

COUNCIL Minutes

Place

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

Date

Wednesday 29 January 2020

Time

7.00 pm

Present

The Worshipful Mayor

Councillor Mick Hayes

Councillors:

Norman Adams

David Gardner

Clive Mardner

Tonia Ashikodi

Patricia Greenwell

Christine May

Olu Babatola

Christine Grice

Dominic Mbang

Linda Bird

Matt Hartley

Sarah Merrill

Stephen Brain

Ian Hawking

Matthew Morrow

Geoffrey Brighty

John Hills

Anthony Okereke

Peter Brooks

Denise Hyland

Linda Perks

Matt Clare

Mark James

Denise Scott-McDonald

Angela Cornforth

Rajinder James

Aidan Smith

Ann-Marie Cousins

Sizwe James

Jackie Smith

Charlie Davis

Adel Khaireh

David Stanley

Spencer Drury

Mehboob Khan

Roger Tester

John Fahy

Chris Kirby

Danny Thorpe

Leo Fletcher

Averil Lekau

Miranda Williams

Nigel Fletcher

Chris Lloyd

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

Item No.

1 **Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gary Dillon, Bill Freeman, Mariam Lolavar, Maureen O'Mara, Gary Parker and Ivis Williams.

Apologies for leaving early were given by Councillors Tonia Ashikodi, Sizwe James, Mehboob Khan and Olu Babatola.

2 **Minutes**

Resolved –

That the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 18 December 2019 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

3 **Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor announced that some of the younger members of the borough were to be awarded Gold certificates to recognise their achievement in encouraging active, safe and clean travel through the School Travel Plan programme. The TfL's STARS accreditation scheme measured how well they were doing and eight schools in Greenwich had achieved Gold status for the first time, on top of 31 existing Gold schools. This was a huge achievement as they had all reduced car use by at least 6%.

The Mayor called on Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport, to present the Gold certificates to;

Discovery Primary School - Represented by: Tomiwa and Bernice (pupils) and Cheryl Van Cooten (teacher).

Fosdene Primary School - Represented by: Jude and Ife (pupils) and Maria Hill (Executive Headteacher).

Plumcroft Primary School - Represented by: Andrew Greenwald (teacher).

St Olave's Prep School - Represented by: Holly (pupil) and Claire Holloway (Headteacher).

Windrush Primary School - Represented by: Jada and Stephen (pupils) and Andrea Baker (teacher).

At the invitation of the Mayor, Council Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, spoke on behalf of the Council to congratulate Councillor Christine Grice on her full recovery from cancer and commended her dedication to the Council by her hard work and service whilst she was undergoing treatment.

Councillor Christine Grice thanked everyone for the tremendous support over the last 18 months and encouraged all residents of the Borough take up the screening opportunities that the NHS provided.

4 Declarations of Interest

Resolved -

- 1 That the list of Councillors' memberships as Council appointed representatives on outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies is noted.
- 2 That the following declaration be noted:

Councillors' Matt Clare, Denise Hyland, Rajinder James, Sizwe James, Clive Mardner, Dominic Mbang and Jackie Smith declared a financial interest in agenda item 13, as owners of a second property in the Borough.

5 Notice of Members wishing to exceed the 5 minute rule

The 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
Petition calling for the installation of an entry phone system by Eglington Road residents. 18 signatures	David Gardner	Directorate of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills

To stop the demolition of Troy Court. 19 signatures	David Gardner	Directorate of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills
Amendment of parking restrictions in Hector Stree and Mineral Street 160 signatures	Angela Cornforth	Directorate of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills

7 Petition Responses

The Mayor advised that the petition responses at appendix 4 and 5 had been considered by the Highways Committee earlier in the month.

The Mayor accepted a request from Chris Thurlow to address the Council in relation to the petition response set out in Appendix 2 of report. Mr Thurlow stated that the Greenwich Toy Library provided holistic support to disabled children and their families throughout the Borough. The Council's offer of a stepped rent had yet to be decided and the building was not really fit for purpose. He asked, that having regard to the 2,900 signatures on the petition would the Council revisit its decision.

Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth, thanked Mr Thurlow for his comments. He noted the offer that was given in the response. Greenwich Toy Library were invited to accept the proposal.

The Mayor accepted a request from James Allotey to address the Council in relation to the petition response set out in Appendix 5 of report. Mr Allotey said that the residents were asking that the Council urgently turn Conduit Road into a one way street due to the heavy traffic levels, nuisance, and fights between drivers that happened on the road, from rush hour into the night. Residents were concerned that the current situation could lead to fatalities.

Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport, thanked Mr Allotey for his comments. Conduit Road was an area of concern and a holistic approach to the situation was necessary as there was an awareness that making the road one way would

push the traffic somewhere else. She assured the residents that the situation was being closely monitored and she would raise the residents' concerns with Officers.

Resolved –

That the Council noted the action taking in response to petition presented at recent meetings of the Council.

8 Public Deputations on matters not otherwise on the agenda

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

9 Public Questions

The Mayor stated that Council had received 30 written questions by members of the public. The questions and replies are attached as Appendix A to the minutes.

10 Questions from Members

The Mayor stated that 36 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 Mayor invited questions to Members of the Cabinet for response.

Councillor Matt Hartley, Leader of the Conservative Group, asked if the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources could ensure that a link to the pro-formas at Appendix A of the deferred Medium Term Financial Strategy Report, be made available as part of the public consultation. Councillor Christine Grice, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, confirmed she would consult with Officers to see if that was technically possible.

Councillor Mehboob Khan asked what assurances the Leader of the Council could give, on behalf of the Council, to the thousands of residents of different nationalities and backgrounds that lived in the borough of efforts to create a cohesive, fair and safe society for those residents. Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council stated that they needed to work together and collaboratively to ensure that they maintained the kind of country that they

wanted it to be in the 21st century. There had been a number of incidents recently which were criminal acts and in the first instance people needed to report any incident directly to the police so that they could secure any forensic evidence. He noted there was a cross-party motion later in the meeting to demonstrate the Council's commitment to dealing with this evil.

Councillor Nigel Fletcher asked the Leader of the Council how residents could inform, influence, or get involved in the Council's decision and policy making process as issues arose during the course of the four year term of the Council. Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, responded that a lot of engagement was undertaken with communities in the Borough and at every level they influenced and shaped policies. For example, Council was considering a report on climate change following approaches from the public. Members of the Council could all contribute and represent the concerns raised by residents at their surgeries. Residents could submit questions directly to the Council. He was not aware of any complaints that policies were not being formulated properly.

11 Matters for early debate

The Mayor noted that no requests for matters to be taken early had been received. However, he would be reversing the order for considering Item 15 and 16, taking item 16 first.

12 Changes to Local Council Tax Support Scheme for 2020/21

Having declared an interest the following Councillors left the meeting for the duration of the item: Councillors Olu Babatola, Matt Clare, Denise Hyland, Rajinder James, Sizwe James, Mehboob Khan, Clive Mardner, Dominic Mbang and Jackie Smith

The Mayor advised that the report was considered by Cabinet, just prior to the Council meeting, and it had been agreed to recommend that the Council agree the decisions required. The Mayor invited Councillor Christine Grice, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources to move the recommendations.

Councillor Christine Grice, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources advised that the proposal to increase Council Tax support to 100% for working households was a recommendation identified by the Council's Fairness Commission. The report also outlined methods to make the claim process for Universal Credit easier.

Councillor Matt Hartley, Leader of the Conservative Group stated that the Conservative Group were delighted at the proposed introduction of the 100% Council Tax support scheme, noting that it would also result in a reduction in the Council's use of bailiffs. He congratulated Councillor Grice, as Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, and also the Director of Finance and the Advice and Benefits team for making the proposal achievable.

In closing the debate Councillor Grice noted that it was calculated that it would have a positive impact on 15,000 residents of the Borough.

The Mayor put the matter to the vote and it was unanimously

Resolved –

1. That it be agreed to increase the maximum level of support for all working age claimants to 100%
2. That it be agreed to maintain the existing non-dependant deductions and temporary absence from Great Britain rules as they apply to working age claimants.
3. That it be agreed to make the scheme work better for Universal Credit claimants, specifically by
 - Increasing the disregard towards pension contributions from 50% to 100%.
 - Ignoring Bereavement Support Payments and Universal Credit Transitional Severe Disability Payments within the calculation for council tax support assessments.
 - Aligning the dates for when changes of circumstances are applied from to reflect the same dates as the claimant's monthly assessment period of Universal Credit.
4. That it be agreed to simplifying the claims process by,
 - Making it easier to backdate council tax support for up to six months without the need to explain why the claimant didn't claim earlier (i.e. to remove the good cause provision)
 - Not requiring a new application within six months of a previous claim ending, where the Council has the financial information to confirm entitlement.
5. That it be noted that the gross cost of agreeing to the decisions above is £1.6M to Royal Borough of Greenwich (+ £0.5M to GLA), which is accounted for under the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.

13 Council Tax Base 2020/21

In line with their declaration of financial interest Councillors Matt Clare, Denise Hyland, Rajinder James, Sizwe James, Clive Mardner, Dominic Mbang and Jackie Smith were not in attendance for the duration of the item. Councillors Norman Adams and Olu Babatola, were also not in attendance for the duration of this item.

The Mayor advised that the report was considered by Cabinet, just prior to the Council meeting, and it had been agreed to recommend that the Council agree the decisions required. The Mayor invited Councillor Christine Grice, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources to move the recommendations.

Councillor Christine Grice, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources stated that the report demonstrated the Council's effectiveness in terms of increasing the number of homes in the borough, bringing in revenue, but more importantly new homes for residents. She drew attention to the recommendation to increase the charge on empty properties by 200% over the next five years.

Councillor Matt Hartley, Leader of the Conservative Group, welcomed that for another year young care leavers would be exempt from Council Tax.

Councillor Christine Grice formally closed the debate.

In accordance with The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, the Chief Executive called a recorded vote for the proposed amendment and decisions required.

In respect of the decisions required.

Councillors L. Bird, G. Brighty, P. Brooks, A. Cornforth, A. Cousins, C. Davis, S. Drury, J. Fahy, L. Fletcher, D. Gardner, P. Greenwell, C. Grice, M. Hartley, M. Hayes, I. Hawking, J. Hills, M. James, A. Khairah, M. Khan, C. Kirby, C. Lloyd, C. May, S. Merrill, M. Morrow, A. Okereke, L. Perks, D. Scott-McDonald, A. Smith, D. Stanley, R. Tester and D. Thorpe, voted for the recommendations.

No Members voted against the recommendations. No Members abstained from voting on the recommendations.

Resolved -

1. That a council tax base for the whole authority area for 2020/21 of 83,664.91 in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012 be agreed.
2. That an additional council tax base for the Gloucester Circus Garden Square area of the authority for 2020/21 of 95.68 be agreed
3. That a continuance in 2020/21 of the Council Tax discount of 0% on Class A & Class B dwellings (second homes) and Class C & D dwellings (empty homes) be agreed.
4. That a continuance of a Council Tax premium of 100% in 2020/21 in respect of Long Term Empty dwellings for dwellings empty for up to 5 years be agreed.
5. That a Council Tax premium of 200% in 2020/21 in respect of Long Term empty dwellings, for dwellings empty longer than 5 years be agreed.
6. That a continuance in 2020/21 of the Council Tax discount of 100% in respect of Royal Borough of Greenwich resident care leavers, aged under 25, in line with the decision of Council in March 2017 be agreed.
7. That it be noted that the proposed changes to the Local Council Tax Support Scheme recommended by Cabinet for Council earlier on the agenda are included in the tax base calculations.
8. That the council tax base relevant to the Southern Region of the Environment Agency for flood defence levy apportionment purposes in 2020/21 is 8,301.31 be noted.
9. That it be noted that the council tax base relevant to the Thames Region of the Environment Agency for flood defence levy apportionment purposes in 2020/21 is 75,363.60.

14 Carbon Neutral Plan Evidence Base

The Mayor advised that the report was considered by Cabinet, just prior to the Council meeting, and it had been agreed to recommend that the Council agree the decisions required. The Mayor invited the Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport to formally move the recommendations.

Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport advised that the proposal arose from listening to the residents and would see the Royal Borough of Greenwich join with over 26 other local authorities who had declared a climate emergency. The Council's proposed target went beyond that of the Mayor of London or the Government's target. The Council's ambitious target to reach net zero carbon emissions within the next 20 years would only be achievable by a combination of strategies and activities, including encouraging walking and cycling, variable parking charges and parking zones to discourage car use, to the use of more LED street lights. The Council would not be able to achieve this aim in isolation and would need the borough's communities, businesses and partners to work alongside the Council so that they could make a difference and truly bring down carbon emissions to carbon neutral by 2030.

Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, stated that although just one of the contributors to this complex problem the Council still had a key role to play. He advised that they were rapidly creating more electric vehicle charging points and increasing buildings standards resulting in an average of 39% better energy efficiency than building regulation compliant buildings. The Council's corporate buildings and vehicle fleet contributed just 5% of the borough's total emissions while their housing stock added a further 20% percent. To have a meaningful impact it was vital to work with communities, businesses and partners across the borough, through the establishment of the Climate Emergency Network, to bring people together to engage in the debate and develop a set of shared actions to be taken.

