



# **LIST OF PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Public questions and answers for the Council Meeting of the London Borough of Lewisham to be held on Wednesday 23 November 2022.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 1**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Heather Gilmore

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

When the council rents its properties through a letting agency, what percentage does the agency retain & do they have responsibility for repairs like broken boilers, windows, doors etc and issues with damp & mould?

**Reply**

Letting agents are often used to market and let vacant properties within the Council's commercial portfolio. Their letting fees vary but are typically around 10% of the first years rent. Commercial letting agents do not have responsibility for repairs. Depending on the nature of the lease, that responsibility usually lies with the tenant or the property owner (Council).

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 2**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Andy Worthington

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Why are the temporary residents in 2-30a Reginald Road (on the housing list, mostly women with children) not being offered new homes in the Frankham Street development?

**Reply**

Working in partnership with Peabody, 79 new social rent homes are currently in construction on the site of the Former Tidemill School. A further 38 social rented homes are to be delivered on the site of 2-30a Reginald Road and so the Council needs to get vacant possession of the properties.

All of the original tenants of 2-30a Reginald Road were entitled to an offer of a new home on the Former Tidemill School site next door to Reginald Road or a new home on the linked site at Amersham Vale or a home through the Council's choice based letting scheme FindYourHome. The majority of the original residents have already moved with the remaining having a new build home allocated to them to move into when they are ready in the new year.

When original tenants have moved, the Council has used the vacated properties as temporary accommodation. This has prevented households from being allocated accommodation that may have been a hostel, B&B and/or out of the borough. The temporary arrangement is made clear to residents. The new homes that are not allocated to original residents will be let via FindYourHome and allocated to eligible households in line with the Council's Allocation Policy.

Officers are working with the remaining temporary residents and will offer them alternative housing.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 3**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Shaka Anderson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Please can the Mayor outline his vision for Catford and explain how the Catford Island site proposals align with this? Has he discussed his plans with Lowick Group lately?

**Reply**

The vision for Catford is set out in the Council's adopted Catford Framework which can be found here: <https://lewisham.gov.uk/inmyarea/regeneration/catford-regeneration/catford-town-centre-framework>. The Catford Island development will be subject to a formal planning application. As part of that assessment, officers will need to determine the scheme in accordance with adopted policies but will also want to understand how that scheme meets the Council's vision for Catford. It would be premature to judge how that schemes aligns with that vision prior to that submission being made and assessed.

The Mayor has met with the developer of the site and their representatives to understand more about their plans.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 4**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Paul Howarth

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

The Hither Green West Campaign is a resident-led campaign set up to help make Hither Green (west of the railway line) the best place it can be.

At the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel meeting on Tuesday 16 March 2021, (see: agenda item 7d titled "2020-21 Cycle Hangars Programme") the Executive Director of Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm agreed the installation of several cycle hangars, including two at the following locations:

- Brightside Road
- Courthill Road

For full details see paragraph 5.4 (second bullet)

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s78799/Item%207d%20-%202020-21%20Cycle%20Hangars%20Programme.pdf>

Unfortunately, 1 year 7 months later and neither of these cycle hangars have been installed.

Please can you confirm when these promised cycle hangars will be installed at the locations Brightside Road and Courthill Road.

**Reply**

Unfortunately there has been a delay to some cycle hangers due to resource constraints and cycle hanger availability. The Council will prioritise these two areas and officers will directly engage with your selves on this matter by the end of this month.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 5**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Alan Hall

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

Can the Mayor outline what are his proposals for any disused nuclear bunkers within the Council's estates?

**Reply**

There are no proposals at this time.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 6**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Julia Webb

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Despite an overwhelmingly positive public consultation response, the Director of Planning refused designation of our Bell Green Neighbourhood Area. She imposed instead a different area, one third of its size, just 50% of which is residential.

Disproportionate weight was given to objections from four councillors, Louise Krupski, John Muldoon, John Paschoud, and James-J Walsh. The three Rushey Green councillors' joint response was submitted two weeks after the consultation closed to the public.

1. Were councillor responses given greater weight than those from individual residents?
2. Were councillor responses accepted when it appeared to the public that the consultation had closed?
3. Please will you provide the time and date of each response considered, that was submitted after the closing date of 7th July?
4. Please will you confirm the Rushey Green councillors' assertion that the BGNA intersects with the Catford Opportunity Area is totally incorrect? It abuts the COA, but doesn't overlap

**Reply**

The Council remains satisfied that the decision taken to designate a reduced area for the Bell Green Neighbourhood Area was made appropriately and in accordance with relevant guidance and legislation. Councillor responses were not given greater weight than any members of the public and all late responses were considered up to the point that the decision was made as is normal practice in the Planning Service. The exact timing of each response has already been released under FOI and a copy of that will be provided directly to the questioner. The boundary of the Bell Green neighbourhood area as applied for did not overlap with the Catford opportunity area

although it should be noted that such an assertion had no bearing on the decision to designate a smaller area.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 7**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Helen Kinsey

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

The City of London were allowed to damage a Cedar by beginning works and putting a container on Lammas Green, on Sydenham Hill, all before a Tree Protection Plan could be assessed and put in place, why was this ?

**Reply**

Officers were made aware that a container had been placed on Lammas Green, damaging a tree in connection with maintenance works to Lammas Green properties. This is separate to the approved Mais House development and therefore conditions applied to that development have no relevance. As soon as the Council became aware of the damage to the tree, they contacted the City of London to raise concerns and ensure that adequate measures were introduced to avoid further damage.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 8**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Jane Alaszewski

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

The council has accepted that blue badge holders and SEN transport need exemption to enter the LTN. What are the grounds for excluding all SEN transport and most blue badge holders from accessing school streets and has an EQIA been conducted for school streets?

The current exemptions listed on the council website are:

- o Residents of the street.
- o Blue Badge Holding teachers, pupils and parents, carers, and other staff at the school where the restriction is present.
- o Carers of residents of the street (approved by resident's GP that they require physical care due to health/physical conditions).

**Reply**

School streets are designed to restrict vehicles from entering the school street area at the times shown on the signs and are not the same as an LTN. Exemptions are kept to a minimum in order to keep as many motor vehicles away from the school gate as possible at school drop off and pick up times, in order to protect children's safety and encourage more sustainable forms of travel.

Parents and school staff are not offered exemption permits, however the Council does offer those with a blue badge the opportunity to access the school gate area in order to drop off their children or to gain legitimate access to the school street area. Using the school street as a through route during the times of operation would go against the objectives of the scheme.

The school street restrictions only apply on weekdays during the school term time and only affect short stretches of road within the overall LTN area ensuring that alternative routes for blue badge holders and SEN transport, not requiring access to the school street area, are available.

An EqIA was carried out in November 2021 on the Lewisham and Lee Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood. It concluded that the LTN measures had a positive overall

impact although recognised that those needing to use a motor vehicle to reach their destination in the area the journey time may take longer but this was generally off set by improvements to air quality, safety, noise and wellbeing.

The school streets have been introduced under an 18 month Experimental Traffic Order, which gives the Council the ability to monitor and assess its impacts before a decision is made whether to amend the schemes, make them permanent or remove them. The issue raised of blue badge and SEN transport access to the school streets will be monitored as part of this review process.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 9**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Louise Leatham

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Either ennersdale or dermoody one of the roads needs to be opened in both directions , the amount of noisey vehicles, the constant road blocks and horn blowing because of that, we have more cars on Pascoe road than ever the air quality has deteriorated and next to a school too, think about it.

One of the roads needs to open, how do you expect us to seroulsly teach Lewisham hospital in an emergency , this i need answering, the road either one needs to be opened both ways ,

**Reply**

All destinations are accessible through the LTN. The council continues to monitor this scheme and has undertaken surveys previously to assess its success as per the links below. The scheme was designed to reduce through traffic and removing these restrictions would compromise the effectiveness of the scheme.

The programme of surveys to assess the operation of the LTN is below. Please see the following links below of reports to the Mayor & Cabinet sessions of January 2022 and September 2022, which will give more detail on this:

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=7912&Ver=4>

A further review of the LTN in planned in the spring of 2023.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 10**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Viresh Padhiar

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

When will something be done about flytipping? The whole of downham has a foul smell to it. It's embarrassing.

**Reply**

The Council has taken a tough stance against those engaged in fly tipping. We have created a team of pro-active Environmental Crime Officers who investigate incidences of fly tipping. Between April and October this year, they have issued 113 fixed penalty notices for fly tipping and littering offences in Downham Ward. Since the Environmental Crime Team was created in August 2021 they have issued nearly 2500 fixed penalty notices for environmental crime offences across the borough.

Please use the Love Clean Street App to report fly tipping and the enviro- crime team will investigate and take action. This will greater assist in dealing with such issues.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 11**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Joanne King

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Since the Hither Green West (HGW) Controlled Parking Zone was introduced over 20 years ago its hours of operation - 09.00- 19.00 hours Monday to Friday have never been reviewed, yet an adjacent zone in Lee Green has since its introduction, had the hours reviewed and reduced to 10.00-12.00 Monday to Friday. Why has a review not taken place of the HGW zone and what is the justification /reasoning for not reducing the hours to 10.00-12.00 as this will still achieve the main aim of the Zone's introduction which was to deter commuter parking at Hither Green station.

**Reply**

A report is scheduled to be presented to the Council's Mayor and Cabinet in December 2022 which seeks approval to formulate a programme to review the borough's existing CPZs. This will include the Hither Green West area.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 12**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Annie Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Please provide the amount of Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) issued from March 2021 to March 2022 in the two following locations:

A) Ennersdale Road SE13

B) Dermody Road SE13

**Reply**

A) March 2021 to March 2022: 1573, in comparison to 6535 for the same period 2020 to 2021

B) March 2021 to March 2022: 58906, in comparison to 77422 for the same period 2020 to 2021

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 13**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Dan Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Why haven't you done any traffic counts since 2020 on the actual boundary roads of the Lee Green LTN?

The heavily affected boundary roads include Burnt Ash Road, Burnt Ash Hill, Lee High Road, Lee Road and St Mildred's Road.

Why are these same boundary roads not included in as part of the monitoring?  
What is the reasoning behind this?

**Reply**

The approach taken is the consistent strategy agreed by the Council for the monitoring of the Lewisham and Lee Green LTN and has been for some time. The monitoring surveys were utilised to assess the performance of the LTN and the surrounding areas. No further surveys were deemed necessary and would be a significant cost to the Council.

