

COUNCIL Minutes

Place

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

Date

Wednesday 16 March 2022

Time

7.00 pm

Present

The Worshipful Mayor

Councillor Denise Hyland

Councillors:

Olu Babatola	Leo Fletcher	Sarah Merrill
Sandra Bauer	Nigel Fletcher	Matthew Morrow
Linda Bird	David Gardner	Anthony Okereke
Stephen Brain	Patricia Greenwell	Gary Parker
Geoffrey Brighty	Matt Hartley	Linda Perks
Clare Burke-McDonald	Ian Hawking	Denise Scott-McDonald
Matt Clare	John Hills	Pat Slattery
Angela Cornforth	Mark James	Aidan Smith
Ann-Marie Cousins	Adel Khairah	Jackie Smith
Charlie Davis	Chris Lloyd	David Stanley
Gary Dillon	Dominic Mbang	Roger Tester
Spencer Drury	Odette McGahey	Danny Thorpe
John Fahy		Miranda Williams

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.

Prior to the start of the meeting the Leader of the Council addressed Council about refugees from the war in Ukraine. Councillor Danny Thorpe indicated that the borough was expected to have a significant role with refugees; Councillor Thorpe stated his concerns about the government's safeguarding arrangements and that he had spoken with colleagues in health and in the voluntary sector about it. He commented on how the Council had responded to the Afghan refugee situation, and noted that final burden had still not been alleviated by the government. He said there was a website for donations, but the Council was asking people to donate goods.

Councillor Nigel Fletcher, leader of the Minority Party, commented on the war in Ukraine and said he was happy to support concerns about getting the government financial support for the refugees. The Mayor voiced the concern that if the government had still not provided the financial support for the Afghan refugees could the Council have any confidence that they would do so with the Ukrainian refugees. The Leader of the Council said he hoped that the leader of the Minority Party would help to raise the point of financing the matter with the Secretary of State.

Item No.

1 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Norman Adams, Bill Freeman, Mick Hayes, Averil Lekau, Mariam Lolavar, Clive Mardner, Christine May, Maureen O'Mara, Ivis Williams

Apologies for leaving early were given by Councillors Spencer Drury (who left after Item 15) and Ian Hawking

2 Minutes

Resolved –

That the minutes of the Council Meetings held on 26 January and 24 February 2022 be agreed and signed as true and accurate records.

3 Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor paid tribute to members of staff who had sadly passed away while in service.

The Mayor gave remembrance to: Cheryl Carter (Performance Analysis Service Officer, Children Services), Robert Smith (Environmental Worker, Communities, Environment and Central), Sean SurrIDGE (Waste Operative, Communities, Environment and Central), Eon Irving (Meal Supervisor, Kidbrooke Park Primary School), Susan Kidd, MBE (Senior Administrative Officer, Greenslade Primary School), Amanda Richards (Clerical Assistant, Boxgrove Primary School), Marie Naylor (Teaching Assistant, Eltham C and E Primary School), Amanda Mahoney (Outreach Worker, Children Services), Richard Quarrinton, (Gardener (Estates), Communities, Environment and Central), Jane Jones (Catering Assistant, Heronsgate Primary School, Thamesmead)

Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Majority Party, and Councillor Nigel Fletcher, Leader of the Minority Party, gave recognition to staff for their service to the borough and spoke in appreciation of their work.

The Mayor called on Council to hold a minutes silence in their memory.

Council held a minute silence

The Mayor was pleased to announce that the Council had won an award for their work on food poverty, their 'cash first' responses to food insecurity, their support for people with no recourse to public funds, and for promoting Healthy Start and the Holiday Activities and Food Fund. The Council had also been commended for demonstrating joined-up leadership on healthier food environments, their good food economy, and their work to support food growing.

The Mayor called on Councillor Miranda Williams, the Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care to present the award to Catherine Hananfin, Senior Public Health Manager on behalf of Claire Bennett, Nicola Nzuzza, Emma, Eaves Anderson, Gillian Bennett and all officers working on different aspects of the food agenda across the Council.

Councillor Miranda Williams, Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care, presented the award.