Councillor Thorpe said that the proposal before Members was the evidence base and the policy proposal need to be developed over the next few months. Achieving carbon neutrality by 2030 would not be easy, requiring a physical change, such as the eradication of all gas boilers from Council homes, to changes in behaviour. There would be a financial context and the Council would face massive challenges in aiming to get all the Council housing stock and buildings to achieve a grade C energy performance, which it was estimated could cost £85 million. Private properties requiring changes would also face costs, so there was a need to consider and debate the choices in the coming weeks and months and be honest about the financial challenges.

Councillor Thorpe noted that there would be challenges in winning the hearts and minds of all residents and communities, noting that often an objection to housing development was the loss of parking, but issues of parking could not continue if they wanted a carbon neutral target. Residents and communities needed to understand that the climate crisis meant patterns

of behaviour needed to change. The evidence base information showed that Greenwich would not be able to deliver without the help and support from Government and the wider community.

Councillor Matt Clare, opposition spokesperson for the environment, welcomed the report and concurred that the Council would face challenges in implementing the target. Becoming carbon neutral was going to hurt, through financial challenges and competing priorities and perceived loss of freedom for some of their residents. Councillor Clare said that the Conservative Group believed that any proposal must pass five rigorous assessment tests, which were intended to support not frustrate the process;

- The Council must prioritise the reduction of its own emissions; they must ensure they addressed the areas under their control.
- Encourage the private sector to contribute; this could not be achieved through the Borough's tax payers alone.
- Seize upon every external source of funding;
- Create a cross-party working group formed of Councillors, residents associations, officers and groups such as Extinction Rebellion; the Council must build robust funding bids team to win the funding bids to bring green infrastructure to the Borough;
- Work in partnership with other Boroughs.

Councillor Matt Hartley, Leader of the Conservative Group, reiterated the importance of the evidence base report and the complexity of the challenge. He hoped consideration would be given to the five tests outlined by Councillor Clare. He noted that the Leader of the Council had highlighted that the cost of reaching the target was large and that it was something Greenwich could not deal with alone.

Councillor Charlie Davis felt that it was important that the Council work to achieve this ambitious target and that it was important to look at what the Council was itself doing. He noted that the Council would face difficult choices, which would need full consideration and evaluation such as the Council's commitment to the preservation of green space, whilst achieving its social housing provision aims to tackle the housing crisis.

Councillor David Gardner, Cabinet Member for Public Realm, felt that it was important to accept that various Councils had different approaches to the matter, with a number seeking net zero in terms of their own operations only. He concurred that the first step was to look at their own operations. He welcomed the cross-party support and accepted that there would be challenges in bringing the public with them, as well as difficult financial challenges and choices, however, this was a priority which they and their

partners needed to achieve. There was a need for Government leadership, policy and funding as well if all authorities were to achieve their carbon reduction targets. Progress was being made in schools, healthy streets programme was a great start but there was still a long way to go. They had to continue with their high level of ambition to make sure that they inspired local people.

Councillor Dominic Mbang highlighted that an area to be investigated and promoted further in order to help was increased use of solar energy. He noted that Germany was making greater use of it and was on target to achieve 80% reliant use on solar energy by 2050. He highlighted the benefits of using solar energy. He suggested that the Council needed to encourage businesses, private organisations and individuals to consider its use.

Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald formally closed the debate.

The Mayor put the matter to the vote and it was unanimously

Resolved -

1. That it be noted that the Carbon Neutral Plan Evidence Base produced in response to the Climate Emergency Declaration passed by Full Council in June 2019;
2. That it be noted that the Greenwich Carbon Neutral Plan will be brought to Full Council for approval in autumn 2020.

15. Motion “Stepping up action on litter and flytipping in the Royal Borough of Greenwich”

In moving the motion Councillor Pat Greenwell commented on the increase in littering and flytipping. She noted the work of community groups engaged in litter picking and felt that the Council should do more to encourage communities and schools to join in regular litter picking, and that cafes and shops should be encouraged to take ownership of the pavement and keep them clean and free from litter.

Councillor Matt Clare, formally seconded the motion, reserving his right to speak.

Councillor Pat Greenwell stated that she accepted the proposed amendment to the motion.

Councillor David Gardner, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Public Realm, as mover of the amendment, thanked Councillor Greenwell for bringing the motion to Council. He acknowledged the work of the Council's street cleaners. He agreed there was a need to do more to stop people littering in the first place. He praised the environmental champions in the Borough and noted that the junior environmental champions were taking off as well.

Councillor Matt Hartley, Leader of the Conservative Group, suggested it was an issue which had a tremendous impact and needed to be tackled. He congratulated the environmental champions on their work but felt that the Council needed to do a better job of engaging with its citizens.

As the seconder of the amendment, Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Community Safety, addressed the Council. She commended Councillor Greenwell for raising the motion and her personal work in supporting litter picking initiatives adding that note should also be made of the excellent work in this area undertaken by Councillor Maureen O'Mara who had initiated the environmental champion's scheme.

Councillor David Gardner formally closed the debate.

The Mayor put the amended motion to the vote and it was unanimously –

Resolved –

That Council acknowledges that levels of litter and fly tipping in our borough, while in line with UK urban averages, are still at unacceptable levels.

That Council, however, welcomes the reduction in fly-tipping in Greenwich and the tremendous efforts of our street services staff working in all weathers and often unsocial hours to keep our public realm as pristine as possible. Further, we salute the efforts of our volunteer environmental champions and the new junior environmental champions in our schools working with community groups, friends of parks groups and others to keep Greenwich green and clean.

Litter is unsightly, a health hazard both in terms of immediate hygiene as well as the harmful environmental impact of plastics and other non-organic materials on plants and fauna. Litter and fly tipping divert scarce council resources from priority areas.

That Council resolves to;

- Step up action to see those littering and fly tipping fined.
- Involve all schools in the borough in the Junior Environmental Champions' Programme to conduct litter picks and make use of the full range of tools available to them to deter littering and encourage care for our local environment
- Work with local businesses to ensure that every tool possible is utilised to minimise littering and fly tipping - including but not limited to:
 1. wall mounted ashtrays on food and drink outlets
 2. voluntary clean ups of areas outside shops, food and drink outlets
 3. the ability for businesses and individuals to notify the council of businesses and individuals who are fly tipping or leaving waste out overnight.
 4. continue to support collaborative initiatives such as Love Woolwich and Love Plumstead involving local business, the council and voluntary groups to reduce waste, littering and detritus and improve our town centres and High Streets.
- To continue to support our environment and junior environment champions throughout the year and to raise the profile of the British Spring Clean week across the Borough.
- Supports the launch of the Adopt a Place scheme to encourage local residents to care for their local street or estate which could include planting, wilding and litter-picks.

16. Motion - "Standing together against anti-semitism and racism in all its forms"

Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, moved the motion saying that the recent anti-Semitic and racist graffiti in the Borough had been perpetuated by a minority but emphasised that their one message of hate had generated many more messages of kindness. This was a reaction that they should all welcome and they should support the coming together of their citizens when something horrible happened in their Borough. He recalled the work of the former Leader of the Council, Councillor Denise Hyland, against the far right and their desire to march through the Borough, following the tragic death of Lee Rigby.

Councillor Thorpe said that history has shown this has happened before and they had to have a collective resolve to say never again, to say that it was something that they were not going to tolerate or accept. It was up to all of them to resolve to tackle not just antisemitism but hate in whatever way it manifested itself.

Councillor Matt Hartley, Leader of the Conservative Group, seconded the motion stating that he and every member of the Conservative Group agreed that there was no place for anti-Semitism or racism of any kind in the Royal Borough of Greenwich. The only people who were not welcome in the Borough were the vile racists behind the incidents. He said these were shocking acts and the motion reflected a correct response to incidents like this, not only in words but action as the Council and its officers immediately mobilised to clear the graffiti, to reassure its communities and to redouble its efforts to commemorate Holocaust Memorial Day. He extended thanks to all the staff involved in dealing with these incidents and the Leader of the Council for his interaction and leadership in quickly organising Members collective response. He also thanked everyone, inside and outside of the Council Chamber, who helped with these efforts and he was pleased to see that time and time again, whether after terror attacks or hate crimes in their communities, or the actions of far right agitators, all attempts to divide the Borough were doomed to fail. Councillors and citizens of this Borough would not tolerate antisemitism nor racism in any of its forms and the perpetrators of the awful acts had to be brought to justice.

Councillor Chris Lloyd concurred with the comments of the Leaders of the Labour Group and Conservative Group on the dangers of such behaviour going unchallenged. He noted that this behaviour had not arisen since the Brexit debate but was something experienced by communities across the world for decades and all communities had to be vigilant and unite and stand up to ugly behaviour wherever it reared its head. He echoed the comment of Councillor Thorpe, that one act of hatred had inspired many acts of unity and togetherness in their communities.

The Mayor put the Motion to the vote and it was unanimously –

Resolved –

That Council Agreed to take the motion as an item of urgent business.

That At its meeting in January 2019 the Full Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich unanimously passed a motion to adopt the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism - in

response to growing concerns around the rise of antisemitism in the UK, and in recognition of our community's long-standing united stance against racism in all its forms.

In recent weeks our borough has had a stark, and shocking, reminder of the continuation of anti-Semitic sentiment amongst a small minority, with the painting of anti-Semitic and racist graffiti at Blackheath Standard, Charlton and East Greenwich. This Council unequivocally condemns these actions, and reiterates that we are united in our rejection of any acts of hate and prejudice that seek to divide our communities.

That Council notes that the response of the Royal Borough of Greenwich and our community to this graffiti has been not just words - showing important solidarity as well as sorrow that this has happened - but also actions. Immediate action was taken to remove the graffiti in question, and representatives from across the borough attended the Holocaust Memorial Day service at the Town Hall - coming together as we always have, and always will, to reject anti-semitism and racism in all its forms.

That Council notes that the rise in antisemitism mirrors a national rise in public acts of racism, islamophobia, homophobia and misogyny, and reiterates its determination to oppose and challenge these acts using every means available to us.

That Council is united in standing together with our Jewish citizens to make clear that the Royal Borough is their home and their community, and that anti-semitism and hatred of any kind has no place in our borough.

The meeting closed at 10:05 pm

Chair

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

I Question from Karin Tearle, SE10, to Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council

With reference to the letter sent by Councillor Danny Thorpe on the 18th October 2019 to Sadiq Khan was there a response to the valid points made therein? And why, only a few weeks later, was planning for the Silvertown Tunnel approved?

Reply -

I thank Karin Tearle for her question.

As you suggest, I wrote to the Mayor of London, asking him to pause work on the Silvertown Tunnel, whilst a full review of alternative options to reduce congestion and pollution around the Blackwall Tunnel was undertaken.

The Mayor wrote back on 21st November, explaining the range of road-user charging, public transport and other options appraised to identify the best solution for issues around Blackwall Tunnel. He reiterated his view that the Silvertown tunnel is the best option to address significant existing disruption, congestion and associated environmental impacts in the area. His response also highlighted the range of modelling, monitoring and mitigation requirements placed on Transport for London in the Development Consent Order that allows it to develop the Tunnel.

Unfortunately, as you say, Transport for London did complete its contract with the Riverlinx consortium, to build the Silvertown Tunnel.

No legal avenue exists to oppose the Tunnel at this stage. Nevertheless, the Royal Borough will continue to be a leading voice in calling for Transport for London to minimise any potential negative impacts of the Silvertown Tunnel.

Supplementary Question (Victoria Rance) -

Can you make it clear publicly whether you are against this project or in favour if it?

Reply -

I sent the letter on behalf of the Labour Group which restated our position that we were seeking a pause and review of the tunnel. It is not individual positions that are important, I gave the views on behalf of my colleagues and the people I was elected to represent.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

2 Question from Karin Tearle, SE10, to Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council

Sadiq Khan has declared a climate emergency, as has Greenwich Council. I therefore ask why both parties cannot work together to overturn the flawed Silvertown Tunnel decision and find alternative solutions?

Reply -

I thank Karin Tearle for her question.

Building on my answer to your previous question: I am disappointed that the Mayor of London did not agree to my request to pause work on the Silvertown Tunnel – particularly in the light of our respective Climate Emergency declarations.

As I have said, the Royal Borough will continue to be a leading voice in calling on Transport for London to minimise any potential negative impacts of the Silvertown Tunnel.

Furthermore, we are working closely with the Mayor of London on a range of projects that will help address the Climate Emergency -

- Woolwich to Greenwich Walking and Cycleway Improvements – earlier this month (January 2020) TfL launched a public consultation on the first phase of their proposals to transform streets in south-east London between Greenwich and Woolwich. The public consultation runs until 16th February 2020. More information on the proposals, details of public drop-in events and the consultation questionnaire can be found here - <https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/cycling/greenwich-to-woolwich/>
- An extension of the DLR and a bus rapid transit service to support the growth of Thamesmead – Thamesmead is currently served by a small number of bus routes and it is essential that we work towards improving the public transport connectivity of this part of the borough to unlock its future potential for residents. The Council is currently in discussion with colleagues from TfL about how an extension of the

DLR and/or a rapid bus transit service could make vital steps towards achieving this.

