full school and 2) individual class closures per ward, each month since January 2021 to early July 2021, as a consequence of further COVID outbreaks in the borough?

Reply -

I thank Paul Billington for his question.

During the period of the pandemic schools have worked tirelessly to comply with the regulations and guidance in order to keep children and staff safe. Changes to guidance have occurred at very short notice and has often been updated during school holiday times, but our Headteacher have responded amazingly and have worked in partnership with Children's services and public health.

Please refer to the attached PDF files for the data on school closures. At this time it's not possible to provide information at Ward level.

2021	Primary School Class closures	Secondary School Class closure	Primary full school closure	Secondary full school closure
January	28	5	2	1
February	11	0		2
March	22	4		
April	5	0		
May	22	23	2	
June	53	28		1
July	130	28		
TOTAL	271	88	4	4

2021	Primary school class closures	School names	Secondary School Class closure	School names	Primary full school closure	School names	Secondary full school closure	School names
January	28	Fossdene Eglinton Morden Mount St Thomas More Primary Middle Park Notre Dame Woodhill Thorntree Rockliffe Manor Blackheath Prep Boxgrove South Rise Cardwell St Alfege & St Peters Timbercroft Greenacres Hawksmoor Foxfield Horn Park Discovery	5	St Ursula's Thomas Tallis Plumstead Manor Leigh Academy Blackheath	2	Wingfield; South Rise	1	Breakthrough AP

APPENDIX A

February	11	Fossdene Cherry Orchard St Thomas a Becket South Rise St Patricks Woodhill Nightingale Cardwell De Lucy Morden Mount	0				2	Woolwich Poly for Girls; Woolwich Poly for boys
March	22	Montbelle Eltham CE Charlton Manor Morden Mount Invicta Blackheath Wyborne Nightingale	4	Leigh Academy Blackheath Thomas Tallis St Pauls				
April	5	Montbelle Morden Mount Boxgrove St Mary Magdalene Peninsular Boxgrove	0					

APPENDIX A

May	22	Morden Mount Fossdene Conway Plumcroft Bannockburn Heronsgate	23	The John Roan Thomas Tallis St Pauls Academy Royal Greenwich Trust School	2	Conway; Deansfield		
June	53	Boxgrove Ealdham Henwick Gordon Horn Park Plumcroft Haimo South Rise Boxgrove Christ Church Shooters Hill Charlton Manor Wyborne St Margaret C of E St Margaret Clitherow Gallions Mount Greenslade Meridian St Thomas More Primary Windrush (Thamesmead)	28	Plumstead Manor Eltham Hill Breakthrough AP Thomas Tallis Woolwich Poly Boys St Pauls Leigh Academy Blackheath St Thomas More Comprehensive The John Roan			1	Breakthrough AP

APPENDIX A

		Halstow Timbercroft					
July	130	Meridian Horn Park South Rise Eglinton Middle Park St Margaret's CE De Lucy Invicta Deptford Windrush Kidbrooke Park Wingfield Discovery Deansfield Gordon Millennium Timbercroft Halstow Sherington Henwick Ealdham Bannockburn Invicta Blackheath Conway Gordon James Wolfe St Josephs Foxfield Alex McLeod Gallions	28	Royal Greenwich Trust School Woolwich Poly Girls St Ursulas St Pauls Plumstead Manor Thomas Tallis St Thomas More Comprehensive Leigh Academy Blackheath Woolwich Poly Boys Street Vibes AP Breakthrough AP The John Roan			

APPENDIX A

		Mount Mulgrave						
TOTAL	271		88		4		4	

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

I Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Good Growth

What has been the total cost to the Council of the Woolwich Works project to date, and what the final projected cost will be?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

As reported at the Regeneration Transport and Culture Scrutiny panel on 12 July, the works are not finished because the site is in a fit-out phase in preparation for opening in September this year. In addition, the construction work is in a final account review process, therefore the total cost and final projected cost is not yet known. It was agreed that a report will be brought forward in due course on this matter

Supplementary Question -

It was a matter of public concern that the costs looked as though they might rise and it was hoped that there would be a report to Scrutiny at an early opportunity to ensure that those costs were being properly monitored

Reply (Councillor Danny Thorpe on behalf of Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald) -

The Cabinet report of 22 March 2017 set out the budget for Woolwich Works. Since then there had been Brexit, inflation and the pandemic which had affected costs. It was not possible to be clear about the cost of a project that was still in development.