Overall a significant number of traffic surveys were monitored across 55 locations within and outside of the LTN at different periods of time to understand the effects of the scheme.

Initial traffic count data was collected in March 2019 as part of the preparatory work for the Lewisham and Lee Green Healthy Neighbourhood. When the LTN was introduced it was understood that the 2019 traffic counts did not cover the entire area so additional data was collected in June 2020 to provide indicative information based on similar streets. Both the March 2019 and June 2020 traffic counts form the Council's prescheme data. As part of the monitoring of the original scheme, additional data capture was undertaken in October 2020 to cover the 'original LTN', and then a survey was undertaken in February 2021 to provide an insight into the operation of the 'revised LTN' as introduced in November 2020 and recently surveys have been undertaken in April 2022 to understand the impact under limited Covid restrictions.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 14**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Frances Sheehan

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

I would like to know why the privileged few enjoy a private roads RE: LTN and the rest of us have to put up with a lot more fast traffic causing more pollution than ever

**Reply**

The roads within the LTN are predominantly public highway and can be accessed by all motorists. Measures were implemented to discourage traffic cutting through this area which were reviewed, with amendments, to ensure the scheme achieved its outcomes to reduce traffic dominance, improved safety and air quality.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 15**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Robert Ashdown

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Despite your decision to make it permanent, we understand you are monitoring the results. My question is: what criteria would the LTN need to meet for it to be removed?

**Reply**

There will be a further monitoring exercise undertaken by the Council in the spring of next year. The surveys will be compared against previous results and a conclusion given.

The success criteria for the scheme includes a reduction of through traffic, improvement in road safety and an improvement in air quality.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 16**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Deone Costley

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

The draft Lower Sydenham and Bell Green Vision document was considered by the Sustainable Development Select Committee on 14th January 2021 (minutes pasted below). The future location of Lower Sydenham station was specifically raised as a key decision.

- What progress has been made by the Officers on this draft document?
- Can the cabinet member please update the Council on the current status of the BG&LS Vision Study?
- Is it to be incorporated into the draft Lewisham Local Plan?
- If there is, what is the status of the "more detailed masterplan" (as quoted from Section 6.3 of the Sustainable Development Select Committee on 14th January 2021"?)

Minutes from the Sustainable Development Select Committee held on the 14th January 2021:

5.1 James Masini (Principal Development and Land Manager) introduced the report – setting out the initial work on the development of a vision for Bell Green and Lower Sydenham in anticipation of the future extension of the Bakerloo line.

5.2 James Masini responded to questions from the Committee – the following key points were noted:

- The proposed location of the station and its surroundings would be key in determining the density of housing that could be provided.
- The potential heights of buildings was at a very early stage of consideration.
- Future designs would meet the Council's accessibility requirements.

- Housing and roads would be designed to minimise impact on residents – whilst acknowledging that access for buses and traffic would be a necessary part of the townscape.
- Further work would be carried out to manage traffic movement and access for double deck buses on Southend Lane.

5.3 In the Committee's discussion – the following key points were also noted:

- The predominance of roads in the Bell Green and Lower Sydenham area separated the neighbourhood into disconnected parts.
- The importance of the work carried out by the Sydenham Society on a vision for the area.
- There were a number of issues with the location of the existing Lower Sydenham station (including lack of knowledge in the community about its location).

5.4 Resolved: that the report be noted."

## **Reply**

Work on the Lower Sydenham and Bell Green Visioning document completed in 2019 and no recent work has been undertaken, including on a more detailed masterplan. The document has no formal status and was prepared in anticipation of future masterplanning across the site. While the study itself does not form part of the Local Plan evidence base, as a study of the area commissioned by the Council, the outcomes of the work have been considered to help inform appropriate locations for tall buildings and their maximum height ranges.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 17**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Clare Bermingham

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Lee Green LTN - Why has this area been selected or more to the point who has selected it and where do they live? Lee High Road and the South circular are two of the busiest routes for those who have to drive to work. By forcing residents within the LTN to exit this green paradise you have increased the traffic and this traffic is emitting more pollution crawling in first gear than it was when moving. Lee High Road constantly has roadworks for some reason or other and that is when drivers need to use rat runs. My own road is a rat run and providing speed limits are adhered to I would rather be on a bus that could move than be stuck in traffic. I think this has been very divisive and badly landed.

**Reply**

The vast majority of road works on the public highway, within Lewisham, are undertaken by utility companies. Under law these works are authorised by the Council as the highway authority by means of the London Permit Scheme. According to our records 16 sets of road works have taken place on Lee Road in the last 11 months. Some of these are planned works and some unplanned as are associated with utility emergency works.

Applications for any planned works are assessed against strict criteria and are either approved, refused or amended depending on the result of the Council's assessment. The specific details agreed include the proposed start and end dates of the works. End dates may be amended once works have started due to unforeseen circumstances, including where works are unplanned emergencies.

The works referred to that started on the 27th October were emergency works to repair a gas leak by the utility provider. As is common with gas leak excavations the hole often needs to remain open until gas in the area has dissipated and reached a safe level, which can sometimes take several days. Once open, excavations for gas leaks cannot legally be reinstated until fully repaired and certified as safe. According to council records the works were completed on the 8th November.

Where utilities and other contractors working on the highway overstay their agreed permit duration or break the rules of the London Permit Scheme the Council will seek to use enforcement powers available under the relevant legislation where appropriate, including fines.

Please also see the report to Mayor and Cabinet in January 2022 as per the link below:  
<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 18**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Mrs Johns

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

With so many people complaining about the LTNs and the latest idea from yourselves to install cameras to enable you to fine drivers, could the council in its entirety please confirm that none of them has friends, family or associates living in the LTNS and where the council gets their mandate from considering the backlash from Lewisham residents?

**Reply**

The Council is implementing changes to the LTN as per the agreed Mayor & Cabinet decisions of January 2022 as per the link below:

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>

Any inference of any unprofessional behaviour is refuted.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 19**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Jodie Rowlinson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

LTN in the surrounding area se12 8dl

What is the purpose of LTN?

Since LTN has been in place what are the pollution levels?

How can resident get a fair vote on LTN?

How much has been spent on LTN?

Why have the barriers now been removed

LTN has increased traffic in the area, increased journey times, and i have to sit at traffic lights every time i leave my house, instead of being able to cut through a side road, LTN is a major inconvenience to residents.

**Reply**

The information requested to this question is publically available on the Council's website. Please see the following links below to reports of the Mayor & Cabinet sessions of January 2022 and September 2022 where this requested information can be found:

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=139&MIId=7912&Ver=4>

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 20**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Donna Davis

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

If some of the streets in the LTN are one way streets or no through roads, and emergency vehicles can travel the wrong way up a one way street, why don't you formally make the LTN streets one way streets or no through roads by putting signs up and, for no through roads, putting locked gates across them instead of just having cameras on them.

**Reply**

Initially barriers were used for the modal filters which were installed within the LTN. However, following liaison with the emergency services the Council agreed to convert these measures to camera enforcement variants to allow emergency services to have unfettered access during blue light emergencies.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 21**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: John Keidan

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Sophie Davis

**Question**

Housing Associations are significant providers of social housing in Lewisham, especially following the decision, now some years ago, to transfer to registered social landlords a sizeable portion of what was, until then, the Council's own stock. Meanwhile, it is acknowledged that housing emissions represent a considerable proportion of the total CO2 emissions which the Council is committed to reduce towards zero.

In the context of the Declaration of a Climate Emergency by the Council in 2019, therefore, and the Council's aim to be a leader of the whole community of Lewisham, could the Mayor and Cabinet please set out:

- 1) what steps the housing associations operating in Lewisham have taken, or are planning to take, to move towards net zero in respect of their own stock?
- 2) what steps the Council has taken since 2019 to require and/or encourage the local housing associations to move towards net zero?; and
- 3) what resources the Council has made available to local housing associations to assist them in moving towards net zero - including information, training or personnel resources - with the understanding that the Council may well not be able to offer financial resources to assist in the transition?

**Reply**

- 1)  
Lewisham Homes' Board approved an Asset Management Strategy and a Sustainability Strategy in September 2021. The Sustainability Strategy sets out plans to improve Lewisham Homes' housing stock over the period 2021-2030. <https://www.lewishamhomes.org.uk/document/sustainability-strategy-2021-2030/> and is in line with the Lewisham Climate Emergency Strategic Action Plan. In 2021 Phoenix Community Housing published a Sustainability Strategy Update Framework 2021-2025

<https://www.phoenixch.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/PNB%20Sustainability%20Strategy%202021-25%20FINAL%20V2.pdf> which includes a plan illustrating the proposed staged approach to deliver Net Zero Carbon to all Phoenix properties and option appraisal and analysis of potential routes to achieving SAP band C for all properties by 2030 and 2050 Net Zero Carbon targets.

A wide range of social housing providers have stock in Lewisham and it is not possible to provide a full assessment of the steps each of them have taken towards reducing carbon. However the Council meets with registered providers on a regular basis and in September officers used this to raise awareness of and share information on the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund.

2)

In March 2022 the Council's Housing Retrofit Task & Finish Group published the outputs from its review setting out recommendations to the Council across a range of housing and retrofit issues including in relation to social housing. In September Mayor and Cabinet approved the response to those recommendations

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s102828/03%20Response%20to%20the%20recommendations%20of%20the%20Housing%20Retrofit%20Task%20and%20Finish%20Group.pdf>. This included the development of a new Housing Retrofit Strategy in 2023/24 and closer working with Lewisham Homes, Regenter, Phoenix Community Housing and other registered providers with social housing stock in the borough on retrofit and decarbonisation.

3)

The Council has worked closely with Lewisham Homes and with Phoenix Community Housing to support the development of bids for the Government's Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund, with the deadline for Wave 2.1 closing on 18 November. In addition officers in the Council convene a monthly informal sustainability meeting with sustainability leads and other relevant staff at Lewisham Homes, Phoenix Community Housing, Regenter, L&Q and Peabody. Topics covered recently by the group include retrofit funding, electric vehicle infrastructure, planning and conservation and rising energy bills.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 22**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Martin North

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Andre Bourne

**Question**

The Deptford Park area has been subject to ongoing housing development for at least 6 years, starting with the extensive Landings development and now Neptune Wharf giving a total of 1300+ units. In addition there is further extensive development approved for Trundleys Road. The occupants of these new units will have the benefit of being next to the attractive open space of two already well used parks and this has been emphasised by the developers in marketing briefs. This advantage is likely to have been used by Lewisham Planning in their negotiations with the developers over Section 106 funding.