- Expansion of the Ultra Low Emission Zone – in April 2019 the Mayor of London launched the world’s first Ultra Low Emission Zone and six months on data has indicated that the scheme is having a significant impact. There has been a large reduction in the number of older, more polluting, non-compliant vehicles detected in the zone: a reduction of 40,200 vehicles on average per day, equating to a 65% reduction. From 25th October 2021 the ULEZ boundary will be extended to create a single larger zone bounded by the North and South Circular Roads and we look forward to the huge impact that this will have on cleaning up the air in our borough, and encouraging residents to walk, cycle and use public transport as they move around the borough.

Supplementary Question (Victoria Rance) -

Are you aware that the Ultra Low Emission Zone addresses air quality but not CO2 which is what concerns the climate emergency?

Reply -

I am aware of what the ULEZ does. The climate emergency is not just about CO2 emissions but also about how we live. When we are debating the carbon neutral plan it will be seen that the biggest single source of emissions is domestic home emissions. Talking to people about the individual lifestyle changes that are required is going to be difficult but I hope we can talk and find a way that we can deal with things individually and collectively.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

3 Question from Debbie Boardman, SE10, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

Could the Council address traffic problems in Burney Street by introducing a road closure there?

Like Park Vista which has just been closed, the traffic from a Burney Streets closure could be easily diverted onto the High Road and would have no impact on the volume of traffic using the 'Hyde's and vales', if anything it might reduce this traffic as it makes the 'rat run' slightly less appealing.

Unlike the Hyde's and Vales which have consistently had a high volume of traffic which has increased with the popularity of Greenwich and for other reasons, Burney Street in contrast has seen a huge increase in the volume of its traffic as a result of the Council's decision to close Gloucester Circus, and by not resolving the compound effect of that traffic that is now on Burney Street. This is extremely unfair. The Council should reopen the roads it has closed if it now wants to address the problem as a wider scheme, or close Burney Street and then deal with the vertical roads after.

Like Park Vista which has just been closed Burney Street is extremely dangerous as it is a wide street and the cars are generally driving in the same direction, and at rush hour they simply speed down the road. A van almost knocked over my 12 year old son who was helping me to unload my shopping a few weeks ago, and I have video footage of the speed at which they drive. There are many young children living on Burney Street and the traffic races down it as if it was a motorway. It is highly polluting and the drivers are extremely rude and have verbally abused residents on numerous occasions.

It is understood that the Council's suggestions for the Hyde's and Vales are upsetting a lot of residents. If residents are not able to have easy access out of Greenwich, then it creates a genuine dilemma which could take a while to consider and resolve. We, on Burney Street cannot wait any longer. The closure of the roads above us by the Council has made our road intolerable and very dangerous. If Park Vista can be closed for these reasons then we

feel that we should also be able to, and as it is no longer going to impact the wider traffic problem and could be done immediately on a trial basis can you please do this.

Reply -

I thank Debbie Boardman for her question.

The Council recognises the issues created by high volumes of through traffic using the residential roads in West Greenwich, including Burney Street. It is also evident that tackling such an issue on a single road, such as Gloucester Circus, merely displaces the issue onto adjacent roads. Consequently in November and December 2019 the Council undertook a public engagement exercise regarding options for an experimental area-wide traffic management scheme in West Greenwich, including Burney Street. The feedback to this engagement will now be analysed before any decision on how to proceed is taken. The Council does not intend to deliver measures on individual streets in the area at this time, as this could undermine the recent engagement exercise and implementation of an area-wide scheme.

The Council had received complaints that vehicles turning into Park Vista from Maze Hill - contravening the no entry restriction - had become more frequent.

The Metropolitan Police attended the location to conduct some enforcement on vehicles not complying with the no entry and advised that a more long term solution should be considered.

The measures taken on Park Vista are in response to vehicles frequently driving the wrong way down the one-way / no entry section of the road, rather than concerns relating to traffic volumes or speeds. Additionally in this instance there are no adjacent residential roads for this traffic to displace to.

The introduction of an individual one-way movement in Burney Street does not align with the Council's aspirations of providing a holistic solution.

Dependent on analysis of the extensive feedback to engagement the Council intends to implement a trial traffic management scheme in the West Greenwich area by summer.

Supplementary Question -

Could Burney Street be prioritised?

Reply -

I can assure you that we haven't forgotten about Burney Street and are looking closely at it but I can't guarantee it can be given priority.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

4 Question from Simon Pirani, SE18, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

In June 2019 the Council pledged to bring its Carbon Neutral Plan to full Council for approval by January 2020 at the latest. I understand from Councillor Danny Thorpe (his email to me, 11 December) that only “the first stage” of the plan, the Evidence Base, will be presented to Cabinet in January. When is the revised date for the complete Plan to go to the full Council? Is this delay not at odds with both the letter, and the spirit, of the climate emergency declaration?

Reply –

I thank Simon Pirani for his question.

The ‘*Development of the Carbon Neutral Plan: The Evidence Base*’ Report is now available on the Council’s [website](#). It details the analysis and modelling that has been undertaken to:

- Assess RBG’s current policies against best practice;
- Identify the main emissions sources in Royal Greenwich;
- Develop a ‘maximum ambition’ pathway towards carbon neutrality in 2030; and
- Appraise the options and recommend ways forward.

The level of detail we now understand the borough’s current and future emissions is unprecedented. The Council will build on this understanding in preparing the Greenwich Carbon Neutral Plan.

We aim to bring back the plan to the Full Council in Autumn 2020, after a period of discussion with our partners, businesses and communities across the Royal Borough. We cannot do this alone: we will require greater powers and more funding to deliver on our climate neutral ambition.

This is the only way a robust plan, fit to deliver our unparalleled 2030 carbon neutral ambition will be delivered.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5 Question from Simon Pirani, SE18, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

In the Council's resolution on the climate emergency (June 2019), a pledge was made to use the Council's lobbying power to campaign at local, London-wide and national level to draw attention to climate change and bring about change at all levels of government. How is the Council using this lobbying power in connection with the Silvertown Tunnel, a development that is clearly incompatible with a climate emergency declaration?

Reply -

I thank Simon Pirani for his question.

As I described in my previous responses, the Labour Group wrote directly to the Mayor of London, asking him to pause work on the Silvertown Tunnel. We lobbied him to undertake a full review of the alternative options to reduce congestion and pollution around the Blackwall Tunnel and approach roads.

Supplementary Question (Victoria Rance) -

Can the Council put forward a motion to propose the project should be stopped, pass it and forward it to the Mayor?

Reply (Councillor Danny Thorpe) -

I am not sure that the Council passing a motion after a contract has been awarded would change anything. The Council will be working with the Mayor and Transport for London to discuss and avoid any measures that will cause issues in this Borough.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

6 Question from Amorel Kennedy, SE18, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

In June 2019 the Council pledged to produce a Greenwich Climate Emergency Annual Report every January between now and 2030 detailing its progress against the Greenwich Carbon Neutral Plan to enable members, residents and other local stakeholders to hold the Council to account for delivery of this pledge. Is the January 2020 report available? If not, why not?

Reply -

I thank Amorel Kennedy for her question.

The 'Development of the Carbon Neutral Plan: The Evidence Base' Report is now available on the Council's [website](#). It details the analysis and modelling that has been undertaken to inform the Carbon Neutral Plan's development.

The next stage is to develop a full Greenwich Carbon Neutral Plan. We will report progress against the Plan annually following its adoption later in 2020.

Supplementary Question -

Can the Council reassure Members, residents and other local stakeholders that the carbon neutral plan will be adopted this autumn, given that it was pledged seven months ago that the plan itself and not an evidence base report would come to this meeting of Council?

Reply -

I can guarantee that it will be done this year. It took a little bit longer due to the elements of research and consultation. I can guarantee that we will be consulting with the public and stakeholders and that the Council is very much committed to the carbon neutral plan.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

7 Question from Amorel Kennedy, SE18, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

In June 2019 the Council pledged to update the Action Plan of the Greener Greenwich Strategy by December 2019 and to publish an Annual Report outlining progress made against the relevant actions. When will the Council be making this annual report available to the public?

Reply –

I thank Amorel Kennedy for her question.

As I explained in answer to your previous question, the Evidence Base report detailing the analysis and modelling to inform the Carbon Neutral Plan's development has now been published.

This provides a very clear picture of the Royal Borough's progress on the climate change issues covered by the Greener Greenwich Strategy

The next stage is to develop a forward-thinking Greenwich Carbon Neutral Plan. The Carbon Neutral Plan will change our approach to many of the issues covered by the Greener Greenwich Strategy.

Once the strategy is updated and expanded to reflect those changes, we will report annually on the Greener Greenwich Action Plan, as set out in the motion referred to.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

8 Question from Charalampos Nikitakis, SE8, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

I would like to bring to the Council's attention the insufficient train services connecting Greenwich and Central London (e.g. Cannon Street).

In my daily commute to the City, I find it very hard to board the morning trains and when I do, the carriages are extremely packed and crowded making the commute very unpleasant. I've noticed that the services are very infrequent particularly during rush hour. For instance, there are no trains to Cannon street between 08:05 and around 08:30 and this big gap results in overcrowded trains and many commuters being unable to board. The situation has been getting worse due to the increased house building activity in the area and the resulting massive growth (43%) in passenger numbers. It is important that this increase in local population is urgently matched by increased public transport infrastructure spending.

Can the Council influence the train company to urgently add more trains especially during rush hour?

Reply -

I thank Charalampos Nikitakis for his question.

The Royal Borough continually lobbies transport operators for improved reliability and the additional capacity required to match growth in the borough.

One example of how we do this is the new 335 bus route. It improves access for residents to the Jubilee Line at North Greenwich and mainline services at Kidbrooke.

Unfortunately, much of the growth experienced in the borough is reliant on the opening of the Elizabeth Line to provide much needed capacity and improved connectivity to Central London. Once the Elizabeth Line is

operational, it will help to relieve existing mainline services. Nevertheless, we will continue to lobby operators as required.

Transport providers will be attending the Regeneration, Transport and Culture Scrutiny Panel on 18 March. You are very welcome to attend this meeting.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

9 Question from Stella Bye, SE10, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

The Council helpfully responded to the Public Questions (no. 31 and 32 on [26 June 2019](#)) and the Supplemental Questions (12th August 2019) raised by the residents of the West Greenwich Liveable Neighbourhood Scheme Area by stating your commitment to addressing safety and health concerns caused by through traffic on our streets and implementing a traffic management scheme for the West Greenwich area.

Since then, the Council held engagement events seeking views on the trial implementation of one of two options to tame rat racing through our streets. At these events, consultees were informed that option 1 could be implemented as early as January 2020 or, if option 2 were determined to be more suitable, by March 2020. Consultees were also told that one of the two schemes would be implemented as a do nothing option was not a feasible outcome for the Council due to safety concerns, particularly on Crooms Hill. We were therefore dismayed to learn recently that the Council's plans to implement a trial traffic management scheme will be delayed until Summer 2020.

Please can the Council reaffirm the commitments you previously made to West Greenwich Residents, specifically:

- The Council remains committed to addressing the concerns caused by rat racing traffic in the West Greenwich Liveable Neighbourhood Area and therefore a do nothing option is ruled out;
- The Council remains committed to implementing a trial of either option 1 or 2 as consulted upon during the first half of 2020 due to the ongoing safety concerns in West Greenwich, particularly on Crooms Hill which has multiple pedestrian access points for Greenwich Park, a busy church and a large girls school,
- In analysing consultation responses, the Council will still take into account the benefit and impact of the scheme relative to the respondent's street of residence, i.e. those less affected will have less influence on a final decision.

Reply –

I thank Stella Bye for her question.

The Council remains committed to delivering a holistic area wide traffic reduction scheme within the West Greenwich area and this has already been prioritised and incorporated into the Council's works programme due to its linkage to the Greenwich Town Centre Liveable Neighbourhood project

The feedback to the Council's engagement in November/December is now being analysed before any decision on how to proceed is taken. Due to the number, depth and breadth of responses this analysis is an extensive process, hence causing some extension of the originally intended timeframe.

Subject to a decision to proceed with a trial scheme the current estimate is for implementation in summer. Nevertheless, we recognise the issues that many residents are experiencing and will endeavour to deliver as soon as reasonably possible, bearing in mind the competing priorities the Council faces.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

10 Question from Stella Bye, SE10, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

In its response of 12th August 2019 to Supplementary Question 1 to Public Questions 31 and 32 ([June 2019 Council Meeting](#)), the Council clarified that "the convention in traffic management issues is that proposals need to take account of other measures that precede their implementation."

There are many events and investments planned in the Greenwich Council area now and in the coming years. These include:

- the current temporary traffic alterations in Greenwich Town Centre (replacement of pedestrian crossings and signalling);
- the anticipated Town Centre Liveable Neighbourhood;
- the upcoming temporary disruptions of Euro 2020 Fan Zone;
- the possibility of permanent closure of Greenwich Park to traffic (page 9 of Royal Parks consultation document);
- the start of construction of Silvertown Tunnel this year;
- the additional tourist and residents growth anticipated as a result of the newly announced £10.5m investment in Greenwich Park and the number of developments throughout the Greenwich Council area (17% increase in population by 2026).

All of the above will have an impact on traffic movements throughout the Council area. Given that the convention for traffic management decisions is essentially a first-come-first-served rule, there is an urgency for the West Greenwich Liveable Neighbourhood trial of options 1 or 2 to be implemented without delay.