The Mayor paid tribute to those Councillors who were to leave Council: Councillors Norman Adams, Stephen Brain, Peter Brooks, Matt Clare, Angela Cornforth, Bill Freeman, Ian Hawking, Mick Hayes, Mark James, Rajinder James, Sizwe James, Clive Mardner, Maureen O'Mara, Gary Parker, Linda Perks and David Stanley. The Mayor said they had all worked collegiately with colleagues to make the Council a better Council and had served their residents.

Councillors Jackie Smith spoke in memory of former Councillor Christine Grice.

The Mayor congratulated Councillor Mariam Lolavar on the birth of her son.

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:
 - Councillor Mark James declared an interest in agenda item 17, as an employee of TfL.

5 Notice of Members wishing to exceed the 5 minute rule

The Mayor accepted a request for Councillor Miranda Williams to exceed the 5 minute rule in respect of Item 16.

6 Submission of Petitions

The following petitions were presented at the meeting:

Subject and Number of Signatures	Presenting Councillor	Lead Department
Urgent Relaunch of Traffic Management Scheme For West Greenwich 14 signatures	Aidan Smith	Directorate Communities, Environment and Central

7 Petition Responses

Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald as Ward Councillor spoke on behalf of the lead petitioner, Barbara Ward, in relation to the petition response set out in Appendix 3 of the report, expressing the problems the petitioner, who was disabled, experienced.

Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport explained the measures that were proposed and indicated that Officers were planning a site visit and that there would be a statutory consultation imminently.

The Mayor invited Melanie Aspey on behalf of Sally Hughes to address Council in relation to the petition response set out in Appendix 4 of the report. Melanie Aspey commented on the detrimental effect of the West Greenwich LTN scheme on the lives of people who were not so well off in the borough, for example those who worked as carers or received care. She urged the Council when considering a new scheme that they look at everybody's benefits and disadvantages. She commented on the difficulties some people had experienced with the consultation on the previous scheme and hoped that would be addressed.

Councillor Spencer Drury, as the Ward Councillor who had submitted the petition at Appendix 5, thanked petitioners and Officers and noted that a new planning application was to be submitted

As there had been a clerical error in the printing of Appendices 1,2 3 and 4 the Mayor with the agreement of Council deferred the petition responses to the next meeting.

8 Public Deputations on matters not otherwise on the agenda

The Mayor noted that there were no public deputations.

9 Public Questions

The Mayor stated that Council had received 15 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 25 written questions had been received from Members of the Council. The questions and replies, together with the

supplementary questions 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 Pat Slattery asked the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport if she could comment on the replacement for the LTN for West Greenwich. Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport advised that they had to wait for the outline of the Transport Strategy because they had to look at the area as a whole.

Councillor Aidan Smith asked the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport when the Transport Strategy was to be published. Councillor Sarah Merrill, Cabinet Member for Environment, Sustainability and Transport replied that it was due in the summer.

Councillor Charlie Davis asked the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement whether the Beat Stop scheme had now been launched. Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement indicated the scheme was expected to launch during the beginning of the purdah period.

Councillor Matt Clare asked the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Good Growth if there were plans to address deterioration in Eltham High Street, Passey Place for example had been damaged by contractors, there were sinking pavements outside some of the High Street premises, and were contractors going to be held accountable. Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Good Growth said she would get Officers to look into it and she would send him a written response.

Councillor Pat Greenwell suggested to the Leader of the Council that when he undertook a site visit to Eltham High Street that he also look at the problem of delivery bikes there. Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council agreed to add it to the itinerary.

Councillor Ann-Marie Cousins asked the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement what the enforcement would be for the final traffic schemes, considering the issues that arose from the LTNs. Councillor Jackie Smith, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement replied that the Council was committed to CPZs across

the borough so that there would be no displacement. Work was being done on a kerbside parking policy. Consideration would have to be given to resources and how wardens were deployed.

*

Councillor Olu Babatola ask Councillor Linda Bird for more copies of the book she produced from her time as Mayor during the pandemic for distribution. Councillor Linda Bird said the book had been a reflection of the community they all lived in. She thanked the communication team for production. The Mayor congratulated Councillor Bird on the book.