There is an ongoing negative impact on the community as a result of these developments with pressure on public transport, services and infrastructure. The protracted construction work has added to the difficulties for current residents. Noise, disruption, dirt and dust inside and outside of homes and large numbers of constructor's vans and cars parked in the residential streets, denying space for others.

Residents now expect and articulate that as these developments are progressing work will commence on Deptford Park itself to bring it up to the standard required of an important green space in an area of very high population density, financed by the anticipated section 106 funding. We already know the park will be connected to Folkestone Gardens and funds are allocated for further improvements to that park. The council last contributed to major improvements to Deptford Park in 2008 and now extensive further works are required:-

- The childrens' playground needs refurbishing with activities added commensurate with a busy inner city play area.
- The old track railings need replacing/refurbishing as a feature of the park. Some are now quite dangerous.
- The old track area needs digging up and properly laid.
- Some pathways need to be relaid after poor repair work a short time ago.

Question:-

Will the council confirm what monies have been allocated for this work, what this money will cover and what is the anticipated programme of work?

**Reply**

I am not able to confirm at this time that the monies have been allocated for the work that you suggest is required regarding the old track railings, the old track or the footpaths,

The Parks team will be consulting with the friend's group in early in 2023 in relation to the playground improvements being funded via the Greening Fund Section106 and NCIL.

I can confirm however that we are committed to improving our parks and open spaces in the Evelyn Ward as can be demonstrated as follows:

In the north of the borough, the Council committed around £700,000 of s106 towards various open space projects in 2020-2021:

S106 funds that have recently been committed to Deptford Park are:

Year	Project	£
2020	A new roof to Deptford Park Pavilion (Retrofit a biodiversity living roof onto the Deptford park pavilion changing room	£12,500
2022	Deptford Park Play equipment (Installation of a bespoke piece of play equipment such as an oasis sand house/basket swing and bulb planting)	£12,041

Neighbourhood CIL (NCIL) monies recently committed to Deptford Park are:

Year	Project	£
2022/23	Deptford Park Play equipment	£43,037

In addition, in recent years the following investment has been made in Deptford Park in partnership with the Friends Group:

- Council Capital Budget for new footpaths: £72,500
- Funding Raised by Friend Group £48,409
- Community Orchid Creation £10,000
- New Drinking Fountain £8,500
- ECB Funded Non-Turf Cricket Pitch £29,250

**Recent spend/commitments in Deptford Park £236,237**

Officers from the Parks Department will continue to work with the community to identify further funding opportunities that will enable us to invest further in Deptford Park and meet their aspirations.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 23**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Cecilia North

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Evelyn ward and particularly the area around Deptford Park has the worst air pollution in Lewisham. It is six times the world safety limit. GLA identifies Evelyn Street as an Air Quality Focus area, which is now being subjected to increased pollution as a result of extensive residential development on Evelyn Street and Grinstead Road. It is recognised that any increase in construction projects and associated HGV use correlates strongly with greatly increased traffic emissions.

These two ongoing developments, Deptford Landings and Neptune Wharf, are in the direct vicinity of two schools, Deptford Park School on Evelyn Street and Sir Francis Drake which borders Grinstead Road and Trundleys Road. Trundleys Road is also earmarked for extensive development, further adding to the problem. These schools also have playgrounds directly fronting these busy polluted roads.

The document Deptford Park by Citizen Sense (2017) identified the poor air quality around the Park using dust boxes which provided evidence to support the breach of world safety limits. The study emphasised the role of a green infrastructure in reducing pollution, so it is apparent that to alleviate the serious problem of very poor air quality, trees should be planted as part of any developments planned.

Deptford Landings site plan shows two rows of trees fronting Evelyn Street and a single row fronting Oxstalls Road in addition to those on other parts of the site, some of which were planted after finishing Phase 1. To date, 6 years after the start of construction, not one tree has been planted facing the busy Evelyn Street or opposite the school on Oxstalls Road. It is not clear from Galliards promotion material what role trees will play on the Neptune Wharf site, rather they seem to be relying heavily on the existing parks, Deptford Park and Folkestone Gardens. The trees in Deptford Park have suffered badly this year due to the increased pollution and drought conditions, some have become dangerous and have been pruned heavily by English Oak.

The early planting and establishment of trees would have alleviated the effect of construction emissions, served to soften the street scene by continuing the tree line from Greenwich to Surrey Quays and reduced noise and dust during the long years of construction. They could also have served to protect the existing trees in Deptford Park and the lungs of the schoolchildren.

Trees have a positive effect on mental as well as physical health.

Given that Lewisham is committed to a green agenda, reducing traffic emissions and improving air quality.

Question

What commitment did the council secure from the developers Galliard and Land Lease towards the green agenda, including planting the majority of the trees before, or early in construction, and was any consideration given to green roofs or walls and the correct choice of planting?

Given that to date very little greening has occurred what are the immediate plans to address the issue?

What provision is planned in Deptford Park to replace any plane trees bordering the Park that become too stressed to survive?

### **Reply**

Both the Neptune Wharf and Deptford Landings developments include significant areas of publically accessible landscaping including trees. Both developments are under construction and is not possible to plant trees until the developments are complete. Both developments also include living roofs.

There is no specific provision in the applications to replace trees in Deptford Park. The trees will be monitored as part of routine inspection regimes and any problems identified would be considered in the usual way and any necessary work undertaken at that time.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 24**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Roger Stocker

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

In July 2019 I asked a public question about bicycle access to Catford Broadway. I have been assured at various full council meetings that they are allowed.

Last March the Cabinet Member responded to my public supplementary question about bicycle access into Catford Broadway stating that the Council now agreed that cycles are not permitted and that the Council would make the necessary traffic order and signage changes. Is there any specific reason as to why, 8 months later, this has yet to happen.

**Reply**

The Council has prioritised its programme based upon its current resource level and funding and this has meant that some initiatives have been delayed. Officers will contact you directly before the end of the year to update you on this request.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 25**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

On what date did the Council decide that it would not evict residents of Reginald House, Deptford on July 26th this year? On what date did the Council inform tenants they would not be evicted on July 26th?

**Reply**

The building at 2-30A Reginald Road forms part of Phase 3 of the development of the former Tidemill School site. As set out in response to a previous Public Question (Question 32, Full Council 28 September 2022), the Council has been working with permanent residents to assist them to find and move to new homes including the new homes built at the linked site at Amersham Vale and new homes being built in Phases 1 and 2 on the Tidemill site. This was one of the commitments made to residents at the outset of the scheme. The majority of original residents have already moved. The vacated properties have been used as temporary accommodation by the Council for homeless households. The temporary nature of the accommodation was made clear to these residents to manage expectations and be transparent. The Council has started the formal possession process for temporary residents, which has included the service of notices. This is a necessary process to ensure that the Council can achieve vacant possession when needed for the development of the new homes on the site. Officers contacted all households to assure them that the serving of a notice is part of the lengthy possession process and that they were not required to physically leave on 26 July. The possession process is continuing and officers are working with the remaining temporary residents to offer them alternative housing.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 26**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Kate Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

With extensive reporting of failings in the media and other organisations about L&Q in its record of repairs for tenants does Lewisham Council consider L&Q to be a suitable partner for Barratt Homes for the proposed development of Catford Island? I understand from Barratt Homes this is likely to be the case

If this is correct on what basis have they been awarded the contract?

Please also set out whether any assessment is undertaken by Lewisham Council of the record of any housing association before any significant development commences where the management of rented property for social tenants will be undertaken by a housing association.

**Reply**

The proposal for the redevelopment of Catford Island is being led by Barratt Homes as a private venture. It will be subject to a planning approval from the Council and the GLA. During the planning process, both the Council and GLA will secure the maximum amount of affordable housing through the associated s106 agreement. The s106 agreement will also ensure that the affordable housing is managed by an organisation registered with the Regulator of Social Housing. It will be for Barratt Homes to negotiate and agree terms with a Registered Provider.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 27**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Mark Morris

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Sophie Davis

**Question**

In answer to public question No. 25 on 20 July 2022 it was stated that “As at 12th July 2022, there were 2,767 households placed in temporary accommodation (TA). Of these, 57% were in TA within Lewisham, 25% were in TA outside of Lewisham and SE London and 18% were in TA outside of Lewisham and SE London.” Yet in answer to a Freedom of Information submitted in February 2022 and eventually answered on 6 June 2022 (Reference No: 1266444449) it was stated “We currently have 441 households placed in Temporary Accommodation outside of the Borough.” As the answer to Public Question Number 25 in July 2022 confirmed that 43% of 2767 homeless households were placed outside of the borough how can this reply be consistent with the answer to the Freedom of Information response (Reference No:1266444449 )? Please can clarification be provided on what is the exact number of homeless households currently placed outside of Lewisham in temporary accommodation.

**Reply**

We apologise for any confusion caused as a result of any previous responses provided. As of the 11th November 2022, there are 2,811 households placed by Lewisham in Temporary Accommodation.

-Number of Households in Temporary Accommodation within Lewisham: 1,596 (57%)

- Number of Households in Temporary Accommodation outside of Lewisham: 1,215 (43%)

Please note that the numbers change all the time, the figures provided represent a snapshot as of the 11th November 2022.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 28**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Jane ford

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Planning permission for Mais House was recommended, and granted, by virtue of the 100% social housing element. Can Lewisham Council confirm the definition of social housing used in the Section 106 Agreement?

And, confirm that the permission will be rescinded if the promise for 100% social housing is compromised?

**Reply**

The Mais House Section 106 agreement defines 'Social Rented Housing' as meaning 'social rented housing owned by local authorities and private registered providers as defined in section 80 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 and let at Target Rents. Further definitions confirm that 'Target Rents' are as set out by the Rent Guidance issued by government in 2014.

Should the scheme be varied to remove or reduce social housing provision, further permission would be required. However, there are no plans to reduce the 100% social housing provision.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 29**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Stuart Ager

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Does the Mayor agree that moving the bus stop outside Lammas Green on Sydenham Hill would have a huge impact on existing residents and safety for all? Who monitors the actions of the Corporation of London in relation to this?