The news of a delay to early Summer 2020 from the first quarter of the year suggests other initiatives such as the Euro 2020 Fan Zone may have been given priority to the detriment of the health and safety of West Greenwich residents, jeopardising the improvements which will be gained by the implementation of the West Greenwich traffic management trial.

What is the Council's plans for implementing the West Greenwich Liveable Neighbourhood Traffic Trial, how will it ensure this scheme is incorporated and prioritised into the Council's vast repertoire of programmed works to ensure the trial will be implemented in early Summer 2020 if not sooner, and how will the Council meet its obligations to manage safety and pollution risks to West Greenwich residents, school children and users of Greenwich Park due to continued exposure to the high volume of traffic on residential streets such as Crooms Hill in the interim?

Reply -

I thank Stella Bye for her question.

Please see response to Question 9.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

11 Question from Maria Blanca Fernandez Todea, SE7, to Councillor Christine Grice, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

At a meeting in [June 2019](#) the Council resolved to join other local authorities and declare a 'Climate Emergency'. As a Borough resident I was delighted by this declaration. I felt encouraged by the pledges made on the day, which to me signalled the commitment of the Council to bringing about changes that will contribute to the reduction of Global Warming.

I was particularly interested in the pledge to ensure that sustainability is a central part of the Council's Procurement Strategy. What has the Council done to ensure that sustainability is central to its Procurement strategy, as it decided in June 2019?

There is a section of the Council's website dedicated to Climate Emergency (<https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/climateemergency>) but disappointingly none of the links work and I could not find the information I was looking for.

Reply -

I thank Maria Blanca Fernandez Todea for her question.

The new Procurement Strategy agreed by Cabinet in October 2019 outlines the Council's awareness and desire to use its purchasing power to engage in sustainable and ethical procurement. Furthermore, the core principles and outcomes of sustainable procurement (e.g. environmental, social and economic concerns) are also covered in the social value policy which was approved at the same time.

As part of our approach to deliver on both the procurement strategy and social value policy, we have identified environmental, social and economic benefits which are aligned to the corporate themes and are to be targeted in a procurement exercise. This will include stating sustainability factors as a core requirement in the specification and applying relevant weightings.

Supplementary Question -

As part of the specific actions that the Council will take, will it be requiring contractors to adopt ISO 14,000 Standards to address the climate emergency?

Reply -

I will look into this and write to you.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

12 Question from Maria Freeman, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

[Last September](#) the Community Led Regeneration Report was presented to the Regeneration, Transport and Culture Scrutiny Panel. While it is understood that the elections may have interrupted progress at the end of last year, due to purdah etc, can the Council confirm when there will be a response published to this Review, with an action plan?

Reply -

I thank Maria Freeman for her question.

I can confirm that a report is currently being prepared with the intention of proceeding to a future Cabinet.

Supplementary Question -

Representatives of the community groups and officers and Councillors worked really hard on developing the report and a timescale would be appreciated?

Reply -

I can assure you it's going to be published as soon as possible.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

13 Question from Maria Freeman, SE18, to Councillor Miranda Williams, Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure and Third Sector

In [October 2019](#), in a response to a Public Question, there was a reference to the fact that the Council had "revised our trees policy". Can the Council highlight where this revised policy is published online, and clarify what the consultation procedures are in relation to tree preservation.

Reply -

I thank Maria Freeman for her question.

The Council's Street Tree Policy, which sets out the Council's broad approach to how it manages the Royal Borough's street trees, has remained in place for a number of years. The policy has been included and discussed in reports to recent Highways Committee meetings where matters related to street trees have been agenda items.

We are amending the policy to ensure a consistent approach to the Royal Borough's trees, with street trees, trees in parks and open spaces and on Council estates all subject to the same approval process for removals.

The new process requires the lead Cabinet Member to approve the most high profile works, along with greater public engagement, specifically where the essential removal of large mature trees are required. Where possible, local residents in the immediate area will be advised in advance following the Cabinet Member's approval unless, for reasons such as safety, the works required are urgent.

This includes signage on trees at risk of removal, enabling residents to understand why a tree has been identified for removal, as well as the Council's plans to replace the tree. The signage will include QR codes connecting to the Council's website, a feature which will be available from next week.

Supplementary Question -

Could you make it clear where the link to the revised tree policy can be found online? What is a QR code on a tree going to be, a link to the policy, the reason why the tree is being removed and when it would be replaced?; would a replacement be part of the 2022 trees or a separate tree?

Reply -

The tree policy is going to be published on the website next week.

The QR code will provide more information than could be presented on an A4 piece of paper, which would be prone to weather damage. It could provide information on why the tree is being felled and whether it will be replaced or if a tree would be replanted in its place somewhere else. The 2022 trees include replacements.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

14 Question from Angela Fletcher, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

Which Councillors visited the Portrait of Plumstead / Positive Plans for Plumstead exhibition which ran at Plumstead temporary library until 14th January 2020?

Reply -

I thank Angela Fletcher for her question.

All local Councillors and stakeholders were invited to the Festive Showcase on 17th December 2019 at Plumstead Library and the showcase was exhibited until 14th January 2020. The exhibition was also promoted locally, via traders and extensively online by RBG.

The exhibition was displayed in an open forum and as such the Council did not request attendees names or contact details.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

15 Question from Angela Fletcher, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

What feedback and challenges have Councillors provided to the Make:Good team, with ideas for further improvements to Plumstead High Street?

Reply -

I thank Angela Fletcher for her question.

Make:Good are currently evaluating feedback from both Councillors and attendees of the showcase which ended on 14th January. Make:Good will provide a report in due course summarising attendees feedback and suggestions.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

16 Question from Sadie Lawes-Wickwar, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

How can the Council justify its continued low spend on our parks and green spaces when there remains millions of pounds of unspent CIL and S106 income?

Reply -

I thank Sadie Lawes-Wickwar for her question.

The Royal Borough considers priorities in order to take a balanced view how best to use the planning obligations it receives. It would not be prudent to simply spend all funds as and when they are received. CIL/S106 will only contribute a small element of the overall infrastructure requirements and costs.

Service areas keep the amounts held in the Section 106 account under review, and prioritise spend in accordance with their plans. Parks and Open Spaces are developing proposals for how best to use the available money, and will draw funds down as necessary to deliver these plans.

Any unspent CIL funds are committed to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which sets the local priorities and will guide spending decisions. The IDP is currently being updated, which will be part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan. Unspent CIL is currently being held by the Royal Borough to underwrite the outstanding financial commitment to fit out the Woolwich Crossrail Station - a critical piece of infrastructure for the borough which bring with it a host of benefits. The funding agreement requires that 50% of all residential CIL receipts contribute to the fit out, up to a value of £15m. It is expected that this amount will be achieved by 2022/23. However, if the pace of development is such that insufficient funds have been collected by this time, it may be necessary to cover whatever remains from the Strategic CIL pot. It is prudent therefore to retain the CIL collected at this time.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

17 Question from Jeremy Phipps, SE10, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

At the recent West Greenwich Liveable Neighbourhood Engagement events, we were advised that the Council would be introducing one of the Traffic Reduction Options proposed by RBG. The Council Officers advised that the current situation cannot be allowed to continue as they have no choice but to implement one of the options to meet their Statutory Duty of Care; we were advised that one of traffic reduction options would be trialled in the first few months of 2020.

Currently there are extensive road works in Greenwich, and taking Greenwich as a whole, with all the changes and closures, such as Ashburnham, Norman Rd and piecemeal changes within West Greenwich, the Hills and Vale is the last remaining pocket that has had no effective road measures to date; as a result we are experiencing even more traffic and this continues to increase. We are also the only residential roads that have gone through a full area wide consultation over what the Council has confirmed are critical health, safety and pollution issues.

It has also been widely publicised in the press this week that Greenwich will have a rise in population of 17% in the forthcoming years given all the new developments in Greenwich; there will inevitably be a corresponding increase in the use of the Park, local traffic such as deliveries etc. It is therefore critical that RBG get ahead of this and ensure that access to the Park and surrounding residential streets are made safe and no longer used as rat runs.

Please could you advise exactly when one of these traffic reduction options is going to be introduced for the trial period?

Reply –

I thank Jeremy Phipps for his question.

Please see response to Question 9.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

18 Question from Jeremy Phipps, SE10, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

How is the Council working with TfL to improve vehicle access and pedestrian crossing on/off the A2 at the junction of Blackheath Hill and Greenwich High Street as this would ensure better traffic flow for all local road users and complement and help the success of the West Greenwich Liveable Neighbourhood traffic scheme, which will in turn help the council to achieve its aim of improving safety in residential areas? And what are the plans and indicative timescales if known?

Reply –

I thank Jeremy Phipps for his question.

It is assumed that this question relates to the junction of Blackheath Hill and Greenwich South Street, rather than with Greenwich High Road, as this is the junction that TfL consulted on and relates most closely to the West Greenwich traffic reduction area.

The Council is working with both TfL and Lewisham Council to try to improve pedestrian provision and safety at this junction. TfL consulted on proposed improvements in mid-2018 but has decided not to proceed with the scheme as consulted on, as it was felt they were insufficiently beneficial for pedestrians.

Based on recent discussions between the boroughs and TfL, TfL is currently developing a revised design for the junction which would incorporate further improvements for pedestrians.

The Council is lobbying TfL to accelerate the development, approval and implementation of a scheme at this junction, in agreement with both boroughs.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

19 Question from Allan Watkins, SE10, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

Notwithstanding future plans to control rat-running in the area of Greenwich known as “Hills and Vales”, will the Council assure local residents that motor vehicles will be prevented from using the most seriously affected roads as through routes during the entire period of the proposed "Fanzone" event this summer in Greenwich Park?

Reply -

I thank Allan Watkins for his question.

The Council is working with the organisers of the Euro 2020 “Fanzone” to develop an appropriate event management plan that mitigates impact on residents and businesses.

In particular the organisers are using ticketing and other measures to ensure that ticket holders utilise public transport, which will be enhanced where necessary.

The Council are currently commenting on the associated planning application, including a Transport Assessment, prior to its submission to Planning Committee and will continue to work with the organisers to avoid or mitigate impacts on the local area.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

20 Question from Jessica Currie, SE18, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

When will the Council include Heverham Road SE18 in the 30mins free parking to help struggling businesses at that end of Plumstead High Street?

Reply -

I thank Jessica Currie for her question.

There are already bays on Plumstead High Street near Heverham Road which provide 30 minutes free parking, although this is the maximum period and do not allow people to park for longer than 30 minutes. The other parking bays around Plumstead High Street were introduced as part of the Plumstead Central CPZ following consultation and the Pay & Display (P&D) bays, which allow a stay of up to four hours, were shown in that consultation. There are currently no plans to extend P&D beyond those existing roads. The changes to those existing P&D bays to introduce 30 minutes free bays are scheduled to be made this week.

Supplementary Question -

There are no bays on the the north side of the High Street, so is there any possibility of looking at Heverham Road as businesses are reporting 70% drop in profits since all the parking measures came in?

Reply -

I will ask Officers to look at this, and will write to you.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

21 Question from Jessica Currie, SE18, to Councillor David Gardner, Cabinet Member for Public Realm

Wheelie bins left all week on streets are becoming a major issue for people with mobility issues. When will the Council issue a reminder to those properties to keep their bins inside the curtilage of their home? This was done a few years back on Plumstead High Street, was immediately effective and lasted for months.

Reply -

I thank Jessica Currie for her question.

I agree that wheelie bins left out on pavements all week is a real nuisance and a particular hazard for those with limited vision or mobility. All residents should return their bins within the curtilage of their properties.

Our small team of waste advisors help to address areas where bins being left on the pavement after collections are an issue. Once we are made aware of the area by either our frontline staff or residents, we will write to the addresses asking them to ensure that their bins are returned to within their property after collections are made. This is usually an effective way to address this issue, but we can also offer door to door engagement in problematic areas. Please let us know the specific area that is causing concern by emailing waste.advisors@royalgreenwich.gov.uk so that we can assist with sending out letters.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

**22 Question from Shaun Slator, SE18, to Councillor Chris Kirby,
Cabinet Member for Housing**

What new Council housing for the over 55s are being built to replace those proposed to be demolished as part of the new Woolwich leisure centre?

Reply -

I thank Shaun Slator for his question.

At the time of publication a decision is yet to be made.

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

23 Question from Shaun Slator, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

As the long awaited Plumstead Centre is due to open on the 17th of February, what space will be available for hire for community groups to hold meetings?

Reply -

I thank Shaun Slator for his question.

There are a number of rooms that will be available for hire by community groups.

The Centre includes 3 small meeting rooms which can each accommodate table discussions for groups of between 4-10 people. There are also other larger spaces such as the large vault area and the badminton-size hall.

Please feel free to contact the centre direct or go to the website to register your interest -

<https://www.better.org.uk/leisure-centre/london/greenwich/the-plumstead-centre/register-your-interest>

No Supplementary Question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

24 Question from Paul Billington, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

Just after the New Year, it became apparent that at least one willow tree adjacent to the Thames Path along the Greenwich Riverside was cut down, before a planning application decision was made on that site (Application I9/3298/F refers).