11 Matters for early debate

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

12 Pay Policy Statement 2022-23

Councillor Linda Perks, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, moved the recommendations.

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

Resolved –

That the Pay Policy Statement for 2022/2023 as outlined at Appendix A of the report be adopted and its publication on the Council's web site be agreed.

13 Overview and Scrutiny Report 2020-22

Councillor Chris Lloyd, Chair of Overview and Scrutiny, moved the report.

Councillor David Stanley said a problem had arisen in that the Scrutiny Members had been advised that Scrutiny could not put forward recommendations to this meeting of Council, on the basis that Scrutiny did not have the powers to comment on decision making powers on the Silvertown Tunnel. It was felt this advice was contrary to the Local Government Act 2000. Councillor Spencer Drury expressed his agreement on the point that had been raised. Councillor Drury added there was work to be done on engagement with housing associations and registered providers which was not mentioned in the report.

The Mayor commented that the legal advice that had been given was clear in the report.

Councillor Spencer Drury requested that the 20 year-old photograph of Severndroog Castle in the report be replaced with a current photograph.

Resolved –

That the Overview and Scrutiny Report 2020-22 as set out at Appendix A of the report be noted.

14 Members' Allowances Scheme 2022 23

The Mayor moved the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Nigel Fletcher spoke in support of the recommendations, but hoped that suggestions that had been previously made by the minority group about having fewer special responsibility allowances and a smaller Cabinet would be looked at by the new administration. Councillor Jackie Smith noted the time put in by Cabinet Members and those with special responsibilities. She commented on the effect of the removal of councillors from the pension scheme. She hoped that local councils would not revert to a situation whereby only those with a substantial private income could afford to hold positions.

Councillor Matt Clare commented on the seeming increasing requirement for councillors to do things during the day and whether that might detrimentally affect recruitment of councillors, and thus weaken the diversity of the Council. Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, said he took on board the point that had been made

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

Resolved –

- 1 That all Councils are required to make annually a scheme for the payment of allowances to Councillors and the scheme must include a basic allowance payable equally to all Councillors, and may include provision for special responsibility allowances be noted.
- 2 That it be agreed to re-adopt the London Councils' Independent Remuneration Panel for the purposes of advising the Royal Borough of Greenwich in formulating its Members' Allowances Scheme for the

next four municipal years (2022/23–2025/26) as each authority must have regard to the recommendations of such an independent panel.

- 3 That a new report has been published by the London Councils' Independent Remuneration Panel and this is attached as Appendix B be noted.
- 4 That the Independent Remuneration Panel advises that the basic and special responsibility allowances should be increased in line with the local government pay settlement be noted.
- 5 That it be agreed to freeze the Basic Allowance, regardless of the outcome of the annual local government pay settlement.
- 6 That it be agreed to freeze the Special Responsibility Allowances regardless of the outcome of the annual local government pay settlement.
- 7 That instead of waiting the usual four years, the Independent Remuneration Panel will be commencing another review in the summer of 2022 with the aim of concluding and publishing a further report in the latter half of 2023 be noted.
- 8 That the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2022-23 as attached at appendix I of the report be agreed and that Part 6 of the Council's Constitution be updated accordingly be agreed.

15 Annual report on Corporate Parenting

Councillor Matthew Morrow, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People moved the report.

Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, asked Members to reflect on the fact that they were the legal parent of children who were in the care of the authority. It was a serious responsibility, and they all had the duty to promote the best interests, outcomes and welfare of those children. He said he was amazed at the services that Greenwich provided and the outcomes that they got. He encouraged Members to actively scrutinize the outcomes of children in their care and work with the Directorate of Children's Services to ensure that Greenwich became the best corporate parent.

Councillor Pat Greenwell thanked the Director of Children's Services and the Senior Assistant Director, Children's Safeguarding & Social Care, for their work, and also the Children in Care Council saying they showed that services

work better with the involvement of young people. Councillor Greenwell noted that there was still a high proportion of looked after children who were placed outside of the borough. Councillor Greenwell agreed with Councillor Thorpe that awareness of corporate parenting needed to be raised across the Council.

The Mayor, on behalf of Council, thanked the Director of Finance and her team, and Councillor Matthew Morrow, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, for their work on the children and young people in the care of the local authority.