**Reply**

The management of bus stop locations within the borough is the responsibility of Transport for London (TfL) not the Corporation of London. Before a bus stop is moved TfL usually carry out an assessment to determine the likely impact of moving it. The Council will raise the issue of the bus stop outside Lammas Green with TfL to ensure these concerns are properly considered.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 30**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Patricia Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Since the installation of traffic monitoring cameras at the closed junctions of Manor Lane Terrace/Kellerton Road, Manor Lane/Manor Lane Terrace, Home Lacey/Manor Lane and Dallinger/Manor Lane how many fines have been issued at each, how much has been collected and how many appeals have been lodged?!

**Reply**

Dallinger Road junction with Manor Lane: 16

Holme Lacey Lane junction with Manor Lane: 59

Manor Lane Terrace junction with Kellerton Road: 85

Manor Lane junction with Manor Lane Terrace: 31

As of 10th November, there has not been any PCN income, and no formal or informal challenges against Penalty Charge Notices issued.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 31**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Eric Kentley

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Given the Council's policy and actions to discourage private vehicle use across the borough, what was the rationale for resurfacing the old lorry park behind St Laurence House to extend the Council's own car park?

**Reply**

As the majority of the Council employees are now working as hybrid workforce, the Council has taken the decision to re-purpose Canadian Avenue Lorry Car Park to facilitate and extend the existing staff car park space Monday to Friday.

The parking tariff at the staff car park has emission based tariff similar to those of the off-street car park sites owned by the Council which aims to promote sustainable modes of transport and lower carbon emission.

The Council is in the process of developing a staff travel plan and one of its key objectives is to reduce staff traveling to work by car. Lewisham will continue to promote more sustainable modes of transport i.e. cycling, walking and also providing car clubs and E.V. points.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 32**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Karen Pratt

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Could the council please let us know how many new residential units have been built in Lewisham in the last 5 years. What proportion of those are affordable or social housing? What effect has this building had on council waiting lists and homelessness in the borough? How many units are being occupied by students? Has the council's housing policy resulted in a reduction of those on waiting lists and the homeless, or has it increased substantially the number of buy-to-let landlords and empty investment properties?

**Reply**

The number of residential units completed each year, the proportion of affordable housing as well as many other key monitored planning outputs are published in the Authority Monitoring Report which can be found here:

<https://lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/planning/policy/adopted-local-plan/annual-monitoring-report>

- In the last 5 years (between 2016-17 and 2020-21) there have been 5,232 net new self-contained homes built in Lewisham (consisting of building conversions and changes of use as well as new builds).
- Of these, 1,304 (25%) were affordable (consisting of social rent, London affordable rent and intermediate housing).
- In the last 5 years (between 2016-17 and 2020-21 there has been 5,287 social housing lets (this includes both new built homes and re-lets) and of these, 1,684 were lets to homeless households.
- The numbers of people on the Housing register continues to steadily increase. We don't hold data on how many homes are occupied by Students. We do not hold data relating to whether the numbers on the waiting list has increased substantially the number of buy-to-let landlords and empty investment properties.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 33**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Helen Anglin

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

In February 2019 Lewisham council declared a climate emergency, with an aim to be carbon neutral by 2030. Do Lewisham council agree that we should preserve every healthy tree in the borough, in order to act as effective (and cost effective) carbon sinks?

**Reply**

I agree that where it is possible every healthy tree in the borough should be preserved. Unfortunately, there are situations where a healthy tree will have to be removed due to it being proven as the cause of damage to property or infrastructure.

Removing a tree is always the last resort following the consideration of other options, for example regular pollarding to manage the crown of the tree to reduce the uptake of moisture from the surrounding area and therefore reducing the possibility of the soil that a property is built on shrinking, which can cause structural damage to a property.

Where possible new planting is undertaken to mitigate against the loss of trees felled and in 2021-2022 we planted 294 street trees and felled just 79. In 2022-2023 we will plant 550 street trees.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 34**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

How is the Council going to engage the community in the decision about 'replacement' of the recently felled London plane tree on Sydenham Park? Can the Council confirm that it will mobilise officers as appropriate for this consultation, and that the planning and execution of consultation will be arranged and paid for by the Council?

Can the Council commit to a schedule of replacement planting in relation to the recently felled London plane tree on Sydenham Park?

Can the Council provide assurance that all replacement planting for the recently felled London plane tree on Sydenham Park will be fully funded by the Council, and that no contributions from local residents will be required?

The London Plan and the Council's Regulation 19 draft Local Plan both require developers proposing to fell trees to account for and replace the value of the trees using a recognised methodology such as CAVAT. With respect to the London plane tree the Council recently felled on Sydenham Park, can the Council commit to meeting the same standards of assessment and compensation that they ask of developers? What number of trees will the Council commit to planting as compensation for the felled tree, (a) in the immediate environs of the felled tree, and (b) in the wider area?

**Reply**

In order to allow for a vital replacement of the bridge deck for Sydenham Footbridge, the construction work required the use of a specialised mobile crane. This necessitated the removal of a London Plane Tree.

To compensate for the loss of the tree, the Council will be planting four additional trees in the local area. These will be funded by the Council from the relevant project budgets.

The Council will also be working with affected residents in the New Year to seek their views and ideas to agree the species and locations for the four replacement trees.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 35**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Peter Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Three school streets have recently been implemented in Lee Green ward. Appropriate street notices and cameras have been erected. They make it clear that school street restrictions do not apply at weekends. However, does that mean the restrictions still apply over school holidays for Easter, Summer and Christmas and half terms.

In view of the considerable amount of traffic already using roads, even at weekends, Manor Lane, Manor Park, the turnings off both, left and right - all residential roads, will the council now be monitoring traffic flows, congestion and pollution, to measure any increase that may occur?

**Reply**

The school streets are enforced at the times shown on the road signs, which is during the school term time only. The signs are in two parts so that during the school holidays the signs can be closed so that all drivers will be aware that the School Street is not being enforced. Term dates can be checked on the Council website. Monitoring will be carried out on all the school street sites as part of the overall monitoring programme for the Lewisham and Lee Green LTN, as agreed by the Council's Mayor & Cabinet. This will include considering feedback received from the schools, residents and other members of the public as well as monitoring the impacts on air quality, traffic flow and collision levels.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 36**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Jane Alaszewski

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

The council is introducing school streets on top of the pre-existing LTN. What modelling has the council done to determine the likely impact

of the combination of the two sets of road closures.

Manor Park is a residential road with two nurseries which has become busier since the LTN closed off other entry/exit points to Lee High Road. The LTN turned it into a one-way circuit through the LTN with Leahurst as the other part of the one-way circuit. How will the council monitor the impact of school streets, and in particular the timed closure of Leahurst, on Manor Park.

**Reply**

The intention of school streets is to make travelling to these schools safer. The school streets are being introduced under an 18 month Experimental Traffic Order, which gives the Council the ability to monitor and assess its impacts post-implementation, before a decision is made on the future of these measures. Monitoring will be carried out on all the school street sites as part of the overall monitoring programme for the Lewisham and Lee Green LTN agreed by the Council's Mayor & Cabinet. This will include considering feedback received from the schools, residents and other members of the public as well as monitoring the impacts on air quality, traffic flow and collision levels.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 37**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Margaret Clarke

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Does Lewisham Council require all developers to include high specification energy saving measures in their building plans? If so what processes are in place to make sure they are achieved?

**Reply**

Developments are expected to follow the 'energy hierarchy' contained in the London Plan and are assessed against London Plan Policy which seeks to reduce energy demands through design, ensure energy generation is clean through measures such as decentralised energy generation and include renewable energy generation. Energy standards are secured in a planning permission and a developer is required to meet these standards. Where a development is in breach of a planning permission the Council has the option to take appropriate enforcement action to ensure compliance.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 39**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Mark Del

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

There are no bins along Lee Rd on the Lewisham side of the road, can the council explain why and what they intend to do to resolve the litter that builds up around the bus stops and is dumped in the hedges on Lee rd.

**Reply**

Budget constraints means that the council have limited supply of litter bins and reserve these for high litter / footfall areas such as town centres, high streets, secondary shopping areas etc.

Lee Road is swept twice per week and the standard of cleaning is monitored by the area street cleaning manager.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 40**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Greta Sandler

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Has there been any application for the Stopping Up of the footpath between Lammas Green and Kirkdale?

Has the Council been involved in any decisions regarding a Stopping Up order for this route?

**Reply**

There is an approved planning application for the associated development at this location, which retains the footpath route through the site. At the present time the Council is not aware of any application or intention to stop up the route.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 41**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Lee Powell

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor James-J Walsh

**Question**

What indicators is Lewisham using to measure the success of Lewisham as London Borough of Culture?

**Reply**

Dear Mr Powell

Thank you for the question —

A full range of both qualitative and quantitative indicators are being collected to measure, for example, people attending events but also whether they enjoyed being there and the impact it had on them. A full evaluation of the year will be produced as part of the year's summation for our own learning and sharing, and also to meet requirements of our funders.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 42**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Tatiana Marek

Relevant Directorate: Children and Young People

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

**Question**

How can the SEN transport service be improved in terms of 1. contracting appropriate transport companies who are sympathetic, patient and happy to provide service to our disabled young people- understanding their special needs.

2. Also who are reliable, professional and picked up our children on time?

**Reply**

Lewisham council currently provides home to school or college travel assistance to 945 children and young people with special educational needs. Around 45% of this is done by our internal fleet of buses. Some parents receive direct payments in order to make their own arrangements, and the council commission vehicles including taxis and minibuses externally. We also have an Independent Travel Training service that helps young people with SEND to meet their potential and develop their independence.

The Council use a number of transport providers, all of whom have to satisfy various criteria in order to work on the Council's behalf. This includes having safeguarding policies in place, and providing relevant training for their staff. The aim is of course always to provide children with a safe and prompt journey to and from school.

Unfortunately, for unforeseen reasons such as roadworks, there will obviously sometimes be occasions when there are delays. The travel coordination team are very happy to discuss any specific concerns with families and to address problems with the travel providers where appropriate.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 43**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Billy Shah

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Now that TfL and the Government have agreed a longer-term funding settlement, what are the plans to take forward the Healthy Neighbourhoods programme, and which areas in the borough will be prioritised first?