This is a much loved and appreciated section of the Thames Path; the willows are unique on the section between Woolwich and Tower Bridge and an important fabric of this particular shoreline. Could a tree preservation order be made to protect the remaining willows on this site, as well as finding out why one was cut down in such a manner?

Reply -

I thank Paul Billington for his question.

The planning application included the need to remove two trees, both of which were overhanging the footpath. One of the trees had failed and therefore needed to be removed, the other was recommended for removal on the basis that it posed a health and safety risk to anyone passing beneath it.

The agents for the developers have confirmed that there will be no further tree removals on the site.

Supplementary Question -

Is it possible to get Tree Protection Orders (TPO) placed on the Willow Trees along the Thames Footpath? Also, could information on how people go about requesting a TPO be clearly published on the Council's website?

Reply -

I don't think it's necessary to seek a TPO on these trees at this time. I will write to you directly setting out what the process would be should you wish to try and pursue this matter.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

25 Question from Paul Billington, SE18, to Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Community Safety

It was hoped that the CCTV enforcement of parking would take place from the end of December 2019 but it has now been pushed back to “by April 2020”. Can the Council confirm that such enforcement measures will commence before the end of April - areas such as the Plumstead Station bus lane desperately need it - and that it will not be pushed back further?

Reply –

I thank Paul Billington for his question.

The introduction of CCTV enforcement has always been dependent on the retendering and implementation of a new back-office system for Parking Services as the provision of the cameras and associated software system to analyse images are an integral part of that tender. The tender process is nearing completion and formal award is expected before the end of January. We still anticipate commencement of CCTV enforcement by April but will finalise the implementation programme with the supplier as soon as the contract is formally awarded.

However, with regard to Plumstead Road bus lane, waiting restrictions are being introduced which will allow enforcement by our officers on the ground in the meantime. The associated notices for these have been advertised and the restrictions are due to go-live imminently.

Supplementary Question -

Will the CCTV enforcement capture vehicles parking on pavements?

Reply –

The CCTV cameras are for capturing moving offences. Enforcement action should be taken in respect of pavement parking and if you send me examples of where this is happening and not being enforced I will take it up with Officers.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

26 Question from Elizabeth Barron, SE18, to Councillor David Gardner, Cabinet Member for Public Realm

Why is there no accessible litter bin near the 51 bus stop at the Slade Ravine ? (Opposite the Five Rivers, direction Welling) There is a bin - a solid metal affair , on Plumstead Common, about three yards from the bus stop - but in order to access it , it is necessary to climb over the metal railing behind the bus stop, deposit one's detritus, then climb back. Such gymnastic feats are beyond the capability of many pedestrians and bus passengers.

The area around the bus stop is consequently afflicted by litter; much of this blows around the road and the Common. Please consider placing a litter bin AT the bus stop as soon as possible.

In addition, the stretch of pavement at the top of Lakedale Road is afflicted by unsightly litter, yet there is no bin in the vicinity. Many van drivers park their vans, eat their 'meal', then throw the wrappings, chicken bones, etc. on to the pavement or over the railings on to the Common. Many pedestrians walking home from the Slade shops, finish eating their boxed meal around there and discard the remains on Lakedale Road.

Please consider very seriously placing a solid litter bin near the top of Lakedale Road. I know that fly tipping is a problem in this area, but a tidier environment might just discourage some of the perpetrators.

Reply -

I thank Elizabeth Barron for her question.

We value feedback from our residents and visitors to help us tackle environmental issues such as litter. We aim to ensure sufficient litter bins are provided borough wide to actively encourage responsible behaviour and to help reduce the amount of litter we have to pick up. We are happy to support your request and will have a bin placed at the bus stop (opposite Ravine Grove and Five Rivers Restaurant. This bin will be monitored and emptied daily.

We will also site a bin at the top of Lakedale Road and this will also be monitored and emptied daily.

No Supplementary Question -

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

27 Question from Dorota Paluch, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

The [Cabinet report of 29th January](#) on the demolition of Troy Court, a council estate for older residents, does not make clear how consultation has been carried out with the affected residents. Can the Council explain why Appendix 5 (Troy Court consultation) to this report has not been published on the grounds of being 'confidential' and will the Council now publish this?

Reply -

I thank Dorota Paluch for her question.

The residents of Troy Court were contacted in January 2019 prior to Cabinet being asked to consider the inclusion of Troy Court in the feasibility work for the new leisure centre. Further engagement was carried out in September 2019. Further contact has been made in advance of this Cabinet paper.

The Appendix has been deemed to be confidential as it sets out some details in respect of programme and next steps that need to be discussed with residents (if Cabinet approve at the meeting earlier this evening) before being made public.

Supplementary Question -

What do you consider meaningful consultation to be, because residents say that they only receive information letters and don't feel that they've been consulted?

Reply -

I consider meaningful consultation to be exactly what we have done.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

28 Question from Dorota Paluch, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

Troy Court is a tight-knit community of council homes for the over 55s in Woolwich, many with health problems. It is located on valuable green space, of which there is a serious lack in Woolwich. Why is the Council proposing to demolish this site and replace it with larger-scale housing development which will no doubt see mostly more unaffordable homes of one and 2 bed flats built which Woolwich doesn't need and the loss of valuable green space?

Reply -

I thank Dorota Paluch for her question.

The Council is proposing to build a new leisure centre and refurbished Tramshed community theatre as part of its efforts to secure the long-term regeneration of Woolwich and provide excellent leisure facilities for local residents in Woolwich. The Council has been working on this scheme for the last 5 years, following agreement at Cabinet in March 2014. Part of being able to do this is by developing some enabling housing. There will be green spaces and new residential units with a mix of market sale properties and Council homes. The new development will provide at least double the number of Council properties and we know that there is a need for a range of different sizes of homes with a genuine need for some one and two bed homes which I am sure you will appreciate can for example facilitate freeing up larger homes.

Supplementary Question -

Why do existing Council homes for elderly people in a successful community need to be demolished? Why can't Troy Court remain as it is and the Council build new homes on the development site?

Reply -

The funding is such that we need the capital receipt from Troy Court. On one hand we need to consider the deliverability of a fantastic new Leisure Centre with all the economic and social community benefits, or we could rehouse the 22 residents of Troy Court, for which we already have the capacity elsewhere. We have considered all the factors and we consider we've made the right decision for the regeneration of the area.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

29 Question from John Edwards, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

Greenwich Labour's 2018 Manifesto states that in the redevelopment of council estates the Council will support the balloting of residents to seek their agreement. The Council is proposing to demolish Troy Court in Woolwich, a council estate of 24 homes for more elderly residents. Will the Council honour its manifesto commitment and commit to balloting the affected residents before it makes any decision to proceed?

Reply -

I thank John Edwards for his question.

The Council will undertake consultation with the residents and undertake housing needs assessments with individuals living in Troy Court. Troy Court is not a housing estate of a scale that warrants a ballot as set out in the Mayor's Guidance on Estate Renewal. The Manifesto refers to such estates.

Of course, it is essential that the consultation is handled sensitively and the Council has good experience of this, as has been the case for residents at Sam Manners House. The project design is at an early stage of what is known as the RIBA stage of development and it is too soon to consult with residents on what the final make up of the scheme will be.

Supplementary Question (Lisa Mannion) -

It is clear Troy Court will be demolished there will be an immediate cessation of lettings, with existing tenants being rehoused; why did you not consult the tenants of Troy Court before you made this decision given the impact this will have to their lives and their future?

Reply -

The decision was made a few hours ago, in Cabinet, which means that the Council is now in a position to undertake consultation.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

30 Question from John Edwards, SE18, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

The Council is proposing to demolish Troy Court in Woolwich, a council estate for the over 55s. A Cabinet report was published on 21st January with a Cabinet decision to be made on 29th January for the demolition of these homes, no further lettings with immediate effect and steps being taken to rehouse the elderly residents, many with health problems, to allow vacant possession of the site. Can the Council be specific as to what consultation it has undertaken with the affected residents, and explain how this has met the requirement of being fair and meaningful?

Reply -

I thank John Edwards for his question.

In respect of 'being fair and meaningful' I am satisfied that the Council is absolutely doing this. Residents were informed ahead of the decision to include Troy Court in feasibility work on the leisure centre in January 2019. Further engagement took place in September 2019 and they will again be contacted before Cabinet. It is absolutely right the Council liaises with tenants however it has to do so in a way that doesn't scaremonger or disrespect their personal circumstances. When and if Cabinet endorse this recommendation, there is a programme of further consultation and individual assessments with residents and their families. It is disappointing that individuals and their circumstances are being used as 'political football' and in doing so not only pre-empting what residents may want but also assuming the Council is not sympathetic in its approach to this.

As I have said the project design is at an early stage of what is known as the RIBA stage of development and it is too soon to consult with residents on what the final make up of the scheme will be.

Supplementary Question (Lisa Mannion) -

Residents are concerned about their homes being demolished and your answer simply refers to information being given to tenants not consultation

with them. The majority of residents have signed a petition against the demolition of their homes because they want to carry on living there, why are you not listening to this?

Reply –

The decision was only made a short time ago in Cabinet and so it is only now that we are in a position to carry out the detailed engagement and consultation with the residents.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

I Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council

The Leader will be aware of the issue highlighted by [853.London](#) regarding the non-availability of council agendas, minutes and decisions dating from before December 2015 on the Council's website, which has been brought about by the switch in platforms from Modern.gov to CMIS. 853 reported the Council's statement in response as saying that "the new system offered better value for money, and residents who wanted to look at the old papers could email the town hall and ask staff to send them the documents."

I understand the legal position is that only four years of documents were required to be migrated - what would be the additional cost of migrating older documents? Is this still technically possible post-switchover? Are there any other ways that older documents can be published in static form more cost-effectively?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

CMIS has been installed following a procurement exercise in line with Council procedures. The new system is much more accessible via mobile devices than mod.gov and we know how important that is.

Legal advice is that we only need to maintain four years of reports, but anyone can request older reports by contact Committee Services directly.

It is still technically possible to migrate older documents to CMIS post switch-over. However, the additional cost of migrating these documents would be in the region of around £10,000 at a time when the Council is facing a £57 m pressure on its budget over four years.

Councillor Hartley's experience when knocking on doors in the recent election may have been completely different to mine – but in the face of his Government's cuts the residents I spoke to were more concerned about us being able to look after their loved ones in later life, empty their bins and

provide high quality social housing than being able to find the Audit & Risk Management Panel minutes from 2009.

If Councillor Hartley wants to prioritise spending £10k on migrating documents beyond the four years we have been advised is our legal duty, he can put this option in his alternative budget next month and we can see what he would cut to pay for this change.

We have, of course, explored other ways of publishing the documents on the website, such as online archive of older documents separate from the new committee system. Whilst this is possible it would mean residents having to search into different places which would not be a user friendly experience. We would also have to host the documents on a separate server so once again there would be additional costs incurred.

The most cost effective process is the option we have gone for which is that older documents can be requested by contacting Corporate Governance and signpost people to how they do this on the website.

Supplementary question -

Can I suggest a cost free, practical solution would be the publication of an index of what reports and decisions are available so that journalists and indeed members of the public know what to ask for, as at the moment people need to contact the Council asking for a report which is very difficult to do when you don't know what you're looking for and it would save a lot of officer time looking for requested information.

Reply -

I am happy to look at the proposal with the IT Department as to whether that's possible.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

2 Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Averil Lekau, Cabinet Member for Adult's Social Care and Health

The Cabinet Member shared progress with the flu vaccination programme running from November to March to me in December, when 86 out of 150 Flu Vouchers issued to staff in Health and Adult Services (57%) had been redeemed. Can she update with progress since?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

By way of my response, the following information and statistics provide an update on the outcomes of this year's Flu vaccination programme for Adult social care staff. I have also included some data regarding the wider council staff vaccination programme for completeness.

- The staff Flu vaccination programme began in November 2019 and will end in March 2020
- All council staff are able to obtain a Flu Vaccination voucher to redeem at Tesco Woolwich Pharmacy or Morrisons Pharmacy Thamesmead
- To date, 150 Flu Vouchers have been issued to staff in Health and Adult Services. There has been a small increase through the voucher scheme due to staff being able to access vaccination through on-site Flu clinics.
- As of January 2020, 90 staff (60%) have redeemed their voucher and have received the vaccination at Tesco Woolwich. This is an improvement on last year when a total of 71 Health and Adult Services staff were vaccinated between November 2018 and March 2019.
Flu vaccination clinics in the Woolwich Centre
- During the last month there has been a focus on delivering two Flu vaccination clinics in the Woolwich Centre, on 17th December and 22nd January.
- This is the first time Flu vaccination clinics have been delivered in the Woolwich Centre
- The clinics have been successful, with an additional 102 staff vaccinated.

- On-site clinics will now be incorporated into the Flu vaccination programme; we will plan to hold an increasing number of clinics in the building as these have proven so popular this year.

Activities being undertaken to promote staff Flu uptake include:

- Communications cascaded to all directorates about the Flu vaccination offer
- Flu stalls to promote vaccination held in the Woolwich Centre Café
- Information on the protective benefits of vaccination and the staff Flu offer uploaded on the intranet
- Emails to remind staff who have obtained a Flu voucher but have not redeemed it.