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

2 Question from Councillor Geoffrey Brighty, to Councillor Mariam Lolavar, Cabinet Member for Business and Economic Growth

Could the Cabinet Member kindly provide an up-date on the Shop Local and Welcome Back campaigns ?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

The Council, in partnership with Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL), has an existing business discount card, called the Greenwich One Card, which have over 40,000 leisure members; 118,500 library members; and nearly 200 offers from local businesses for people who live or work in the borough.

We are now building on this work and plan to rebrand and relaunch the Greenwich One Card – with a formal launch in the Autumn. As part of this work, we are making improvements to our respective webpages, the operating and digital platforms to make it easier for businesses to sign up with offers and for residents and workers to find the offers and incentives provided by local businesses.

In the lead up to the formal launch, the Council in partnership with GLL and South East London Chamber of Commerce, will recruit ‘Shop Local Business Champions’ through the DWP Kickstart Scheme to enhance the extensive business engagement work being carried out, to make visits to as many businesses across the borough to promote the scheme and to secure further sign up of new offers.

We will continue to seek the views from local businesses particularly around branding and collateral packs to make this scheme a greater success. Businesses can email Shoplocal@royalgreenwich.gov.uk to provide suggestions and feedback.

Work is underway with Visit Greenwich to develop a Visitor-facing website, which seeks to combine Shop Local with Enjoy Local. The new website will be a mobile friendly site designed to support a hyper local experience based

on where people are with information on offers nearby e.g. what to do, where to eat, where to visit – to encourage greater dwell time and spend. To support retailers in our various town centres, we have commissioned the development of Shop Local online retail directories for each town centre. These online directories are almost complete and should be live by the autumn. The Plumstead/Wilton Road one was completed as a trial/pilot and has been live since June.

In relation to the Welcome Back Fund – the council has been allocated £258,441 and have developed an extensive programme of support, which has recently been signed off by MHCLG, enabling us to roll out these plans imminently. This includes temporary public realm improvements e.g. planters, memorial benches; events and activities to welcome shoppers back to physical stores and our venues across the borough; and testing new approaches including plans to develop our night-time economy – through extended opening times in our heritage and cultural venues and advancing our economic recovery work.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

Is the Cabinet Member able to provide an up date on the funding arrangement with TfL for the installation of electric vehicle charging points and also where any new points are to be sited ?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

I can confirm that we have a funding agreement in place with Transport for London for further electric vehicle charging points to access funds in the current funding period.

Possible locations have been identified and are currently being assessed for technical suitability. As soon as we have more certainty about these locations, I will share them with you.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

4 **Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Miranda Williams, Cabinet Member for Health and Adult's Social Care**

Since the last Full Council, it has been reported that the NHS has been given the green light by the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) to begin planning activity for a potential Autumn Covid-19 booster jab for specific groups. Can the Cabinet Member share any details of the work being done on this locally, by the Council and local health (and other) partners? Is specific local planning underway for a booster jab campaign, and can she share any details? Obviously the immediate focus is on completing the roll out, but any detail she can share on the planning necessary to get ahead of that next big (potential) vaccination challenge would be welcome.

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

Details regarding the booster programme are now emerging, and the Greenwich Vaccination Partnership Group has now been reconfigured to include Phase 3 (booster) planning alongside system partners. A clear plan will be developed as part of this work.