**Reply**

TfL have agreed a settlement with all London boroughs in September 2022 for delivery by the end of March 2023. This involves agreeing a programme that can be delivered within that timeframe and the Council is currently awaiting confirmation from TfL to proceed. The Council plans to publish the agreed details once approval has been given by TfL.

The timescale dictates that significant works will not be possible to deliver within this short time available, however, the Council has sought funding from TfL to support a feasibility study to review potential future locations.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 44**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Mark Morris

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

(A) What is the amount of Section 106 money that has been agreed as payment from the City of London to Lewisham for the Mais House redevelopment?

(B) What is the amount of Section 106 money that Lewisham Council have agreed to allocate to the City of London for this housing development?

(C) Where did the Section 106 money that Lewisham Council are allocating to the City of London come from? Which developments and how was that money intended to be allocated?

**Reply**

A. Total of £351,203.

The s106 monies agreed are set out on page 93 in the following report -

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s74578/Mais%20House%20-%20Committee%20Report.pdf>

B. Total of £1,650,000.00

C.

Planning Number	Site Address	Amount	For
DC/00/46436	Former Thames Waterworks site, SE8	£90,888.46	Affordable Housing
DC/14/89436	Marine Wharf West, Plough Way.	£238,473.01	Affordable Housing
DC/07/67276	Former Catford Dogs Stadium and Station Gateway, SE8	£1,320, 638.53	Affordable Housing

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 45**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Cheryl Kipping

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

When will the Highways team be conducting the consultation on the traffic flow in the Mayow Road, Silverdale, Bishopsthorpe Road, Sydenham Road/High Street area of Sydenham?

I am particularly concerned about the impact of the heavy traffic on people's health, especially that of children. Given Lewisham's declaration of a climate emergency and the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi Debrah in the borough, with air pollution being identified as a contributory factor, the levels of traffic particularly in Mayow Road during the time when many children are walking to/from school in this area are extremely concerning.

**Reply**

A public consultation is being prepared to launch in December for six weeks which will seek feedback from residents on the modal filters on Silverdale Road and Bishopsthorpe Road. Officers will consider feedback to the consultation in conjunction with data monitoring to decide the future of the filters.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 46**  
**Priority 1**

Question asked by: Erica Cattle

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

1. Are there any plans to assess the effectiveness and repercussions of this LTN block or to have a public consultation about it?
2. Is the Council aware of the knock on effects this LTN block is having on roads in the surrounding area?
3. Is the Council aware that since the implementation of this road block the traffic on Mayow Rd has increased causing bad traffic jams, regular grid lock at the junction of Mayow Rd with Sydenham Rd & increased noise and emission pollution in the Mayow Rd area?
4. Is the Council aware of the concerns of parents and local residents re: traffic management in Mayow Rd now that Greenvale School has opened for KS5 & Glade Pathway students and that the special needs homes opposite the school will be occupied in the not too distant future?
5. Is the Council aware that photographic evidence is available which shows the extent of the traffic problem in the Mayow Rd area?

**Reply**

The Council responds to all queries sent to them on any aspect of the LTN and has been undertaking assessments and surveys within this area. Further details can be found in the following links below of reports of the Mayor & Cabinet sessions of January 2022 and September 2022:

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=7912&Ver=4>

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 47**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Shaka Anderson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Can the Deputy Mayor explain how the Tall Buildings proposals in the draft local plan were formulated? How high is too high for Catford?

**Reply**

The Tall Building policy within the draft Local Plan has been informed by a robust evidence base which includes the Lewisham Characterisation Study, tall building evidence work and several framework documents completed by the Council. The policy provides height ranges rather than just a maximum and has also been informed by considering the character of the area and context.

With regard to specific tall building evidence work this includes the Tall Buildings Study 2021. This was prepared by Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners as independent consultants and experts in this field. This looked at areas which may be more suitable for tall buildings and also identified a layering of sensitivities. This document can be found here:

<https://lewisham.gov.uk/my services/planning/policy/adopted-local-plan/evidence-base/ldf-evidence-base--urban-design>

Following public consultation, the Council commissioned additional work as part of a Tall Buildings Study Addendum which was published for comments in 2022 and can be found here: <https://consultation.lewisham.gov.uk/planning/lewisham-council-tall-buildings->

[study/supporting\\_documents/Lewisham%20Council%20%20Tall%20Buildings%20Study%20Addendum.pdf](https://consultation.lewisham.gov.uk/planning/lewisham-council-tall-buildings-study/supporting_documents/Lewisham%20Council%20%20Tall%20Buildings%20Study%20Addendum.pdf).

This study looked at identifying more tightly defined suitability areas for tall buildings and providing maximum heights within those areas to comply with the London Plan.

With regard to Catford the heights identified within Catford have been informed by the Council endorsed Catford Town Centre Framework which can be found here:

<https://lewisham.gov.uk/inmyarea/regeneration/catford-regeneration/catford-town-centre-framework>.

All new buildings are subject to assessment and review via the planning process which will ultimately determine the appropriateness of proposals in Catford.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 48**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Paul Howarth

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

The Hither Green West Campaign is a resident-led campaign set up to help make Hither Green (west of the railway line) the best place it can be.

At the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel meeting on Tuesday 30 March 2021, (see: agenda item 4b titled "Review of Social Distancing Measures 18 March 2021 fv") the Executive Director of Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm agreed, at a cost of only £250, to:

"Remove the water filled barriers from the parking bay outside the Coop, (no 200-206) and the bay outside no 222-226, and replace with double yellow lines to create more space in front of the shops and improve compliance and enable enforcement at these locations. Introduction of permanent parking restriction is a priority at this site, specifically outside the premises of Grows Kings as there has been no compliance with the temporary restrictions. Water filled barriers had been moved out of place and parked vans/cars had filled the space that should have been cordoned off to allow social distancing. This has narrowed the remaining available pedestrian routes to an unsafe level."

For full details see paragraph 5.1.3(e) here

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s79015/Item%204b%20-%20Review%20of%20social%20distancing%20measures%2018%20March%202021%20fv.pdf>

Unfortunately, 1 year 7 months later and the permanent parking restriction by way of double yellow lines at this site has not yet been installed.

Please can you confirm when the promised double yellow lines and associated signs will be installed outside the Coop (200-206 Hither Green Lane) and outside Grow Kings (222-226 Hither Green Lane).

**Reply**

The Council is undertaking a review to design a balanced solution, and the installation of double yellow lines are being considered as part of this.

Implementation of a solution is expected by the end of the year.

The council understands and appreciate the safety of the public is paramount and is also taking into account the needs of shoppers who may require short-term parking, promoting the local economy.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 49**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Alan Hall

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

I understand that Lewisham Council has a vision document for Bell Green, could the cabinet member:

- (a) publish the latest version
- (b) confirm the status of the document
- (c) explain the relationship between this document and the Local Plan?

**Reply**

The document has no formal status and was prepared in anticipation of future masterplanning across the site. While the study itself does not form part of the Local Plan evidence base, as a study of the area commissioned by the Council, the outcomes of the work have been considered to help inform appropriate locations for tall buildings and their maximum height ranges.

Now that officers are aware that the study is not available on the website, they will ensure that it is made available again.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 50**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Julia Webb

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Barratt Homes are the developers of Bell Green Works (the gasholders site). At their latest meeting with the Bell Green Neighbourhood Forum team, they reported being instructed to follow Lewisham's Lower Sydenham / Bell Green Vision Study.

The LSBG Vision study is only available in draft form, as submitted to the Sustainable Development Select Committee on 14th January 2021.

A. Please will you confirm the Vision Study's current status?

B. Please will you explain how the Vision Study relates to the draft Lewisham Local Plan? Is it to be incorporated into the LLP?

**Reply**

The document has no formal status and was prepared in anticipation of future masterplanning across the site. While the study itself does not form part of the Local Plan evidence base, as a study of the area commissioned by the Council, the outcomes of the work have been considered to help inform appropriate locations for tall buildings and their maximum height ranges.

Now that officers are aware that the study is not available on the website, they will ensure that it is made available again.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 51**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Viresh Padhiar

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

**Question**

When will more CCTV be installed?

**Reply**

The Council manages 174 camera across the public realm and approximately 550 on Lewisham Homes estates.

These cameras are monitored 24 hours and day, 365 days a year.

CCTV is also installed on highways for the purpose of enforcing traffic regulations.

We keep the coverage and effectiveness of CCTV under constant review. Cameras may also be installed from time to time on a temporary basis in response to specific requests or reports of crime. However, owing to the severe constraints on the Council's budget resulting from ongoing cuts from central government, there are currently no plans for wholesale extension to our public space CCTV coverage.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 52**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Annie Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

The LTN Blue Badge Exemption Certificate allows Lewisham Borough BB Holders (with the approved certificate) to travel through all filters in the LTN. The School Street Scheme, (within the same LTN), does NOT allow these same Blue Badge holders, but DOES allow Blue Badge Holders who attend the school, drop off at the school, teach at the school or generally work at the school.

The reasons for exemption do not disappear for 2 hours a day, and neither do their disabilities, so my question is:

What was the decision process behind having two separate schemes, for Blue Badge exemptions, within the Lee Green LTN? Do you agree that there will be confusion as a result of this decision?

**Reply**

School Street programme across the borough is designed to protect school children and is not the same as an LTN.

School streets are designed to restrict vehicles from entering the school street area at the times shown on the signs. Exemptions are kept to a minimum in order to keep as many motor vehicles away from the school gate as possible at school drop off and pick up times, in order to protect children's safety and encourage more sustainable forms of travel.

Parents and school staff are not offered exemption permits, however the Council does offer those with a blue badge the opportunity to access the school gate area in order to drop off their children or to gain legitimate access to the school street area. Using the school street as a through route during the times of operation would go against the objectives of the scheme.

The school street restrictions only apply on weekdays during the school term time and only affect short stretches of road within the overall LTN area ensuring that alternative routes for blue badge holders not requiring access to the school street area are available.

The school streets have been introduced under an 18 month Experimental Traffic Order, which gives the Council the ability to monitor and assess its impacts before a

decision is made whether to amend the schemes, make them permanent or remove them. The issue raised of blue badge holder access to the school streets will be monitored as part of this review process.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 53**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Dan Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

how much has been contributed to the highways and transport budget from the general funding each year, for the last 5 years?

Also, what is the forecast for this year (2022) and how much has come from ring fenced funding such as parking fines?