Royal Greenwich Vaccination - Total

- Between November 2019 and January 2020, 568 staff have been vaccinated through the voucher scheme and Flu clinics. This is a significant improvement on 18/19 Flu programme when 269 staff were vaccinated in total.
- Activities will continue until the end of March 2020 to increase staff vaccination numbers.

Supplementary question -

It is good news that flu jabs amongst Council staff have doubled this year but still only 60 percent for adult social care staff. Can I ask what progress has been to improve this including working with our NHS partners?

Reply -

We are continuing to work with partners. The figures I have given you are up to January and the programme continues up to March.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

3 Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Community Safety

In light of the recent Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman ruling that the Council was at "significant fault" by failing to provide occupational and speech therapy in one case - which included instructions that the Council take steps to minimise the risks that similar situations arise in the future - can the Cabinet Member outline (without reference, of course, to any individual cases) what these steps will be? Have they now been implemented and what lessons have been learned from this ruling?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

In 2018/19 there were 14 initial enquiries from the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) across all areas of Children's Services. Ten of these were declined by the LGO. Of the four that were investigated; two were not upheld, one was upheld, and one went to JR proceedings (against the LGO) where it was dismissed.

We have a robust integrated therapies contract with Oxleas that provides speech and language, occupational and physio therapy. If there are any delays to the Education, Health and Care plans being finalised, this on occasion can impact on accessing this provision. We learn from all ombudsman cases and endeavour to put in place actions to address any system issues.

To ensure that we minimise risk moving forward we are continuing to work to ensure that Education, Health and Care plans are finalised within timescales for provision to be put in place as quickly as possible to meet need. We have also increased our focus on Annual Reviews where the needs of children and young people can be considered, and provision re-considered if significant changes have taken place.

In 2019/20 we have seen a significant increase in the number of initial enquiries and investigations. This is mirrored nationally and the LGO have a large number of cases waiting to be assigned for investigation.

Children's Services annual report on "Complaints, Compliments and Other Representations" for 2018-2019 was presented to Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee on the 8th October 2019 (attended by Councillor Greenwell). A copy of the report can be found [here](#). The Annual Complaints and Representations Report for 2019-2020 will be presented to Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee at a future date to be determined.

No Supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

4 Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Miranda Williams, Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure and Third Sector

Can the Cabinet Member provide an update on the Council's tree-planting programme - how many trees have now been planted against the target of 2,022 by 2022?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

I am pleased to confirm that 1,332 trees have been planted so far against the Council's target to plant 2,022 trees by 2022 and at least a further 271 trees will be planted by the end of March 2020.

The Council is well on its way to achieve its target to plant 2022 trees by the end of the 2021/22 planting season at the end of March 2022. Our aim is to exceed this number as much as funding opportunities present themselves.

Supplementary question -

Could you give me details of the proportion of those 1,332 that are replacement trees rather than new ones, and do you really expect people to scan a QR code on a tree?

Reply -

I will get those figures to you in terms of replacement trees and new trees.

QR codes allow for extra information to be given and I think this approach will be able to provide people with why trees are being removed and the reasons.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

5 Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

The Cabinet Member will be aware of calls on the Council for the introduction of the post of Ecology Officer, as other London Boroughs have done. What assessment has she made of this proposition, and what is her assessment of the likely cost and benefit?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

At present, where specialist ecology advice is required for planning purposes, the Council procures this from external experts at the developers' expense. This is done because the level of advice required would not support a specialist ecology officer.

We will continue to monitor our requirements, but it would not currently be beneficial for the Council to employ a specialist ecology officer, either in terms of:

- the use of its scarce resources; or
- providing a suitable workload to maintain the expertise of such an individual at the high level our current approach does.

This approach currently provides the best balance of costs and benefits for Royal Greenwich.

Supplementary question -

Given the costs and constraints is this a resource we might be able to share with other boroughs?

Reply -

We are constantly looking at how this service is provided.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

6 Question from Councillor Matt Hartley, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

The Cabinet Member will be aware of the Department for Transport EV charging point league table published in November, which places Greenwich a favourable 11th out of the London Boroughs and 17th overall, with 61 EV charging points per 100,000 population (with 176 total public charging devices and 15 rapid charging devices).

Based on the Council's current plans i.e. if all planned charging points are delivered, how will this figure of 61 charging points per 100,000 population increase and over what timescale?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

The population of Royal Greenwich is 286,000. Based on the Department for Transport figures you refer to, this suggests that there are around 176 charging points in the Borough (including those on private land).

In 2020 we have plans to add:

- 60 lamppost chargers
- 61 Source London charging points
- 11 new rapid chargers (3 on our highway and 8 in a new rapid charging hub at Glass Yard).

This would take the total to 305 charging points. This would equate to 106 charging points per 100,000 people.

Based on the current league table this would put Royal Greenwich fifth in the UK. The rest of the top five are also London boroughs: Westminster, Wandsworth, Richmond and Hammersmith & Fulham. Our actual (relative) performance will depend on the EV charging plans of other local authorities in 2020.

No Supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

7 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council

Could the Leader describe the process by which policy is developed by the Council, and the opportunities for Member and public input?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

The most obvious route through which policy is developed is the holding of a local election. The majority group can then seek to implement their manifesto during their term of office.

Supplementary question -

Is it really the view of the Leader of the Council that the only method through which policy is made in this Borough, and the only input that the public has into that process, is through the holding of local elections every four years?

Reply -

No. I believe that politics is about being honest and having conversations with people. Policies are developed and implemented over time and reflect changes.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

8 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council

When does the Leader expect the Council to respond to the public consultation on the future of Avery Hill Winter Garden?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

The first phase of public consultation regarding the future options for the site is complete. The next phase of activity is to undertake analysis and modelling of operating models to test viability of a range of options. The duration of this work is difficult to predict as it will depend on the initial findings, however it is expected that it will complete around summer 2020.

Supplementary question -

Would it be possible to co-ordinate the public feedback on the winter garden with the consultation and public engagement on the other parts of the site, so that when we do hold public meetings, and when residents are consulted, there is a joined-up view of the whole site?

Reply -

I am happy to have a look at that to see if it is possible.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

9 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Miranda Williams, Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure and the Third Sector

What would be the Cabinet Member's priorities for the additional funding proposed in the budget for Parks in the Borough?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

I am currently working with officers to develop my priorities for the additional funding proposed for the Parks budget. Parks Friends and Residents are passionate about their green space and they will be consulted to capture their views. However, my priorities will be directly linked to supporting delivery of the Corporate Plan and Parks and Open Spaces Strategy objectives. In general terms my priorities will be linked to improving Parks infrastructure, initiatives to combat Climate Change and support residents to be more active and support healthy life styles.

Supplementary question -

Could you say a bit more about how Friend groups will be engaged with in terms of setting priorities for the fund?

Reply -

We are still in the early stages of this but parks friends groups will be at the forefront of any consultation.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

10 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Miranda Williams, Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure and the Third Sector

What assessment has been made of the effectiveness of the new arrangements for public and researcher access to the Borough Archives at the new archive store?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

Following substantial investment by the Royal borough of Greenwich, the Royal Greenwich archive is housed in a facility and store which is fitted to the highest standards of archive care and management.

The Royal Greenwich Heritage Trust (RGHT) is responsible for managing the archive and the museum collections on behalf of the Borough. They opened the new archive and research facility at Anchorage Point in Charlton for public access in July.

Access is currently available on Tuesdays by prior appointment. So far this has proved successful and the Trust have been able to meet demand via prior appointment. 6 research sessions are offered each Tuesday with researchers receiving the full attention of the Archivist during these periods.

Figures up to and including December 2019 show 71 researchers have been welcomed to the archive with usage averaging 66% of the time slots offered. It is anticipated that demand may increase in Spring/Summer 2020 as the session become more established and once the weather improves.

The Trust will continue to monitor demand and to work with the archive user groups and the wider community to develop sustainable access to the museum collections and archive in order to ensure that they can meet demand and appropriate levels of access are offered.

In addition, RGHT will continue to undertake outreach of its collections via the National Lottery Heritage Funded '[Meet the Collection](#)' project. This provides valuable access for residents who have never accessed the borough archive in Woolwich (as well as to the wider community). Successful sessions have so far been held at Charlton House, Rothbury Hall, Eltham Library and St Alfege Church. The pop-up museum and archive exhibitions also attended Thamesmead Sparkle, Kidbrooke Village, and Woolwich Winter Warmer.

Programmes such as this truly provide public access to the Borough archives in new ways, and the Trust plan to build on this community access in 2021 and beyond, as a Trustee of Royal Greenwich Heritage Trust, I know they welcome suggestions of other venues where Meet the Collections could visit.

Details of the programme can be found at <https://www.greenwichheritage.org/visit/museum-collection-archive/meet-the-collection>

Supplementary question -

Could she look at the suggestion that the regularly used items be made more available at Charlton House where a drop-in research room facility could be set up?

Reply -

I am more than happy to look into this as a possibility.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

11 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Christine Grice, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

What is the total amount of money GLLAB has received from Section 106 and CIL contributions in the last 10 years?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

GLLAB has received £11,480,021 in Section 106 funding over the last 10 years (2009/10 to 2018/19). Over this period GLLAB has supported 11,868 local residents in to employment.

CIL is collected to provide new or improve existing infrastructure, and as such cannot be used to fund the GLLAB service.

No Supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

12 Question from Councillor Nigel Fletcher, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

Does the Council have set criteria for assessing applications for Asset of Community Value listing and designation of a Conservation Area ?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

In terms of Assets of Community Value, the Localism Act 2011 gives communities the right to identify land or buildings that they believe are of benefit to the local community and to nominate them for inclusion on a Register of Assets of Community Value. If the Asset subsequently comes up for sale the community will be given time to prepare a bid to purchase the Asset. A nomination will be agreed if, in the opinion of the Council, the following criteria are met:

- The current primary use of the building/land, or use in the recent past, furthers the social well-being or social interests of the local community.
- It is realistic to think that now or in the next five years there could continue to be a primary use of the building/land which will further the social well-being or social interests of the local community.

There is no statutory definition of terms such as “social well-being” or “recent past” within the legislation and only limited guidance as to what constitutes “social interests”. However, some Local Authorities have developed their own definitions and use them when assessing nominations. Officers are currently looking at whether the adoption of a similar approach in Greenwich would give greater clarity to nominating groups in regards to how the Council will assess nominations. Any proposals that emerge from this exercise will be brought before Members for their approval”.

With regard to designating conservation areas, I would draw your attention to the Royal Borough’s [Conservation Area Designation Procedure Note \(2017\)](#). Paragraph 5.1 sets out how conservation areas can be nominated. A nomination needs to be accompanied by an assessment demonstrating how the area proposed meets the Royal Borough’s selection criteria for

conservation area designation. Photographs, historic maps and images are also required to support the application. To note though that a planning application is not a relevant consideration in respect of the designation of conservation areas.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

13 Question from Councillor Geoffrey Brighty, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

The Cabinet Member will be aware that the famous tea hut on Blackheath was demolished earlier this month as a result of a car smashing into it unfortunately causing injury to staff and customers. Attention is now turning to whether the tea hut should be reconstructed on the present site or elsewhere in the Blackheath area, There have been suggestions that the old toilet block close to Greenwich Park's Blackheath gate might be a new venue. As the Cabinet Member knows it is owned by the Crown Estate and was managed by Greenwich Council as a public convenience until closure many years ago The block has become an eyesore and a wasted resource and, given its location, shamefully the Crown Estate has shown little interest in it.

Would the Cabinet Member ask Officers to discuss with Crown Estates, Lewisham Council and the owners of the tea hut whether it would be feasible for the building to be brought back into use as a possible new venue for the tea hut ?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

Members and Officers are aware of the accident that severely damaged the tea hut.

The hut falls within the London Borough of Lewisham boundary and there is a social media campaign to rebuild it. The crowd funding website Just Giving has raised £3,636 as at 23rd January.

With regard to the disused public toilet owned by the Crown Estate on Blackheath, Officers are continuing discussions with a senior representative of the Crown to bring it back into use. However, the Council is beholden to them and cannot force the pace of negotiations.

Any renovation of the building will require, and is subject to, surveys, valuations and financial analysis and will also be subject to the both parties' normal governance and approval process. In any event, at present, this is not an agreed project, there is no budget to cover these costs and our Officer resource time is limited.

Supplementary question -

The former public toilets on Blackheath have been closed since 1991. Can the Cabinet Member persuade Officers to ramp up their discussions with the Crown Estate to find a solution to this?

Reply -

We have seen that the Crown Estates is slow but I will certainly ask Officers in try to speed up the process.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

14 Question from Councillor Pat Greenwell, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

I understand that this may be the last year that the Safe Drive scheme will reach students in its present form. as funding is being cut. Apparently TfL are in the process of devising a new less costly way of educating our young drivers and their passengers. Are the Council working closely with TfL on this new approach?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for her question.

Safe Drive Stay Alive is a brilliant scheme (which actually happens to be running this week), which reaches thousands of year eleven and sixth form students each year. The powerful theatre performance focuses on people with real-life experience of fatal collisions, to help students understand the limitations in their still-developing perception.

Transport for London has announced its intention to move to a lower cost model next financial year. Unfortunately, TfL has not told us what form this will take, despite pressure from boroughs across London.