The JCVI advice states that the COVID 19 booster vaccines should be offered in two stages from September, starting with those most at risk from serious disease in stage 1, and to a second group of patients in stage 2, and that the seasonal flu vaccine should be offered alongside the booster dose of the COVID-19 vaccine. The NHS has asked systems to work with local providers, local authorities and regional teams to review their current Autumn/Winter plans, to ensure alignment with interim guidance. Our local considerations will include:

Consideration regards delivery model

- We will be exploring local delivery models which spread capacity across community pharmacy, vaccination centres and general practice.
- We are also considering the best delivery access for our population requirements and will want to make the most of community pharmacy,

pop ups, mobile units and other approaches. We have considerable learning from Phase 1 and 2 of the vaccination programme and will use this to maximise uptake of the vaccine in underserved communities.

Workforce

- Planning will include the need to ensure sufficient workforce is in place to deliver Phase 3 alongside the national flu vaccination programme and the continuation of routine immunisation programmes.

Estates

- Many estates used in Phases 1 and 2 are now returning to their business as usual function, and therefore we are planning to maximise existing NHS estate use, commissioned provider premises, or Local Authority or other estate where offers best value for money

Co-administration with flu

- We will be working through the implications of coadministration with the flu programme and all settings where possible.

Ongoing delivery of Phase 1 & 2

- We will also be considering COVID-19 second doses to those who receive their first COVID-19 vaccination over the summer and continue to offer a new first and second dose of the COVID-19 vaccine to all eligible patients (the “evergreen offer”)

Vaccine supply

Making Every Opportunity Count

- We will be exploring as part of this planning whether we can use the 15 minute wait as an opportunity to bolster other initiatives e.g. Pulse checks for Atrial Fibrillation, blood pressure monitoring.

Financial Resourcing

The first two enhanced service specifications became available yesterday (15/7), one for primary care networks and one for pharmacies. We are awaiting guidance on the booster programme for 16/17 year olds.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

5 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Adel Khaireh, Cabinet Member for Culture and Communities

I note that in June 2020, the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council announced a review of statues, monuments, historic figures and names of public spaces across the area. At the time the Leader of the Council stated that this review would cover the whole of the public realm to develop a way forward.

I was advised in May that “Royal Greenwich Heritage Trust has completed an initial draft review of monuments and street names. This has formed part of a draft report which is currently with the cabinet member for his input.” At that time I asked for a schedule for when this report would be published and when the Cabinet Member or Leader would be ready to put their way forward into the public domain, but I have yet to receive an answer.

Could the Cabinet Member inform me when he aims to publish the report presented to the Council by the Royal Greenwich Heritage Trust and what the Council intends to do as a result of this review?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

The report detailing the review and next steps will be tabled after recess.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

6 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport

I note that the Council has announced new(ish) proposals for Controlled Parking Zones in Eltham under the title “Proposed Extensions and Amendment To CPZ ‘E’ and CPZ ‘EO’ with Creation of CPZ ‘EN’”. Many residents and businesses have been in touch with Cllr Davis and myself to express their continuing concerns about the proposals and the detrimental impact that they are likely to have on the viability of shops and quality of life of residents. Will the Cabinet Member commit to publishing a full report including all the responses to the latest consultation and the way in which the Council intends to respond to them?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

As you will be aware the council agreed to re-consult, in relation to the Eltham CPZ, due to concerns raised by businesses and residents regarding the impact of the original proposals.

Therefore, I can confirm that a parking beat survey was carried out in Kidbrooke Lane and also Well Hall Road. This was carried out on a weekday and also on a Saturday to investigate parking turnover and also the number of ‘residents’ parking on street, to alleviate concerns around the availability of parking for various businesses.

As a consequence, we made some revisions, which were included in the revised scheme and they have been subject to the re-consultation.

The Traffic Management Order (TMO) was subsequently advertised as per the agreed timescales which was shared with ward members and posted on the Councils website.

We wrote to all those directly affected by the proposals to notify them with the revised plans and provided a link on the Councils website to the

proposed scheme and the public consultation. In addition, notices were placed on street and the scheme was also advertised in the local press to help promote the changes to those that do not live but may visit or work in the area.