**Reply**

Council's General Fund Highways and Transport Service budgets

Year	Amount £M
17-18	2.9
18-19	3.1
19-20	3.2
20-21	3.4
21-22	3.3

	£M
22-23	3.3

None of the Ringfenced Parking Fines income is used to cover Highways and Transport Service costs as insufficient income is generated to cover concessionary fares. The Council makes up the shortfall on both Concessionary Fares and Highways and Transport Service from its general fund budget.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 54**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Martin North

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Sophie Davis

**Question**

We have been informed that the introduction of Additional Licensing 'will help to address poor standards and growing anti-social behaviour within the Private Rented Sector through stricter licence conditions relating to the standard and management of rented properties within the borough'.

The current standards for licensable houses in multiple occupancy in Lewisham include:-

- The responsibility on the licence holder to proof the property from rats and mice.
- A statutory duty to maintain outbuildings, yards and forecourts, boundary walls, fencing and railings.

There is evidence locally that these particular standards are not currently being enforced.

Question:-

What are the 'stricter licence conditions' that will now be imposed in addition to those currently in place?

How will the conditions be enforced in a timely fashion if 'an inspector MAY carry out a full inspection of the property within 5 years of the licence being granted'?

**Reply**

Additional licensing does not in itself introduce license conditions which are stricter than mandatory HMO licensing. However, it extends the requirement to demonstrate compliance with those conditions to a much larger number of properties, and very considerably simplifies enforcement of standards in HMOs. Additional licensing also generates the income needed to allow proactive enforcement of the license conditions.

All HMOs are inspected prior to licensing. The sentence referred to in the question simply means that the property may be subject to additional repeat inspections at any time during the license period, to check that it remains compliant.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 55**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Roger Stocker

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

- 1) Have Lewisham Council had a public meeting to discuss cycling, as stated would happen annually in the Council Cycle Action Plan?
- 2) Are Lewisham Council planning to hold a public meeting to discuss cycling, as stated would happen annually in the Council Cycle Action Plan, in the near future?
- 3) How many times have officers met with Lewisham Cyclists, as stated in the Council Cycle Action Plan, since the May elections?

**Reply**

In 2020/21 the Council's ability to hold public meetings was severely impacted by the Covid pandemic along with significant reductions in staff, resources and funding. At present staffing levels have not recovered to pre-pandemic levels.

The last time we met with Lewisham Cyclists was 6 July 2022. In addition we receive emails regularly from Lewisham Cyclists Committee members which we respond to in a timely manner and we endeavour to work with them in a constructive manner to improve our cycling infrastructure.

Presently the Council is in the process of assessing future programmes, including cycling. Following the recent announcement from TfL of additional funding for transport related matters, the Council will assess how best to progress your request.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 56**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: The Mayor, Damien Egan

**Question**

How many public questions to Full Council has the Mayor directly answered in each of the following calendar years: 2020; 2021 & 2022? What form of words should someone use if they want the Mayor to directly answer a question and supplementary?

**Reply**

According to our records, I have answered nine Council Questions between 2020 and 2022. Council questions are typically delegated to the relevant cabinet member.

The focus of my Mayoralty has been meeting residents outside of the Town Hall. As Mayor I have held 36 Meet the Mayor sessions, two per ward, attended by more than 2,000 local people where I have answered hundreds of their questions directly. Residents have told me they prefer this form of direct engagement and my next Meet the Mayor sessions are set to be held from January.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 57**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Mark Morris

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

In answer to public question number 19 on 20 July 2022 it was stated that ‘When the Council refers to its Building for Lewisham programme, the council uses the term social home to describe the tenures references above i.e. LAR and Target Rent and also temporary accommodation, which the Council are both building and acquiring to support those presenting to us as homeless.’ Is this precise definition of social homes consistent with the statements made by the Mayor of Lewisham, for example in his email to local residents dated 17 March 2022, that: “In total over 1,200 social homes have been delivered since 2018”. If this statement made by the Mayor of Lewisham was not correct please state the actual number of social homes that have been fully completed and delivered by Lewisham council between May 2018 and March 2022 based on the exact definitions set out in public question number 19 on 20 July 2022.

**Reply**

The statement by the Mayor is correct. The 1,200 figure refers to the number of social homes delivered in the period 2018-22. This was calculated as the number of social homes completed in the borough between 2018/19 and 2020/21, as well as all social homes that were under construction through the Council's Building for Lewisham programme as of March 2022.

‘Social homes’ counted towards the 1,200 homes referred to homes for families on the Council’s housing waiting list, temporary accommodation for homeless families and specialist housing for individuals with a housing need (e.g. supported housing for older people or people with learning disabilities). The tenure provision for these homes is a mix of traditional social rent and new London Affordable Rent – classified by the GLA as social rent.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 58**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Joanne King

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

I have submitted several requests ( not acknowledged) for the unused parking bays on Wellmeadow Road ( opposite numbers 71-79 approx) to be considered for the installation of cycle hangars and electric vehicle chargers. These bays are very rarely used and their location is ideal for either hangars or chargers - the former especially as the Littlebourne block of flats have no secure cycle storage facilities and I'm sure those residents would welcome and use these hangars.

It is particularly irritating to see cycle hangers installed in the Lee Green area - there is one in Manor Park by houses that all have front gardens and side entrances therefore cycle storage should not be a problem for those residents.

Can the Council explain if this area in Wellmeadow Road has ever been considered and if not why not ? If so, the reasons why it has been rejected. I would also welcome a clear criteria for the installation of cycle hangars.

**Reply**

Unfortunately there has been a delay to some cycle hangers due to resource constraints and cycle hanger availability. Cycle hangers and electric charging points are being installed on the basis of demand and Wellmeadow Road will be considered part of the programme roll out.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 59**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Patricia Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

As advised I have researched the council documents suggested to find records and statistics monitoring, traffic flows, traffic speeds, air pollution on the section of Manor Lane Terrace south of the Northbrook Road junction to the Kellerton Road junction. It appears there is no record on cable monitoring or pollution monitoring of this stretch of road which is constantly used, and become the subject of overwhelming reversing and turning traffic. If this is the case on what statistics did the council base its decision to make the closure permanent? Where are the statistics and what are they?

Has Wolfram Close, connected to the garage area at the rear, ever been monitored?!

**Reply**

The Council undertook an agreed programme of surveys to assess the operation of the LTN. Please see the following links below of reports of the Mayor & Cabinet sessions of January 2022 and September 2022, which will give more detail:  
<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>  
<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=7912&Ver=4>

Wolfram Close was not included in the locations monitored as it is a short cul-de-sac and not a through route.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 60**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Karen Pratt

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Could the council please let us know what they understand will be the consequences of turning Leahurst Road into a school street on traffic in the surrounding roads. Will the traffic during the afternoon rush hour in Longhurst Road increase substantially? Will residents of Leahurst Road be forced to park in Longhurst?

**Reply**

The school street is intended to provide increased road safety for school children and similar arrangements have been provided outside many other schools across the borough. The scheme is also intended to reduce the level of through traffic on these roads which is also intended to improve air quality. This is not a parking reductions scheme.

The school street is being introduced under an 18 month Experimental Traffic Order, which gives the Council the ability to monitor and assess its impacts post-implementation, before a decision is made on the future of these measures

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 61**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Can the Council commit to providing ongoing maintenance of all trees planted as compensation for the recently felled London plane tree on Sydenham Park? The Council's Regulation 19 draft Local Plan requires this of developers, so for its own works should meet the same expectation.

In situations where tree loss is deemed "acceptable", the Council's Regulation 19 draft Local Plan requires that developers provide compensation tree planting, and that "Priority will be given to on-site replacement." With respect to the London plane tree the Council recently felled on Sydenham Park, can the Council commit to meeting the same standards of on-site replacement that they ask of developers?

**Reply**

In order to allow for a vital replacement of the bridge deck for Sydenham Footbridge, the construction work required the use of a specialised mobile crane. This necessitated the removal of a London Plane Tree.

To compensate for the loss of the tree, the Council will be planting four additional trees in the local area. These will be maintained by the Council in line with our adopted policies.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 62**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Jane Alaszewski

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Manor Park is a residential road with two nurseries. It has seen an increase in speeding traffic post-LTN. It is not unusual for vans to do motorway speed down the road. How is speed being monitored on Manor Park. What is the council doing to deter speeding?

What plans does the council have to install crossings on Manor Park?

**Reply**

Speeding is a criminal offence and as such enforcement is legally the responsibility of the Police. The Council works with the Police and TfL in relation to speed enforcement across the borough. Officers make requests for police enforcement when concerns are raised by councillors or members of the public. This liaison can lead to police speed enforcement being undertaken if certain criteria are met and the Council will raise the speeding concerns on Manor Park for the Police's attention. The council have recently carried out a number of speed surveys across the borough in association with our 20mph speed compliance monitoring programme. The results of these surveys will be used to inform where future interventions may be required, including the installation of new pedestrian crossings, and Manor Park will be considered, subject to funding.

Members of the public concerned about speeding on their road can volunteer to become part of a Community Road Watch group. A web link with further information can be found at:

<https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/safety-and-security/road-safety/community-roadwatch>

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 64**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Mark Del

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Now that we are in Autumn there is a build up of leaves on the pavements along the Lewisham side of Lee road. However the same can't be said for the Greenwich side which appears to be kept reasonable free of leaves. The leaves along the Lewisham side of Lee road make the pavements treacherous for able bodied people, let alone a person with a disability. Can the council commit to keeping the pavements along Lee road relatively free of leaves.

**Reply**

The street cleaning service manages the autumnal leafing season by prioritising roads for leaf clearance.

Lee Road is swept twice per week and this frequency is considered adequate for removing leaves from the pavement.

The council will monitor service provision in Lee Road and take action to resolve any issues found upon inspection.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 65**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Lee Powell

Relevant Directorate: Corporate Resources

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

Lewisham's auditors called for council reports to explain capital project slippages on a scheme by scheme basis. How is this recommendation being taken forward?

**Reply**

Thank you Lee Powell for your question. Currently, the management action is being tracked by the Audit Panel. The most recent update for their September meeting (papers were published but the meeting was cancelled as it was on the day of the Queen's death announcement) was:

Revised project highlight summary reporting will provide clearer detail of the performance of capital projects against time, cost and quality. Slippage against profile will be reviewed on a quarterly basis by Regeneration Capital Programme Delivery Board (RCPDB).