Officers are working closely with TfL and the cross-London group of boroughs involved in Safe Drive Stay Alive to understand the situation. It is a great scheme and we want to continue to deliver great training for this age-group. As proposals emerge we will work to understand what shape this can take.

Supplementary question -

Given that TfL are looking at drawing back their funding is it possible to follow up with students six months after they've taken part in the scheme, to see how strongly they still feel in order to make a case for TfL to change its mind?

Reply -

I am more than happy to look into that.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

15 Question from Councillor Matt Clare, to Councillor Christine Grice, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

The Council has made much of its efforts to digitise processes (e.g. make more services/processes available via the web). Is there evidence of success and return on investment (e.g. a reduction in the number of phone calls to the contact centre per resident per year) ? What further processes and services remain to be digitised in the coming year?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

The Council's change work so far has focused on internal technology refreshes, to help our staff to be able to do their jobs as efficiently as possible and to stabilise our current systems. We also refreshed the website in 2018, paving the way for new services to come online.

The Council has just appointed its first Assistant Director for Digital and Access, whose brief is to take services online as well as evolving the council's technology systems and processes. A report will come to Cabinet in due course to set out our plans in full.

In terms of customer contact, our total volumes fell from 1,006,359 in 2018 to 923,331 in 2019. We hope to continue this downward trend as we bring new digital services online from 2020 onwards.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

16 Question from Councillor Matt Clare, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

With regret Greenwich still does not seemingly have a new provider or providers of car club (ideally floating/one-way car clubs) in place. Would the Cabinet Member please explain why this is taking so long and when we can expect a contract to be in place?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

The Council has issued a draft contract to five 'back to base' car club operators with a deadline of 26th January to respond, including locations that they are interested in operating. New car club locations will be agreed in February. Traffic management orders will then be changed and bays prepared, for a contract start date as soon as possible afterwards.

In terms of the 'free floating' one-way car club model, a decision on this was added to the Royal Borough's forward plan in early January. We are in discussions with the only operator offering a free-floating service. Subject to the decision described above being made, this could go live from May 2020.

The car club market has seen a lot of change in the last year. New models have emerged, and operators have come and gone. We have had to work hard to ensure we get the best possible solution for Royal Greenwich in this fast-changing market. Whilst this means the process has taken longer than expected, the results are better than expected. It will be worth the wait.

Supplementary question -

I disagree that the wait has been worth it and ask when the contract would be in place?

Reply -

The market keeps changing. Once I have a date I'll let you know.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

17 Question from Councillor Matt Clare, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

Lewisham Council has recently introduced tiered pricing for parking permits based on emissions with pricing in 13 bands ranging from £70/year for an Electric Vehicle to £300/year for the most polluting vehicles. What is the Council's current stance on this ?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

Officers have commissioned technical work on a new Parking Strategy for the Royal Borough. This will examine a wide range of options for using parking controls as a lever to move us towards our objectives for a greener, healthier, safer and more prosperous Royal Greenwich.

Variably priced parking for high and low pollution vehicles are one example of how we could do that.

I look forward to sharing our proposals, once we have developed the strategy further

Supplementary question -

Is there any early indications, either from Lewisham or from within this Council, as to whether this is something that is of interest?

Reply -

Officers from our Transport Team and Public Health Team have looked at the Merton scheme. This is something we are looking at, it is the direction of travel.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

18 Question from Councillor Matt Clare, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

In December *The Times* reported that all 32 London boroughs would step up enforcement in relation to engine idling.

Lewisham Council has introduced £60 fines for drivers who idle for more than 3 minutes.

Indeed, since 2002 the law has provision for local authorities to levy fines. <https://idlingaction.london/idling-enforcement>

As Councillors we continually hear of residents who have health problems due to poor air quality with vehicles being a major contributor.

What are the Council's plans in this important area ?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

The ability to enforce against idling is an important complement to the behaviour change work the Royal Borough has already done to reduce the effects of idling vehicles.

A decision that would allow for enforcement action to be taken against idling engines in Royal Greenwich is expected to go to Cabinet on 11th March.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

19 Question from Councillor Roger Tester, to Councillor Chris Kirby, Cabinet Member for Housing

What checks are carried out on the quality of out of borough temporary accommodation and the owners / landlords of these properties to ensure the health and safety of Royal Greenwich residents placed there and the conditions residents are living in?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Roger Tester for his question.

We currently have a number of way in which temporary accommodation and landlords are checked through various teams in the Council. It's worth saying that before we place anyone in temporary accommodation we ensure that we receive up to date health and safety compliance documents such as the Landlord Gas Safety Record. We then look to complete a full inspection of any new temporary accommodation within 72 hours of us placing a tenant, however this is sometimes hindered by access issues. A Housing Health and Safety Rating System inspection is completed, if any minor issues are found they are raised with the landlord for rectification, if anything major is found then we will move the tenant as a priority.

Where we use Houses of Multiple Occupation for temporary accommodate within the borough we will only place within those HMOs that have been licenced, or going through the licencing process, by our Environmental Health Team and have been judged as a satisfactory property.

We are currently working with London Council's on a project with other London Boroughs to bring in a consistency of standards for inspection of studio and bed and breakfast temporary accommodation, this will give even greater assurance of standards.

Any concerns regarding tenants' temporary accommodation should be raised instantly so the team are able to work with landlords to resolve issue or move the tenants to more suitable accommodation.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

20 Question from Councillor Roger Tester, to Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council

On 10th January an error in the publication meant that 4,824 copies of *Talk Housing* had to be reprinted after incorrect copies were delivered to Council tenants . What was the cost to residents of this error and subsequent reprinting

Reply -

I thank Councillor Roger Tester for his question.

Talk Housing is one of our key communication tools with our Council Tenants and Leaseholders. In the last addition unfortunately, the colours on one of the charts were transposed meaning that misleading information was provided regarding the overall levels of satisfaction of our Housing Tenants. I want to confirm that the recent Star Survey we undertook showed that 70% of our tenants were happy with the service they were provided. *Talk Housing* was dispatched to tenants with the quarterly rent statement but is dispatched later to leaseholders. The error was noticed in time for us to be able to reprint *Talk Housing* for our 4,000 plus leaseholders. The cost of this reprint was £1,000. It was judged by the service to be cost effective to reprint this to ensure that the information was corrected, however it did not seem cost effective to reprint and resend *Talk Housing* to 20,000 tenants.

We have updated the online version of *Talk Housing* with the correct chart. We are making our Housing Panel and Boroughwide Housing Panel aware of the mistake and we will also be printing a correction and apology in the next addition of *Talk Housing*.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

21 Question from Councillor Charlie Davis, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

What conversations has the Cabinet Member had with Meridian Home Start regarding the leasing of the community space on Jack's Acre? Can the Cabinet Member confirm this has gone out to tender and at what stage negotiations are?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

The Jack's Acre site is owned and managed by Meridian Home Start, therefore the marketing of the community space is being managed by them. The selection of the tenant for the space will be their decision also.

I can confirm that Meridian has engaged an agent and the property has been marketed. They will be handling any negotiations and tenant selection therefore the Council is not able to comment on the progress of this work as it is a commercially confidential matter.

No supplementary question -

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

22 Question from Councillor Charlie Davis, to Councillor Chris Kirby, Cabinet Member for Housing

What awareness does the Cabinet Member have of the Rural Urban Synthesis Society and their development in Ladywell? Would the Cabinet Member be open to similar developments in Greenwich? And how would the Cabinet Member encourage these developments?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

Officers have undertaken research into the Rural Urban Society (RUS) development at Ladywell, as well as similar such developments in South and East London.

Members will be aware of the commitment in the October 2018 Cabinet paper on housing delivery proposals, to “explore the possibility of establishing two pilot sites for the Community Land Trust (CLT) model subject to the community forming a trust.”

Officers are developing a strategy to implement this commitment, and I have had informal discussions with residents on the best way to deliver a CLT within RBG.

Supplementary question -

Can you say if there are any specific sites being considered for the pilot?

Reply -

As part of our commitment to build Council homes land throughout the Borough is being assessed. Once the assessment is complete we will be looking to set up a Community Land Trust with interested residents. The Council is taking a broad spectrum approach to providing affordable housing and no idea is off the table.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

23 Question from Councillor Charlie Davis, to Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Air Quality, Sustainability and Transport

Can the Cabinet Member confirm what conversations the Council has had with Lewisham Council regarding the three 'modal filters' that will meet Middle Park and Sutcliffe ward on the Lewisham border of Upwood Road, Cambridge Drive and Leyland Road?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

The Council has been engaging with its neighbouring borough Lewisham Council on a regular basis, in relation to their Lee Green Healthy Neighbourhood project.

Council officers have attended formal meetings with their Lewisham counterparts to discuss their proposals. As well as these formal sessions between the boroughs, officers have been in regular communication.

Formal representation was made from Greenwich (and Lewisham) residents in the form of a petition submitted to Council on 31st October 2018, reported to Highways Committee on 23rd January 2019 and reported back to Council on 30th January 2019.

The Royal Borough of Greenwich are unable to influence Lewisham Council on any proposals in Cambridge Drive and Leyland Road, as these roads sit entirely within their borough boundary. However, as both the Lewisham and Greenwich borough boundaries intersect Upwood Road, collaborative discussions are ongoing between both authorities on potential coordinated measures to enable traffic reduction.

Supplementary agenda -

What conversations have Greenwich had about the 'modal filters'?

Reply -

We are in communication with Lewisham, at Officer and political level. When I have more information I shall share this with you.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

24 Question from Councillor Charlie Davis, to Councillor Denise Hyland, Cabinet Member for Economy, Skills and Apprenticeships

What dialogue has the Cabinet Member had with TfL and Crossrail since the announcement that Crossrail will be delayed until at least Summer 2021? Can the Cabinet Member confirm what support she has secured for residents and local business in Woolwich and Abbey Wood to help minimise the impact of this delay?

Reply –

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

The Council works continuously with TfL to identify how the impacts of the delay can be minimised.

An example of benefits secured from Crossrail is the new 301 bus route. It was planned to begin operation on the opening of Crossrail and other Crossrail-related bus changes were put on hold. However, the new 301 route was brought forward and introduced in the summer of 2018. This has improved connections between residents of Abbey Wood and Woolwich – way ahead of the opening of Crossrail.

Officers have been working closely with Businesses in Abbey Wood Village and Woolwich to understand the impacts of the delay and to consider a package of business support. While all businesses recognise the direct benefits Crossrail will bring, including from the anticipated increase in footfall, not all businesses have attributed their difficulties to the delays in Crossrail. Businesses have mentioned other factors such as Brexit, changing shopping habits and economic uncertainty. Council officers also sought to understand the potential impact of Business Rates on these businesses. A considerable number of these business are already receiving full small business rate relief and a number of those who do not receive relief are large multi nationals or retail chains in the UK e.g. Paddy Power and Greggs. To comply with State Aid Rules, the Council would not be in a position to award discretionary business relate relief to these businesses. A number

have taken up the offer of business support, including the council's e-business support programme

No supplementary question -

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

25 Question from Councillor Charlie Davis, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

Can the Cabinet Member confirm that the Council will be extending the lease of One Space on Kidbrooke Park Road to secure the future of a much appreciated community space?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

The land occupied by the One Space Community Centre is to be transferred to Berkeley Homes to facilitate the construction of Phase 5 of the Kidbrooke development. Berkeley Homes have confirmed that the land will not be required until new community facilities are ready for occupation and Officers will be offering One Space a short term lease that reflects Berkeley Home's construction timescales.

The Council will be undertaking a tendering exercise to procure an operator for the new community facilities and Kidbrooke Focus, who manage the One Space facility, will be provided with details of the tendering requirements in due course.

Supplementary question -

Can you confirm how long the lease will be extended in the interim?

Reply -

I will write to you.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

Given his continued and enthusiastic support of the Eltham Masterplan in its current form, can the Leader confirm when his Council will commence development on the site of the M&S car park and the current Council car park on Orangery Lane?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

The M&S car park is not owned by the council and to date there has been no pre-application nor planning applications for redevelopment brought forward by the owner.

In respect of the Council's own car park there are no plans to bring this forward for development.

Supplementary question -

Can the Leader explain why there is discord between what he's telling us and the documents that this Council keep producing, and whether the Master Plan and the Site Allocation Plan are relevant?