Resolved –

That the work of Children’s Services in relation to children in our care during 2020-2021 and on the areas identified for further action in 2021-2022.

16 Motion “Violence Against Women and Girls”

Councillor Denise Scott-McDonald moved the motion. Councillor Scott-McDonald said it was a sad state of affairs that in the modern world they had to raise the issue and demand justice and not be silenced. She recalled the death of Sabina Nessa and paid tribute to Annie Gibbs and the other women who had drawn attention to it. She noted the numbers of women killed in 2021 but emphasised they were not statistics: mothers sisters cousins aunts and daughters; violence against women did not discriminate, it cut across all sections of society, across all ages and classes. She said women would not be silent and recalled how the police had tried to silence the women on Clapham Common holding a vigil for Sarah Everard and the anger that had caused. She explained that the Council had undertaken an online survey and a women only listening session. Councillor Scott-McDonald said this had resulted in four strands of work: one on domestic abuse led by Councillor Jackie Smith, one looking at places where women do not feel safe led by Councillor Miranda Williams, one on equality, considering the issue for black and Asian women, and those living with disability, led Councillors Adel Khaireh and herself, and one on education of boys led by Councillors Matthew Morrow and Jackie Smith. Councillor Scott-McDonald concluded by following the example of Jess Phillips MP, and read out the names of women murdered by men recently.

In seconding the motion, Councillor Jackie Smith drew Members’ attention to what it had been like before the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 but emphasised that women still experienced harassment after all these years. She recollected personal experiences of unwanted physical contact on public transport, and said women felt unsafe anywhere. She highlighted that while

some murdered women get media mention those who were killed in domestic violence or through working in the sex industry were hardly mentioned. She noted that domestic violence also resulted in children being brought into care. She said change would require a lot of education of boys and young men, but also they needed to empower young women about what was and what was not acceptable. With sadness she noted that things had not changed for newer generations. They had to deal with the issue, they had to lobby the government, they themselves as a Council had to work with their communities and with women in their communities to make sure that this no longer happened.

Councillor Miranda Williams said as a society they must all stand up to misogyny and violence against women and girls, but highlighted that the term violence removed any reference to the perpetrator who was almost always a man. In most instances the perpetrator appeared to be an ordinary man and in a profession that meant most would regard them as being trustworthy. She related for the benefit of male colleagues in the Chamber the scenario of what women had to do and experienced walking home from the shops as it was getting dark. She said it was time for all men to step up and challenge the inappropriate behaviour of friends, peers and sons and they needed to be the best role models; boys and young men needed role models to show them how to treat women respectfully and as equals, and girls and young women needed positive male role models so that they could see how decent men behave so that they could then expect the same high standards from other men in their lives. She emphasised that women were tired of walking home with keys between their fingers, telling friends where they were at any moment, and were angry about being shamed about what they wore and angry that the levels of reporting and conviction of rape was so low because the victims feared that they would not be taken seriously. She said that for as long as women were being murdered by men and lived in fear of men and had to seek refuge from men then not enough was being done. Councillor Williams concluded that they needed to reach a point where they could wave off friends and loved ones knowing that they would not come to harm on their way home.

Councillors Dominic Mbang, Chris Lloyd, Danny Thorpe, Pat Greenwell, Denise Hyland, Sandra Bauer, Matt Clare, Odette McGahey, Ann-Marie Cousins, Matthew Morrow, Adel Khaireh, Linda Perks and Nigel Fletcher spoke in support of the motion. Statistics were given relating the numbers of women subject to physical and sexually violence, and from physical and sexual violence from an intimate partner or husband, and the numbers of deaths; and it was noted the survivors of violence often suffered mental

trauma and sexually transmitted diseases. It was said that most attacks began with a mindset of misogyny, for example insults shouted at women for what they were wearing. The issue of misogynoir was explained. Womens' human rights were violated day in and day out; reference was made to a 15-year-old black girl who was recently strip-searched by Police officers at her school in Hackney. Personal experiences were related, of sexual harassment at work and the misery it caused. It was highlighted that women were still paid less, and their work was seen as menial and unimportant, they were seen as worth less than men. They were living in a country where there had been two female Prime Ministers, women Home Secretaries and Foreign Secretaries yet women still could not walk around safely.