The RCPDB is currently chaired by the Director for Inclusive Regeneration. Through 2022/23 regular financial reporting on a scheme by scheme basis has been provided as part of internal capital governance boards, starting with the RCPDB. This highlights where spend is / is not in line with profiled budgets and explanations provided. This informs the capital section of the quarterly financial monitoring reports to Public Accounts for scrutiny and onto Mayor and Cabinet.

In addition, the progress with the implementation of this and other recommendations from the external auditors is also updated in their regular reports to the Audit Panel.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 66**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Mark Morris

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Team Catford placed on Catford Commonplace, dated the 15 July 2021, a statement which says:

“Planning application will be submitted later this summer for improvements to the area around Catford and Catford Bridge stations, which could see works start next year. Safer walking and cycling routes with a double-width pavement along a stretch of Catford Road, a wider underpass under the South Circular Road and two river decks across the River Ravensbourne will create a pleasant riverside space. A new pedestrianised approach to Catford Bridge Station could be in place by December 2022.”

<https://catfordtowncentre.commonplace.is/news/plans-for-catford-town-centre-approved-by-mayor-and-cabinet>

It would appear the above information was based on Mayor and Cabinet papers and other information provided by Lewisham Council.

Please state why pedestrianised improvements will not take place by December 2022 and please set out in detail the revised timescale for pedestrianised improvements.

**Reply**

The project has been delayed while we explore the detailed feasibility of delivering the public realm improvements desired. This has required extensive engagement with stakeholders including the Environment Agency and Transport for London. Design work is anticipated being finalised in the New Year and subject to Planning consent being granted, procurement will be prioritised as early as is feasible in 2023-24 and construction to begin on site soon after.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 67**  
**Priority 2**

Question asked by: Peter Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Cameras have been installed at the barrier junction of Manor Lane Terrace and Kellerton Road. There is warning signage on Kellerton Road but the warning signage on Manor Lane Terrace is situated after the bend therefore not warning traffic turning right from Northbrook Road or directly south from Abernethy Road and left from Manor Lane Terrace.

Consequently traffic still comes into the Terrace, needing to reverse, 3-point turn, using the pavement and dropped pavement areas to do so, increasing pollution. In addition all residents with cars, some with 2, have to do the same, as do their visitors, delivery vehicles, service vehicles. This has been the case over the last 2+ years. Lewisham Traffic department has never implemented adequate signage on various parts of the LTN as part of its duty of care and best practice. Where are the guidelines to be found? Are there legal requirements to be observed for adequate signage?

Residents of the Terrace, Wolfram Close and garage tenants have seen no improvements from the LTN imposition. Due to the cameras motorcycles are now using the pavement areas, east and west, to circumvent the camera controlled barrier. Did the council not consider this might be a result of its measures and what will it do to reduce the problem caused to all pavement users?

The council keeps tweaking the LTN system, without consulting or informing residents, and spending more money to no advantage. What is the aim of what is being done and the constant changes?"

**Reply**

The Council has been undertaking assessments and surveys within this area and will continue to do so. All action being undertaken has been agreed following a wide scale public consultation and approval at decision making committees. Further details can be found in the following links below of reports of the Mayor & Cabinet sessions of January 2022 and September 2022:

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>

[https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=7912  
&Ver=4](https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=7912&Ver=4)

Other concerns including motorcycles riding on the footway will be raised with the Police to consider appropriate action.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 68**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Shaka Anderson

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

When do Councillors intend to resume their advice surgeries?

**Reply**

As councillors, engagement with our constituents is a key priority and something we personally believe is important to us. We welcome opportunities to connect in a variety of ways. Advice surgeries are one of the many ways councillors meet with constituents and these can be carried out in person or online. Residents can also communicate via email. Other ways of engaging with residents include communicating by email, telephone or social media; and having conversations on the doorstep, at community meetings, or at other places where people gather. A number of Lewisham councillors hold face to face surgeries and the details are available on the council website, under the ward councillor profiles (<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgMemberIndex.aspx?FN=ALPHA&VW=L IST&PIC=0>)

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 69**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Alan Hall

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

The Livesey Memorial Hall is a Grade II Listed building and the war memorial is separately Listed by Historic England. Both of these important structures are deteriorating; when will planning enforcement and other actions promised to protect and enhance them and public safety be actioned?

Will the Mayor give an assurance that the new owners of the Livesey Memorial Hall, Apex Capital Partners will be obliged to deliver the scheduled repairs agreed by the previous owner, Kier, before proceeding with any further planning application?

**Reply**

The Planning Service is continuing engagement with Apex Capital Partners and their design team to understand their plans for the future of the Livesey building. This includes the exploration of all options for potential planning enforcement to protect and repair the listed building whilst ensuring that any decisions made to take action are robust and legally justified.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 70**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Julia Webb

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

The Livesey Memorial Hall is Bell Green's Asset of Community Value, with a community right to bid. Earlier this year, Kier Group was permitted by Lewisham Council to sell it to a property developer, Apex Capital Partners.

Lewisham officers have told us that the property developers used a legal loophole to avoid giving the community its right to bid. As this decision is complete and irrevocable, and therefore no longer commercially sensitive, please can we have access to the documents and correspondence which lead to this decision?

**Reply**

Thank you for your question. I have asked the Council's Monitoring Officer, Jeremy Chambers to look at this. As you know from your meetings with Jeremy, he is a strong advocate of transparency and will ensure all information that can be released will be released to you as soon as possible.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 71**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Viresh Padhiar

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Lewisham Refuse site needs to accept a wider range of materials like other boroughs do. When will this be fixed so that people can recycle properly? This is why they throw it on the street.

**Reply**

The Council offers a wide range of services to residents to enable them to reduce, re-use and recycle the waste they produce.

The Re-Use and Recycling Centre at Landman Way accepts a comprehensive range of items and a list of acceptable items can be found on the Council's recycling web page.

<https://lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/wasterecycle/reuse-and-recycling-centre-covid>

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 72**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Annie Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

What specific technology (brand / model) was used to count traffic on roads such as Lee Road, SE3, for the purpose of the LTN monitoring report, and other monitoring since the LTN was implemented?

**Reply**

The Council utilised pneumatic loops which are commonly used throughout London to undertake traffic and speed data collection.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 73**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Roger Stocker

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

No Cycling and Cyclists Dismount signage has appeared around the pedestrian and cycle bridge in Ladywell Fields over the railway line.

- 1) Are these formal council signs and markings?
- 2) If yes, what procedures were taken to ban cycling over this bridge (part of the National Cycle Network)?
- 3) If not approved will the council be taking action to have these removed?
- 4) If there are issues with cyclists interacting with pedestrians, have the council liaised with Lewisham Cyclists/Sustrans to look at possible interventions, ways forwards?

**Reply**

The Council has installed advisory signs to reduce the conflicts and the perception of conflicts with pedestrians following concerns raised to the Council. At this stage no further action is considered necessary.

The Council strongly urges all users of the bridge to interact within the limited space available in a safe manner.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 74**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Sophie Davis

**Question**

Has the Council raised any concerns with Peabody about their failings as identified in the Altair report? When will the review by Lewisham Homes into the report and their response to it be published?

**Reply**

Lewisham Council have not raised concerns formally with Peabody – the situation was not in our borough and the matter was being investigated through statutory channels.

Peabody provided an update on the actions being taken following their investigation into the incident at the Registered Partnership Group (Officer Group) meeting in September.

The independent report, produced by Altair, has been shared with the Lewisham Homes Board and they are self-assessing themselves against this. The outcome of this review will be reported to the Audit and Risk Committee in November 2022. Sub -Committee reports are not published.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 75**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Mark Morris

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

In relation to the Lewisham Council's Planning Service the council's website states: "We publish the Authority monitoring report in December each year and the reporting period covers the period April to March of the preceding year." However in the last two years the Lewisham Planning Service report published its reports much later than December, with the 2020-2021 published only after this year's council elections. Please clarify whether the 2021-2022 planning monitoring report will be published next month.

**Reply**

The Planning Service is currently working to finalise the Annual Monitoring Report for 2021-2022 with an aim to publish it before the end of December 2022.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 76**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Karen Pratt

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Juliet Campbell

**Question**

What help is available for Ukrainian refugees whose hosts are no longer able to accommodate them after 6 months?

**Reply**

Avoiding homelessness is a key priority for Lewisham and we have been working very hard, Ukrainian refugees are afforded the same protections under homelessness law that are available to UK citizens. There were 227 host families in total. 35 host families are no longer part of the HFU. These are hosts where the guests are no longer with them and they have confirmed that they no longer want to re-host new guests. The 35 host families correlates to the 22 +13 fig. below

<b>Type of Accommodation</b>	<b>Household single</b>	<b>Household families</b>
Re-matched (to another host family)	5	1
<b>Private Rented Sector</b> This is where the household has moved into the private rented sector and have their own tenancy)	9	7
<b>Temporary accommodation,</b> This is where a household is being accommodated by the Council in temporary accommodation	0	2
Moved to another country	1	1
Returned to the Ukraine	7	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>13</b>

The following are areas in which we have supported our Ukrainian Refugee families

- Basic Reference confirming that they are part of the Scheme and the date they arrived in the UK
- Providing deposit
- Providing Emergency Accommodation
- Procurement of properties

- Single households are where we have one Ukrainian refugee (one individual) being accommodated
- Family households are where we have more than one individual being accommodated. Please note that this could be a family group, adult partners, single parent and children, two sisters, older mother and adult child etc. Family households are where there are more than one person who are linked to each other in some way being accommodated.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 77**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

In addition to rectifying structural issues with the Sydenham Park footbridge, the Council has repeatedly referred to its objective to address issues of personal safety, in particular for women and girls. Given that trees are proven to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour, can the Council commit to developing and implementing a landscape design for the footbridge environs that will compensate for the lost tree and deliver further benefits to personal safety for people using the footbridge?

**Reply**

In order to allow for a vital replacement of the bridge deck for Sydenham Footbridge, the construction work required the use of a specialised mobile crane. This necessitated the removal of a London Plane Tree. To compensate for the loss of the tree, the Council will be planting four additional trees in the local area. Further landscaping may be considered where feasible and subject to funding being available.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 78**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Jane Alaszewski

Relevant Directorate: Children and Young People

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

**Question**

Lewisham's SEN transport system collapsed this year. The service did not answer emails or the phone and failed to inform many families

about transport arrangements before the start of the school term. In many cases families who were eligible for transport were left without a transport provider for weeks. What is being done to improve this key service for children with disabilities and their carers to ensure that the same issues are not repeated next year?