All comments and objections that have been received will be taken into consideration with this scheme. Whilst I appreciate that we do have some objections, this is expected with a consultation of this size and for a CPZ. With over 3,000 letters being sent out and extensive consultation, we have received to date around 35 formal letters/emails with comments (for and against).

Once comments have been fully reviewed, the outcome will be shared with ward members and a decision will be taken on the next steps, which will require a report to be issued to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport.

The report that is issued will include a summary of all comments and objections received and also include recommendations. The final report will be published and all those that have commented during the public consultation and all those directly affected will be notified of the final decision.

Supplementary Question (by Councillor Charlie Davis on behalf of Councillor Spencer Drury) -

Could Councillor Drury and myself meet with the Cabinet Member and Officers once all the responses have been considered to put across concerns in more detail?

Reply -

Yes. Officers and I will be visiting some of the sites on the Friday following this meeting.

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

7 Question from Councillor Pat Greenwell, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Good Growth

Before the first lockdown in March 2020 I met with Councillor Thorpe to discuss the future of the former Wide Horizons site on Bexley Road. I have heard nothing since. Does this mean that all plans are still on hold for this valuable community asset?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for her question.

Plans are still being actively progressed for the use of the entire site and a number of options are being explored. To support this there was an open day in September 2020 where the local community and other interested parties attended site to undertake some volunteering and meet to discuss proposals for the future of the site.

Since then, further feasibility work has been undertaken in relation to options for the use of both the built part of the site and the green space. Once the proposals are at a far enough advanced state of development a report will be brought forward for consideration and agreement on the way forward.

Supplementary Question -

What feasibility work has been undertaken in relation to options and why is it taking so long ?

Reply (Councillor Danny Thorpe on behalf of Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald) -

We have been doing the feasibility work to bring it back into use.

We have had people who haven't been let out at all in the past 18 months which is why this Council created the Community Hub , invested millions in

parks, we have the parkrun in Avery Hill Park, so we have been supporting all of our communities.

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

8 Question from Councillor Pat Greenwell, to Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement

The number of delivery bikes still continues to grow on Eltham High Street. Not only do they take up valuable parking places but they are a major health and safety concern. They turn around and drive up onto the pavement area putting the lives of pedestrians at risk. I am aware that they do not have to display a parking ticket but please can this problem be looked at carefully?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for her question.

I am aware of the issues caused by delivery bikes, motorcycles and cars in Eltham High Street, which appear to have increased during the Pandemic period.

Enforcement against motorcycles has always been difficult due to the type of vehicle, collecting the details required for a PCN and the fact that the riders / drivers tend to be very close by (and can therefore move very quickly when a CEO arrives).

That said where we can we do enforce, however the Council does not have the powers to enforce against the driving of vehicles on the footway as this is a matter for the police.

The Royal Borough has worked hard to improve the walking (and cycling) environment in Eltham High Street. Illegal parking and footway use should not be allowed to undermine our efforts to make it a great place to walk, cycle, shop, eat and enjoy.

We are looking closely at the options for addressing the issue. These options are likely to include:

- Ensuring we have the right restrictions in-place and looking at how enforcement can be targeted at illegal parking;
- Working with food outlets and delivery providers to encourage them to act safely and responsibly; and
- Exploring whether improvements to parking provision could help to address the issue. For example, more cycle parking or dedicated short-stay motorcycle parking.

I have a visit to Eltham High Street scheduled with officers soon and will take that opportunity to consider this issue further too.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

In October 2019 a motion was agreed by Council on ways of tackling the ever increasing problem of litter. Local shops, food and drink outlets were to be approached and asked to take on ownership, voluntary clean ups, of the front of their properties. I realise this could not progress during COVID but have we now restarted these conversations with businesses?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for her question.