Reply -

If you are confused about the documents let's sit down and I'll try to help you.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

Please can the Leader of the Council confirm -

- the remit of the Hervey Road Advisory Board?
- on what date he and the Chief Whip decided to nominate Councillor Grice for her role on the Hervey Road Advisory Board?
- the content of the legal advice received by the Chief Whip relating to the appointment of a Councillor to the Hervey Road Advisory Board, and will he publish this in full?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

The Terms of Reference have been drafted for Hervey Road Advisory Group and were discussed at the meeting on Monday 27th January 2020

Hervey Road Advisory Group - Aims

- To assist in increasing usage of the facility, including the grass pitches, the cricket area, the Multi-Use Games Area, and the pavilion
- To help provide feedback from current users, residents and the local community
- To support the current range of opportunities and assist with ideas to widen the offer that is available
- To ensure that the facility complies with all the necessary obligations regarding the calendar of events, opening and closing times
- To assist in promoting and marketing the facility to current users and the local community, ensuring equality of access and opportunity to use the facilities where possible.
- Receive information on usage of the facility, current and future programmes of activity, including targets and priorities for the coming 12 months, which will be flexible and changeable

- To offer ideas and suggestions on the operations of the facility, but understanding that all management decisions lie with Blackheath Rugby Club

Hervey Road Advisory Group - Invited Membership

Organisation	Representation/Representatives
Chair	Rory O’Sullivan
Ward Councillor Representative	Christine Grice – Cabinet member for Finance and Resources
Blackheath Rugby Club	Dr Alan Thompson - President Blackheath Rugby Club Rory O’Sullivan Chairman – Blackheath Rugby Club Tim Brindle - Operations Manager- Blackheath Rugby Club
Hervey Road Users	Graham Colledge – Chair of Blackheath Mini-Rugby Emma Smith – Head of Leigh Academy Alex Wareing - Business Manager Pointer School Jeffrey Barnes Manager - Blackheath Rhinos Football Club Andy Pye - Greenwich District Cricket Club Roger Trevena – Head Kidbrooke Park Primary School
The Friends of Hervey Road	Susan Proudfoot- Chair F of HR
Kidbrooke North Residents Association	Ruth Wheeler- Chair - KNRA
Royal Borough of Greenwich	Tim Hetherington – Head of Sport, Leisure, Libraries and Adventure Play Stephanie Turner – Sports Development Officer TBC - Public Health Outreach

Councillor Grice was appointed to the Hervey Road Advisory Board on 2 October 2019.

First Supplementary question -

Does the Leader think it is the job of the Advisory Board to carry out PR for the Blackheath Rugby Club as is listed as one of the Advisory Board’s responsibilities?

Reply -

I recently visited Harvey Road and people seemed happy.

Second Supplementary question -

What legal advice was received in regard to the appointment of a Cabinet Member?

Reply -

I can assure you that if any of us do anything illegal in relation to the publication of agendas or nominating Members, the Council's Monitoring Officer will advise us immediately. To the best of my knowledge that's never happened. It is incumbent on all Members to manage and declare their own interests.

Statement by Councillor Christine Grice -

On a point of order it's not for Councillor Davis to say I have conflict of interest, it is my responsibility to say if I have a conflict of interest or not. I can assure Council that if I ever have a conflict of interest I would remove myself from the room when any items were being discussed.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

Please can the Leader of the Council confirm -

- the total amount the Royal Borough of Greenwich spent on converting Thames Polytechnic Sports Ground, and the Hervey Road Sport Ground?
- whether the Royal Borough of Greenwich have yet received Blackheath Rugby Football Club's new business plan?
- the reason for Hervey Road being £90,000 over budget?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

Against a budget of almost £1.5m, the total amount spent is £1.4m.

The Council has recently received a plan from the Club and will be reviewing it in due course.

I am not clear where the figure of £90k is from and would ask for clarification around the derivation of this sum?

First Supplementary question -

The project was overbudget in 2018-19, having spent £780,000 rather than the £690,000 budgeted, can you confirm why?

Reply -

This is a mystery calculation and if you have a specific question send it to me and I will answer it.

Second Supplementary Question -

The plan was first mentioned in October; why has it taken so long to be received and when will the decision be taken on recommencing the loan?

Reply -

I shall contact you directly with an answer.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

Please can the Leader of the Council confirm -

- the total balance of Blackheath Rugby Football Club's loans with the Council?
- when Blackheath Rugby Football Club commenced their payment holiday with the Royal Borough of Greenwich?
- whether any payment holiday between the Royal Borough of Greenwich and Blackheath Rugby Football Club incurred interest?
- whether Blackheath Rugby Football Club have recommenced the repayment of their loans to the Royal Borough of Greenwich?
- which Cabinet Member took the decision to commence the payment holiday with Blackheath Rugby Football Club?
- which Cabinet Members were involved in making the decision to commence a payment holiday with Blackheath Rugby Football Club? Can he confirm the date of this decision being made, and can he confirm which Member of his Cabinet had the final decision?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

The Club is in receipt of two loans. The balance outstanding on the first loan is £2,333 which is on schedule for repayment in May this year, as originally agreed. The balance outstanding on the second loan is £45,833. It is an interest free loan and as such, there is no loan interest foregone since the holiday commenced in September 2017.

The loan agreement itself is delegated to the Director of Finance. Officers in Communities & Environment and Finance & Legal Services have worked together with the club over the period and with the time elapsed between the submission of the original business plan and the completion of works at

the site - a new business plan was sought to enable a reprofiling of the loan, so that repayments can recommence.

First supplementary question -

Which Cabinet Member took the decision to commence a payment holiday with Blackheath Rugby Club?

Reply -

It was an Officer decision.

Second supplementary question -

Were any Cabinet Members involved in the decision to commence a payment holiday with Blackheath Rugby Club?

Reply -

Absolutly not

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

30 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Sizwe James, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth

Following an enquiry from a local resident, it has been brought to my attention that the Vue Cinema in Eltham does not appear to show any captioned (subtitled) films suitable for the hard of hearing. Can the Cabinet Member reassure me that the Council included in their lease an expectation that films with subtitles would be shown at Eltham Vue, as they are at other cinemas in the Borough?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

The lease for the site is a property transaction therefore has no relationship or bearing on the operating policies of Vue Cinemas. This matter is therefore not something that the Council can influence.

However, Officers have looked at the Vue website and have confirmed that a number of screenings of films with subtitles are available.

Under the accessibility section of the website Vue also state “Vue Eltham shows subtitled (ST) films every week. Film times are updated each Wednesday morning for the coming Friday”.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

31 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Christine Grice, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

I am aware that the Eltham Centre contains a library (which is open until 7pm) and a Leisure Centre (which is open until 10pm) but I was recently informed that it would not be possible to book a room for a meeting there after 7pm. This seemed to me to confirm that there had been a substantial reduction in the Council's presence at the Eltham Centre. Can the Cabinet Member confirm which Council Officers are still based at the Eltham Centre and which services members of the public can access from there?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

I would like to assure you that there hasn't been a reduction in the Council's presence at the Eltham Centre. A member of the Council's Building Management Team is based at the Eltham Centre Monday to Friday from 0900 to 1700. This is on a rotational basis between the team members.

The service centre operates Monday to Friday from 8am to 6pm, Saturday 9am to 1pm. Closed bank holidays.

There is also a self-service kiosk which operates Monday to Friday from 7am to 10pm, and Saturday and Sunday from 9am to 5pm

Officers from the Council's Adult and Community Learning team are also based at the Eltham Centre, Monday – Friday. There are 8 classrooms used for adult and community learning courses and for RBG apprenticeship training, with classes starting at 9am and finishing by 6pm.

Meeting rooms are only available 9am to 6pm as there are no Council Officers available after this time to monitor and this is not part of the leisure offer provided by GLL.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

32 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Community Safety

I am informed that Eltham Police Station remains on The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) disposal list although no indication has been made of when it might close. Given the Government's commitment to increase police numbers in the future, I would imagine Plumstead Police Station will struggle to provide space for all the Officers, so can the Cabinet Member confirm whether she has made or intends to make any formal representations requesting that Eltham Police Station remain open?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

The future of Eltham Police Station is an issue regularly raised at Council questions and I would refer him back to my previous responses over the last year or so. I believe officers also addressed a similar enquiry from him recently.

I would again however point out that the deployment of police officers is a matter for the Met, as is how they use their estate in line with their available budget.

We are regularly updated by local police around officer numbers and estate issues as they themselves are told. At this time however, there remains uncertainty how any additional Government funding will impact on police officers locally and whether it will reverse losses experienced since 2010.

Neither the Council nor I therefore intend to make any representations regarding retaining Eltham Police Station nor can we make comment on capacity within Plumstead Police Station.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

33 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Community Safety

The police non-emergency number 101 charges for members of the public to make calls to it, however, there seem to be increasing reports of substantial waits for this line to be answered. Can the Cabinet Member confirm the average waiting time for calls to the 101 number from the Royal Borough of Greenwich to be answered or indeed how many calls were abandoned after two minutes?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

The Council do not have accountability for services provided by the police. As a responsible partnership, we do however discuss police performance regularly, predominantly to positively influence and improve outcomes at a local level.

In addition, the Community Safety & Environment Scrutiny Panel also hear evidence from the local police from time to time. Last week, for example, the panel received and scrutinised a police report on the three borough merger.

In regards to the 101 non-emergency number, this was introduced by the Home Office in 2012 and connects callers to local police forces. The local BCU (Basic Command Unit) do not provide call handling and this is dealt with centrally.

Calls to 101 from both landlines and mobile phones cost 15 pence per call, no matter what time of day or the length of the call. There was an announcement in May 2019 that this charge would be removed from April 2020 and covered by Home Office investment. We await to see if this is implemented.

Regarding the request for data, Council Officers have attempted to source this from the local BCU, but the data is not readily available.

Data from 2018 has been provided but it is important to note that from August 2018 this only includes calls where the caller has decided to wait for an operator.

101 call answer time and incomplete for 2018

Month	101 calls incomplete	Average answer times for 101 calls (secs)
Jan 18	60476	153.0
Feb 18	81166	273.9
Mar 18	95780	305.9
Apr 18	72287	216.6
May 18	113401	407.0
Jun 18	128803	638.4
Jul 18	141074	603.9
Aug 18	51418	175.4
Sep 18	31132	134.9

Councillor Drury may therefore wish to contact the Met himself and request this specific information as a freedom of information request. He may also wish to engage the local BCU Commander around any specific policing concerns he has.

Non-emergencies (including less urgent reports of crime) can be reported in other ways, for example online via www.met.police.uk. Emergencies, including crimes in progress, should always be reported via 999.

Non-emergency contact with local Safer Neighbourhood Teams can also be made through the Met website at www.met.police.uk/a/your-area/local-policing-team-contact/contact-your-local-policing-team

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

34 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Danny Thorpe, Cabinet Member for Leader of the Council

In the decision he took in November entitled “London Business Rates 2019-20 75% Pilot Pool - Strategic Investment Pot” the Leader seemed to confirm that the “Local London e-Business for Growth” bid from Greenwich would cost £13.4m of which the Royal Borough of Greenwich would provide £5.9m (including £3.5m of public sector funding). Can the Leader confirm how the £2.6m (75% of £3.5m) public sector funding would be generated by the Council?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

The decision I took in November was to confirm the Council’s support for a package of 18 projects across London proposed for funding through the 2019/20 London Business Rates Retention Pilot - Strategic Investment Pot (SIP). This confirmation is required as part of the governance process for SIP to show broad agreement across London government.

The package of projects has now been agreed and I am happy to confirm that Greenwich will benefit from this funding as one of the eight Boroughs in the Local London Partnership “Local London e-Business for Growth” programme awarded a total of £5.62m over 3 years from March 2020 to June 2023 (75% of the funding originally requested.)

The eight Boroughs will each receive £650,000 of SIP funding to deliver a package of e-business support closely modelled on the Council’s own highly successful e-business programme, which to date has supported 689 businesses, safeguarded 1,453 jobs , created 183 new jobs and generated increased turnover of £22,411,347.

The SIP programme requires £225,000 as a match-funding contribution in kind with the expectation that this is from existing resources e.g. officer time, use of facilities, events and business engagement. No cash match-

funding is required. The additional funding will enable the Council to extend the existing e-business programme by another 2 years up to 2023.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

35 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council

I note from a recent email from the UNITE union that Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) does not recognise trade unions and employs workers on zero hours contracts. Can the Leader confirm what approach he asked the Council's representatives on the Board of GLL to take to these issues?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

I asked GLL for a response on your question and I have received a speedy reply

GLL recognises unions wherever they have members with representatives who want to engage in collective bargaining. We recognise UNITE union in RBG and meet with them regularly.

I understand 70% of GLL's hours are worked by permanent employees. GLL's working model offers both permanent, part time and casual positions.

Within the leisure industry it is common for people to work on a casual basis for different organisations across numerous locations. These contracts, which place them under no obligation to work, suit many of their workers – including students and parents of young children who want flexible hours. All casual workers earn at least the LLW, many much more, and are entitled to sick and holiday pay.

GLL have said that some staff would like the security of guaranteed hours. GLL are therefore running a pilot to assess how many are willing to make this commitment and to design suitable contractual packages that can be roll out across the business.

COUNCIL

29 JANUARY 2020

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

36 Question from Councillor Spencer Drury, to Councillor Averil Lekau, Cabinet Member for Adult's Social Care and Health

With the merger of Eltham Park Surgery and Dr V Sandrasagra's Practice with Eltham Medical Practice is the Cabinet Member concerned that there will be a shortage of GPs in Eltham, which could make it harder for residents to obtain appointments with their doctors?

Reply -

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

Following the merger of these 3 practices, only 1 GP who was from Eltham Park Surgery, has retired. The GP at Westmount Road practice is now working as a salaried GP for Eltham Medical Practice. All of the clinical and administrative staff from Eltham Park and Westmount Road have been TUPEd over to Eltham Medical Practice and 2 new additional GPs have been appointed making a total of 13 GPs supported by 2.7 WTE practice nurses. As part of the Business Case process it was important that there was evidence that there would be enough clinical capacity to support the merger.

Greenwich has a programme of work which supports GP recruitment and retention which has been successful in that we are seeing a stepped increase in salaried GPs coming to Greenwich.