While Councils were trying to do what they could sadly the government was not moving as quickly in terms of prosecution of perpetrators and support for victims of rape; confidence in police and the judicial system was nowhere near what it should be. It was noted that the difficulties in prosecuting crimes that took place mainly behind closed doors meant that men were left with little or no disincentive to refrain from committing these crimes. They had to ask whether the justice system was fit for purpose.

It was commented that too many women suffered in silence. They needed a societal shift in mindset, a culture change. They needed to think about their responses when a girl told them something; how they reacted when someone told them what had happened to them could have a big impact on that person, too easily they were disbelieving or looking for ways to victim-blame. They needed to bring up young girls to feel respect for themselves and to stand up for themselves and defend their rights to be equal.

The problem was how men behaved. Any behaviour that demeaned, frightened or distressed women and girls was abuse and had to stop. It was important to educate boys; educate one and he would educate someone else. It was important for men to speak out if they saw something on social media or when out socialising otherwise they were part of the problem. Men had to take a leading role in pushing back against ideas that devalued women and to call out comments and actions that put women in danger. The [HER Centre](#) was running training, and it was hoped all male Councillors and staff would attend. Attention was drawn to the Mayor of London's [Have a Word](#) campaign which helped men think about their language and behaviour. The [Ask for Angela](#) campaign for use in licenced premises was noted. The Little Fish Theatre Company was doing good work in the borough teaching young men and boys to think about misogyny.

Members agreed that as a Council they needed to commit to doing everything within their power to bring violence against women and girls to an end.

In closing the debate, Councillor Scott-McDonald thanked every speaker. She gave a big thank you to Councillors Miranda Williams and Jackie Smith for their work on the matter.

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

Resolved –

This Council notes:

1. The local murders of Sabina Nessa, Constana Bunea, Naomi Hunte, and Khloemae Loy, along with Sarah Everard, Nicole Smallman and Bibaa Henry nationally have launched a wave of anger and protest across the country.
2. Blessing Olusogun's death remains unexplained.
3. Over the last twelve months, sadly 24 women have been killed through violence in London and four of them have been in the borough of Greenwich as mentioned above.
4. Violence & abuse against women & girls does not discriminate. It cuts across all sections of society, including age, race, faith, sexual orientation and class. We are aware that some women & girls are given more compassion than others.
5. Women & girls from marginalised communities and those with additional needs are even more likely to experience harassment, discrimination and abuse. Women & girls from diverse backgrounds experience abuse differently and male power is used against them differently.
6. Women & girls living in poverty are particularly vulnerable to experiencing violence and face disproportionate challenges in accessing the necessary support to make them safe.
7. Whilst serious physical assaults by strangers are rare, street harassment and violence against women and girls is endemic in the UK:
 - o 80% of women of all ages have been sexually harassed in public
 - o 97% of young women have been sexually harassed
 - o One in two women are sexually harassed in the workplace
 - o One in three women experience domestic violence in their lifetime
 - o One in five women will be raped in their lifetime
 - o 2 women a week are killed by a current or former partner, and 3 women take their own lives following domestic abuse

This Council believes:

1. Male violence against women & girls is part of a broader culture of misogyny in society.
2. Tackling violence against women & girls means dismantling this culture and tackling other forms of discrimination and the economic system that further enables abuse against women & girls.
3. That a justice system that allows one of the most heinous crimes to be effectively decriminalised is not fit-for-purpose. Sustained cuts to all elements of the justice system, as well as institutional misogyny mean that crimes against women & girls that are reported are not effectively investigated or prosecuted. The decision to fail to resource this work adequately is a political choice by the Government.