Following the motion approved in January 2020, engagement has taken place with a number of businesses in respect to the increasing problem of litter during the pandemic and to agree action to address this issue. This has been met with a positive response from businesses in most cases and has led to changes in operating arrangements to reduce the likelihood of littering recurring. This has included:

- Increased signage to notify customers to dispose of their waste responsibly
- The provision of extra bins for their customers to dispose of their waste
- increasing the level of their cleansing arrangements
- staff patrols to clear litter emanating from their business that may have been discarded by members of the public in the surrounding streets

In respect of businesses that have been issued with a Forecourt or Pavement Licence to place tables and chairs on the highway, businesses are also required to ensure that they have appropriate measures in place to avoid any issues arising that may cause a nuisance to residents, businesses and users of the public highway.

Following restrictions being lifted from 19th July, this provides an opportunity to intensify our engagement with businesses, and garner further support to maintain the attractiveness of our high street / local shopping parades.

We plan to build on this work through a targeted marketing campaign and engagement through upcoming traders, business forums and through other business communication channels. This is with the aim of securing further commitment, for example through businesses becoming a street champion to take greater responsibility of the forecourt areas immediately in front of their premises.

This can be done by ensuring:

- ensuring they have appropriate waste management plans in place, relating to the storage, collection and disposal of their commercial waste
- encouraging their service users to responsibly dispose of their litter
- encouraging participation in 'Street Champions' to take part in a periodic clean-up of their area

I hope this provides a sufficient update on the progress being made and ongoing work to tackle this issue.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

10 Question from Councillor Matt Clare, to Councillor Linda Perks, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

Regularly we are made aware of poor quality highway or utility contractor work, delays or other issues such as rubble left in the road recently in Kings Orchard for weeks on end. How much has the Council claimed in service credits, compensation or refunds over the last 2 years from Riney/other contractors/utility companies ? What performance management is in place of key contractors such as Riney?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

The Royal Borough of Greenwich implemented the London Permit Scheme (LOPS) in September 2011. Through this we monitor utilities as well as our own Highway works. As part of the monitoring process, the Council inspects 30% of the works carried out by utility companies. These inspections are done at each of the three different stages of work every year. Any defect found is discussed with the company for resolution. The utility company can incur a fine if they don't comply. In some cases, the Council can complete the works itself, and charge the company for costs incurred. Of note, the Council has limited powers to charge companies for not completing their work as soon as is practical. Companies can apply for an extension of time due to unforeseen circumstances.

The highway network is regularly inspected to assess the condition and safety of our roads and to also inspect the work undertaken by utility companies. If the NRSWA (New Road and Street Work Act 1991) inspector finds a defect or poor-quality reinstatement, they will inform the utility company and follow the defect process and we re-charge these additional costs to the utility company. This includes any defective or damaged apparatus that they encounter while on their site inspections. If the utility company leaves rubble, (under section 74 of the act) they are informed and incur a daily charge until the rubble is cleared. Furthermore, we inform the Highways Manager, and they discuss this in the monthly contract meetings.

Additionally, the Royal Borough can issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs). FPNs are designed to ensure that enforcement is proportionate, and that information and support is given where necessary, but that firm action is taken against undertakers who fail to comply with their duty. FPNs are also issued to our own contactors to improve compliance but they do not incur any financial penalty under current legislation. This performance is discussed at NRSWA Quarterly coordination meetings attended by all road work promoters, including RBG's contractors.

With regards to King's Orchard, the works were undertaken by the Council's Highway Contractor (Riney) who frequently separate excavated material for recycling purposes. We are aware instances where excavated material is being left for long periods and we are working with our contractor, who is introducing a new system that will alert them of sites where they are yet to clear excavated materials.

Greenwich is a permitting Borough and must provide monthly performance information to the Highway Authorities and Utilities Committee (HAUC) on 5 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), 9 Operational Measures and Quarterly Traffic Management Act performance Indicators (TPI). For the last two years we have received a total inspection income of: (1) £180,255.00 (2019/2020) and (2) £163,137.00 (2020/2021) including fines.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

11 Question from Councillor Matt Clare, to Councillor Linda Perks, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

Given the likely ongoing hybrid mix of working from home and office-based work will the council look to reduce its office and other facility footprint by hotdesking with the potential opportunity to raise funds (through divestment/subletting) or to convert space into much needed housing?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

It is too soon to say what the long-term effect of the epidemic on the Council's estate will be.

Now that Government requirements concerning working from home have been relaxed the Council will be embarking upon a detailed exercise in Directorates discussing and evaluating working arrangements with staff which may result in opportunities in the long term to release some parts of the estate for alternative use.

In meantime and in parallel, the Council is also undertaking a review of all its non-housing property assets. Further information will be released as these programmes of work develop.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

A number of Tesco and Sainsbury's stores have begun to recycle soft plastics (e.g. film). Currently only 17% of local authorities recycle soft plastics. Clearly there are challenges in terms of potentially contaminated loads. However significant increases in the amount of material recycled can be achieved. What thought has the Council given to this so far?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

For clarity, soft plastics are lightweight plastics that often cannot be placed in recycling bins at home and include;

- Plastic bags
- Fruit and vegetable bags
- Toilet paper packaging
- Crisp packets
- Biscuit packs
- Bread, rice and cereal bags

The materials that local authorities can accept in the recycling stream is determined by the contract specification and the Material Recovery Facility (MRF) that the recyclate is taken to for the sorting and separating process. Although the material we can collect has been extended during the contract period to include additional recyclable items, a major change to the recycling of soft plastics would likely be considered at the point of a new contract (2027) because of the capital costs involved in updating the processing facility.

Currently, Royal Greenwich residents cannot recycle soft plastics via our Blue top bin collection service. Soft plastics such as carrier bags and cling film are always difficult to recycle, particularly when collected as part of a co-mingled collection as often these materials become entangled in the high-

tech machinery in the MRF and can bring the entire facility to a stand-still, leading to expensive down time at the facility.

The market for recycled soft plastics has a quality requirement of 94% which is difficult to achieve when the material is part of a co-mingled collection. Contamination impacts on the quality of the soft plastics and unfortunately the authority is reliant on residents putting the right materials in the blue top bin and not contaminating. Frequent messaging to remind residents of what can and cannot be recycled is required to achieve this and the Council does this through regular publicity through Greenwich Info, the Council's website and social media, as well as leafletting and door-knocking which has resource and cost implications.

In respect of new recycling initiatives recently introduced in a number of Sainsbury's and Tesco stores, these supermarkets produce significant amounts of soft plastics on a regular basis and as a producer, they have a responsibility to handle it in an environmentally and economical way, hence the in-store recycling facility. As Tesco and Sainsbury's and also the CO-OP, now collect some of these hard to recycle soft plastics, we would encourage residents to fully utilise these facilities. This will also help remove them from our blue top recycling service as we are currently unable to recycle them, so helping to reduce contamination levels in the Blue top bins and helping to increase our recycling.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

21 JULY 2021

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

Some residents in the west and south of our borough are much closer to neighbouring boroughs recycling centres than Birchmere. Reducing journeys could not only reduce carbon emissions but also encourage more materials to be taken to recycling centres. Has the Council considered a simple method of corporation with neighbouring boroughs such as Bexley and Lewisham ?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

The council has always worked closely with colleagues in the neighbouring boroughs of Bexley and Lewisham and whilst there are no formal reciprocal arrangements in place, the boroughs have allowed at times, out of borough residents to use their facilities for a fee to cover the additional disposal costs. This has had the benefit of reducing carbon emissions due to reduced numbers/length of journeys.

Unfortunately, COVID has impacted on this arrangement as all authorities have restricted usage to residents within their own Boroughs. However, once restriction are fully lifted, this will be reviewed, with the aim of agreeing a more formal reciprocal arrangements for cross borough usage.

No supplementary question