This Council resolves to:

1. Stand in solidarity with community groups and protestors against all forms of violence & abuse against women & girls
2. Campaign for misogyny to be legally recognised as a hate crime
3. Call on the Mayor of London, our police and crime commissioner to prioritise investigating crimes against women & girls and ask him to ensure that people are supported, not discouraged, when they report a crime
4. Call on the Government to ratify the Istanbul Convention on preventing and combatting VAWG
5. Call on the Government to ratify the International Labour Organisation's Convention No.190, recognising the right of everyone to work free from gender based violence and harassment.
6. Support the White Ribbon pledges and White Ribbon Day events.
7. Educate our society, especially men & boys through campaigns and bringing in male 'allies'
8. To make it easier for victims to feel supported when they report a crime
9. To ensure that there are multiple channels available to report violence & abuse against women & girls e.g., online, text, phone, QR codes etc
10. To ensure that there is a joined-up approach across different departments across the council, and our wider partners, to tackle the issue.
11. To continue to support and endorse the work of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Violence Against Women & Girls task-force action plan which prioritises women's public safety, domestic abuse, education and equalities
12. Call on our partners and individuals to sign the Royal Borough of Greenwich Women's Safety Charter. The Charter sends a clear

message to anyone who lives, works, studies or visits the borough that the safety of all women & girls is a priority.

Under the Constitutional meeting procedures A1.95, Council agreed to extend the time of the meeting by another half an hour.

17 Motion “Pause all work on the Silvertown Tunnel”

Councillor Chris Lloyd moved the motion. He hoped that they had now reached a consensus on the matter and would call for a pause and review of the Tunnel.

In seconding the motion Councillor Gary Parker noted the climate emergency and that matters had changed. He highlighted that the Council was committed to reducing traffic and so that had to be taken into account in considering the Tunnel.

Councillor Nigel Fletcher moved an amendment to the motion. He said that the Conservative group were in principle in favour of a tunnel to reduce congestion and problems at the Blackwall Tunnel but not without qualification, and had been since the consultation in 2015. He said they had met with campaigners opposed to the Tunnel. He suggested that it was only at the last minute that the Labour group had agreed for such a motion: it was all too little and too late and stood no realistic prospect of success, and that the Labour group had tried to face both ways over the issue over the last years. He suggested the amendment could even at this stage amend TfL’s scheme. He detailed the alternatives given in the amendment.

Councillor Matt Clare seconded the amendment. He noted the Tunnel was controversial and that there was local opposition to it. The problems at Blackwall Tunnel had to be addressed. Even though the Silvertown Tunnel would increase traffic flow it was likely that there would be more traffic. The proposed amendments offered alternatives including use of public traffic. The Silvertown Tunnel could not be stopped, therefore they needed to consider alternative to make it more acceptable to local people.

Councillor Chris Lloyd did not accept the amendment.

Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, spoke against the amendment. He acknowledged there were many differing views on the Tunnel, which had been proposed by Boris Johnson when he had been Mayor of London. He noted that Conservative group had not brought a motion to Council on the subject before. He said the Council was not the

best forum for a public meeting on the subject of the Tunnel. He recalled that he had written to the Mayor of London in 2019 requesting a pause and review, and had written recently after Scrutiny in February. He noted the Mayor of London's record in improving air quality and the success of the ULEZ. It was recognised that the car industry was changing. He commented on the government's dealing with TfL which resulted in disruption.

Councillors Chris Lloyd spoke against the amendment. He said that the motion had been taken from the recommendation by the Regeneration, Transport and Culture Scrutiny Panel and had been supported by the leader of the Conservative group. It was felt the Conservative group's support for public transport contrasted with a recent call to bring more cars into congested town centre car parks. He commented that Conservative group had not chosen to bring a motion to Council until now.

Councillors Matt Hartley spoke in favour of the amendment. He emphasised that any review that led to no change would be extremely costly to the taxpayer and would have no actual benefit. Rather than a symbolic review he suggested Council agree to support the alternative options in the amendment. Doing nothing was not an option as it did not address the problems at the Blackwall Tunnel. He dismissed the idea of tolling the Blackwall Tunnel as that would be punitive. Councillor Hartley felt that the Council had not made the case for a DLR extension to the south of the borough.

Councillor Sarah Merrill spoke against the amendment. She commented on Clive Efford MPs campaigning for the extension of the DLR to the south of the borough. TfL had told him what was possible and about the final requirements. She said TfL had no money because of the Prime Minister, Boris Johnson.

Councillor Chris Lloyd closed the debate on the amendment.

The Mayor put the amendment to the vote and with the minority group in favour and the majority group against it was not carried.

Councillors Charlie Davis and Nigel Fletcher spoke on the motion. They queried what was the Leader of the Council's position on the Silvertown Tunnel. It was felt questions and public deputations had not been allowed on the matter. It was felt the matter should be debated by Council, rather than a letter from the Leader of the Labour group which had not been published.

Councillor Chris Lloyd closed the debate on the motion.

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

Resolved –

This Council is calling on the Mayor of London and Transport for London to pause all work on the Silvertown Tunnel project immediately pending a review to take into account the Climate Emergency and the Borough's Climate Neutral Plan agreed in November 2021. This follows formal recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny meeting held on 16 February 2022 which followed the Transport and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel meeting (held in December 2021).

Council notes that following the meeting of the Council's main Overview and Scrutiny Committee met on the 16 February 2022, the Leader has written to the Mayor of London to outline these recommendations and request their consideration.

18 Motion “Review decision to impose a charge on testing kits for COVID 19”

Councillor Linda Bird moved the motion. She said with incidences of Covid on the rise they were going to need more kits. The government had not issued any guidance, and they could end up being expensive for many families, particularly vulnerable families with financial difficulties.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Stephen Brain.

Councillor Matt Hartley moved an amendment to the motion. He spoke to the amendment as published.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Nigel Fletcher.

Councillor Linda Bird did not accept the amendment.

Councillor Linda Perks, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, spoke against the amendment. She advised that the money referred to in the amendment was for recovery of their residents from the pandemic. She contrasted the minority group's position with their position opposing devolving the test and trace system to the local authority.

Councillor John Fahy spoke against the amendment. He noted the minority group had been denial about the failures of the government during the pandemic but now they expected the Council to bail the government out on this issue. While the Prime Minister might believe the pandemic was over it was not, and many people in China and New Zealand were in lockdown. He suggested the government should provide the equipment so that people could feel safe.

Councillor Linda Bird closed the debate on the amendment.

The Mayor put the amendment to the vote and with the minority group in favour and the majority group against it was not carried.

Councillor Linda Bird closed the debate on the motion.

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

Resolved –

This Council calls upon the government to review their decision to impose a charge on testing kits for COVID 19.

This Council recognises that most families will be disadvantaged by the introduction of a charge on the packs, which have until now been freely available.

We believe that frontline workers such as nurses, doctors , care workers and home carers, should automatically receive free testing for COVID.

We also believe that families on low income, those who already rely on support through Foodbanks and those who are vulnerable should automatically continue to receive free testing.

We also believe that those who are over 65 should continue to receive free testing.

We also recognise that this action will result in fewer people testing their symptoms, which could lead to a rise in cases.

Therefore, we do not support this government's plans to introduce the charge.

The meeting closed at 10.55 pm

Chair

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

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

Reply –

I thank Jeremy Phipps for his question.

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank John Robb and Jessica Ballantine for their question.

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

We will work on developing proposed alternative schemes.

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

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

Reply -

I thank Tim Anderson for his question.

As per Question 2

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply -

I thank James Montgomery for his question.

As per Question 1

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

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

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

Reply -

I thank Shevaun Pearce for her question.

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Eibhleann Radford for her question.

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply -

I thank Eibhleann Radford for her question.

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply -

I thank Fiona Moore for her question.

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

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

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

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

Supplementary Question -

When will we see the plan to reduce traffic by 45% by 2030, what are the timescales?

Reply -

The initial framework for the Council's Transport Strategy was expected to be in place by the summer

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply -

I thank Fiona Moore for her question.

As per Question 8

Supplementary Question -

How soon will be there some new traffic measures for East and West Greenwich?

Reply -

They had to look at the area holistically. The expectation was they would have a framework in place by the summer from which they could then work forward on a scheme.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply -

I thank Stella Bye for her question.

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

Responses were analysed and duplicates were removed.

Supplementary Question (Fiona Moore on behalf of Stella Bye) -

When are you going to publish the results of the Westcombe Park and Maze Hill consultation?

Reply -

It was published earlier in the year on the Council's website

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply -

I thank Stella Bye for her question.

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply -

I thank Simon Radford for his question.

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply -

I thank Simon Radford for his question.

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

Supplementary Question -

The consultants' report did not say they will be but that they could be, and that disabled people were positively benefited by the scheme?

Reply -

The report indicated those with disabilities within the scheme were not disadvantaged but those travelling through the scheme were

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply -

I thank Sarah Phipps for her question.

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

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Sarah Phipps for her question.

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Would you be able to supply a list of the representations and discussions the Council has had with TfL and the Mayor of London since 2015? And what meetings have you or predecessors had with regard to other river crossings?

Reply -

It would be disproportionately time consuming to provide all that detail. There were ongoing discussions about a DLR extension to Thamesmead.

Councillor Danny Thorpe, Leader of the Council, explained that he was Chair of a cross party group developing a business case for a DLR extension to Thamesmead, which should be ready by the summer.

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

Can the Cabinet for Finance and Resources state -

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

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

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

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Why was there no review of the CIL in 2018?

Reply -

I will look into why it was thought it had been the Council's intention in 2014 to review the CIL and get back to you.

I would like to add that a comparison had been made with Lewisham; Lewisham had commissioned a company to do the initial stages of a review for them but when they saw the results they took the decision not to proceed and thus it was incorrect to say Lewisham has increased its charges as a result of a review

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX B

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

Discretionary Grants

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

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

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Nigel Fletcher for his question.

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

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

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Could she consider embedded cables in pavements?

Reply -

At the moment they were looking at faster charging points and lamppost charging

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Why was the decision delegated to the Leader and will the Cabinet Member or the Leader commit to the decision being decided prior to purdah?

Reply –

Questions about the Council's Constitution should be directed to the Council's Monitoring Officer

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

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

Supplementary Question -

When will the review be completed and will the available options in relation to the tram sheds be published?

Reply -

I can't confirm a date as it's on going and it takes about four years to complete all the properties, but it will definitely be published

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

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

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

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Charlie Davis for his question.

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

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Does he think it's likely a crane will be found, and how long might the work take place?

Reply –

As soon as they got a crane they would have timescales for works

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

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

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

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

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

Supplementary Question -

How confident were they that any new scheme will not be as disruptive and divisive as the mess which you recently cancelled?

Reply –

Residents can be very confident that anything going forward will be equitable

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

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

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Geoffrey Brighty for his question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

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

RBG Building Control will follow up with the O2.

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

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

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Will the Council now commit to being open to part funding the extension should that be a decisive factor in bringing it to Greenwich?

Reply -

In view of government cuts unfortunately I can't make that commitment

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Clare for his question.

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Could they get a car club in place?

Reply -

It is on our priority list as something for us to incorporate in the final Transport Strategy

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Is the Council actively using the rebate and the prospect of a quick payment to encourage more households to sign up to pay by direct debit?

Reply -

Yes. They now had a council tax online system which makes it a lot easier to pay; they were drafting letters which will explain how people can pay council tax by direct debit and encourage them to register online

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Are you prepared to write to the Mayor and to MOPAC and formally request that they rule out Greenwich taking part in any such pilot?

Reply –

We do not know what the remit of the proposal is, there had been no discussions with Greenwich or Bexley boroughs. The Leader of the Council has talked with both the Deputy Mayor of London and the Mayor of Lewisham but until Greenwich knew what the details of that pilot were, I can not say no to something we know little about

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Matt Hartley for his question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Could you share the Council's written submission from back in January?

Reply -

I can show you the response we made

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for his question.

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

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

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

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

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for her question.

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Would it be possible to have a site visit, or maybe they could have a meeting with some local schoolchildren to find out what their ideas are to actually improve the sign?

Reply –

I will have a site visit with you

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Pat Greenwell for her question.

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

No supplementary question

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

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

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

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

Supplementary Question -

Why were they still waiting for this cafe to be re-opened?

Reply –

There was nothing unusual about the process

COUNCIL

16 MARCH 2022

MEMBERS QUESTIONS

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

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

Reply –

I thank Councillor Spencer Drury for his question.

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

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

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

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

No supplementary question