**Reply**

Lewisham council currently provides home to school or college travel assistance to 945 children and young people with special educational needs. Around 45% of this is done by our internal fleet of buses. Some parents receive direct payments in order to make their own arrangements, and the council commission vehicles including taxis and minibuses externally. We also have an Independent Travel Training service that helps young people with SEND to meet their potential and develop their independence.

In the past 5 years the service has seen over 40% increase in demand, and at the start of September, after a great deal of work over the summer, the team had services in place for the vast majority of eligible children and young people. It is regrettable that when the term started, there were around twenty out of nearly a thousand children for whom services had not yet been set up. This came about as a result of a variety of reasons, including late applications, and external factors, including the fact that across the whole of London there is a shortage of drivers available, which has made it difficult to procure appropriate vehicles for some school routes.

The large volume of calls and emails did unfortunately mean that some people encountered difficulty getting through to the Travel Coordination Team and receiving responses in a sufficiently timely manner, for which we apologise. Plans are being put in to place to manage this better next summer, for example by having a rotating duty system and also altering the closing date for transport application to support further planning.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 79**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Mark Del

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Can the Council inform the residents of Lee road as to when traffic evaporation is likely to kick in? It's now been over two years since the Lee and Hither Green LTN was implemented, and 11 months since it was made permanent, yet traffic levels on Lee road have not reduced, and are worse than they were pre-pandemic

**Reply**

The LTN has been designed to reduce traffic within this area and monitoring has shown that no significant detrimental effects have been created outside this area. Further details can be found in the following links below of reports of the Mayor & Cabinet sessions of January 2022 and September 2022:

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MIId=7912&Ver=4>

Traffic in some other areas of the borough have been influenced by many other factors including historic traffic patterns, the geographical make up of roads over the years, and the traffic patterns in neighbouring boroughs such as Greenwich as well as the operation of the Blackwall Tunnel and Woolwich Ferry.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 80**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Lee Powell

Relevant Directorate: Children and Young People

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

**Question**

The Trust for London recently reported that Lewisham has the worst GCSE results in London. The Education Policy Institute reported that Lewisham has the second biggest gap in results between those on school meals and other pupils. The new education strategy makes no mention of either issue. Why does the strategy fail to mention these issues nor detail any action to address them?

**Reply**

Our new education strategy was developed hand in hand with schools, community and children, and reflects the issues they tell us are most important. I make no apology for the fact that the Strategy highlights the fantastic work being done by Lewisham schools and the very significant improvements they have made in recent years. These include:

- Over 96% of schools rated Good or Outstanding by Ofsted (well above national and London averages)
- In 2022, Lewisham secondary schools were significantly above the national average on the government's Progress 8 indicator (which measures average attainment at each school adjusted for differences in prior attainment, and is accordingly a fairer picture than an unadjusted average attainment that does not take into account differences in school intakes)
- The best attendance in London, and a big reduction in permanent exclusions.
- A 10% rise in first preferences for Lewisham secondary schools last year, reflecting growing community confidence in them.

Some specific assertions in your question are either incorrect or out of date. Based on the 2021/22 provisional data:

- It is untrue to say that Lewisham's GCSE results are the worst in London; and
- it is similarly incorrect to say that Lewisham has the second biggest gap in results for children receiving free school meals and the average. There are in fact more than 100 local authorities in England (including nine in London) with a wider FSM gap than Lewisham for Attainment 8 (one of the government's outcome measures for GCSEs).

Of course, no one would pretend there is not more work to do: we are ambitious for all children in Lewisham and outcomes are still not as high as we want. The education strategy will help us continue to monitor, support and challenge our schools to continue improving. The strategy provides a framework for the Council to broker effective support for and intervene in schools when appropriate.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 81**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Patricia Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor James-J Walsh

**Question**

Lewisham council has been consistent, in spite of problems, in supporting Adult Learning Lewisham (ALL) over many years, for the advantage and benefit of its residents.

As it has been revealed that requirements from government for funding of certain classes may change from 24/25 can the council say how it has challenged such proposals? Will the council keep students properly informed so that they may have input to challenging government over what the loss of certain provision may mean

**Reply**

Dear Mrs Richardson

Thank you for your question, both you and I share a concern for the future of adult education and proposals consulted on by the Government.

I can confirm that we will keep students fully informed as the updates are published from the Department for Education (DfE). The Head of Adult for Learning Lewisham will email learners directly with updates as well as the potential impact, if any, on provision.

In relation to the actions taken to challenge the DfE proposals by the council, please see as follows the summary of actions, to date:

We have liaised with the Mayor of London's Office to highlight our concerns and coordinate a response.

I sent a letter to then Secretary of State for Education – Rt Hon James Cleverly MP (61 days in Office) to challenge the DfE proposals. Since then, we've had Rt Hon Kit Malthouse (19 Days in office) and now Rt Hon Gillian Keegan as Secretary of State for Education who was appointed on 25th October 2022.

The Head of Adult Learning Lewisham wrote to learners via email and the student newsletter in September 2022 to inform them of the DfE's proposals to change skills funding. The email included a draft letter to support learners to write to their MP's and the Minister for Skills – Andrea Jenkyns MP. The email also included the link to the public consultation regarding the proposals and a draft response to the consultation.

The Head of Adult Learning Lewisham contributed to two articles in FE Week in August and September 2022 outlining the types of provision and learners that the DfE proposals will impact in Lewisham.

The Head of Adult Learning Lewisham submitted the consultation response on behalf of the Council challenging the proposed changes to skills funding in October 2022. We have also contributed to a national network for Adult and Community Learning response to the consultation, which was submitted in October 2022.

The Head of Adult Learning Lewisham discussed the proposals with learners at the learner forum meetings throughout week commencing 31st October 2022. Although the DfE has not yet published the outcome of the consultation or their decisions about the implementation of their proposals. The learner forum notes will be made available to all learners via MOODLE shortly.

I hope I have managed to respond to your enquiry and that you continue to enjoy learning with Adult Learning Lewisham.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 82**  
**Priority 3**

Question asked by: Peter Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor James-J Walsh

**Question**

We have been made aware that the Manor House, Lee, a Grade II\* listed building, is suffering from another leak/damage to the exterior of the building. In view of the time and internal damage caused by the previous exterior damage to the south side of the building we would like to have information of what the damage is and a time line indicating drying out, repair and any restoration of interior damage.

**Reply**

Mr Richardson thank you for bringing this to my attention

Officers inform me that the damage to the first floor is caused by water penetration in strong winds, when rain enters the building through a newly installed slatted vent. The issue has been reported and should be resolved soon.

The repair of interior damage has been agreed and scheduled for the summer, by which time the vent issue should be resolved and the area should be dry enough for the repairs to happen.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 83**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Shaka Anderson

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

How long should the Monitoring Officer take to respond to complaints and enquiries?

**Reply**

Thank you for your question Shaka Anderson. The Monitoring Officer aims to respond as quickly as is reasonably possible to any communication. Obviously the time taken will vary depending on the nature of the complaint and other commitments, e.g. elections, leave, other priorities, general workloads.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 84**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Alan Hall

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

What is Lewisham Council's definition of social housing?

**Reply**

The Council considers 'social housing' to be housing that is made available to households who are eligible to be on the Housing Register. The Council does have a local definition of 'genuinely affordable housing' which is housing let at a social rent levels or the GLA's London Affordable Rent levels.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 85**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Julia Webb

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

Lewisham Council has incurred huge losses by paying contractors for work upfront.

The redevelopment of Our Lady and St Philip Neri School, SE26, was funded by Lewisham's multi-million pound grant to the RC Archdiocese of Southwark. The grant contract clearly states that it was to be paid in stages after progress was approved, yet it was immediately handed over in full up front. This allowed RCAOS to ignore all the agreed provisions for oversight, and the redevelopment went out of control.

Just around the corner, the Lewisham Homes development at the Home Park Estate was hit by the insolvency of the contractor, Caledonian Modular. Of its £20 million debts, Lewisham Homes has a potential £7.2m debt listed, by far the largest debt to a client, which suggests that the contract wasn't prudently managed.

Will the Mayor please review and report back on:

- A. The handling of public money in capital projects to ensure value for money.
- B. The overuse of 'commercial sensitivity' to redact entire classes of documents, rather than the genuinely time-sensitive details.
- C. The failure to set a release date for commercially sensitive details. They should not be redacted for an indeterminate time, as this prevents public scrutiny of such corporate failures.

**Reply**

In the two cases you refer to, action by other actors outside the Council's direct control led to the project delays and costs incurred.

However, the general challenge of ensuring the Council is vigilant and delivers value for money through its use of public funds is of course one we are and should remain alert to at all times.

In respect of governance of the capital programme, the programme is agreed by Full Council annually, following scrutiny and Mayor & Cabinet consideration as part of the

Council Budget setting process. Contract awards for individual projects are presented to Mayor & Cabinet for decision in compliance with the Council's constitution and scheme of delegation. The programme is then monitored internally on a monthly basis and quarterly through the regular financial reporting to scrutiny and Mayor & Cabinet. The financial outcomes of the programme are independently audited as part the Council's financial statements.

On the question of commercial sensitivity and time limits on publishing any restricted documents, the Council acts within the specifically relevant legal exemptions where this is necessary. The reason for exempting some aspects of these decisions from being placed in the public domain is generally to ensure that bidders' intellectual property and commercial pricing decisions are respected. To not do so would risk contractors not bidding for work and the Council being unable to work effectively with partners to progress its' strategic corporate objectives. Nonetheless, the Council does look to make public as much of these decisions as reasonably possible and publishes both part 1 (public) and part 2 (restricted) reports to do this.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 86**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Annie Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

The Department for Transport and TfL have both proved that the amount of side road traffic has not increased at all over the past decade, and that they had been using the WRONG data. This was the data upon which LTNs have been designed.

Since it was implemented based on completely wrong information, has the discovery of flawed data from TfL had any impact on the decision to keep the LTN as it is?

**Reply**

Lewisham undertook its own surveys to monitor and amend the LTN after it was implemented in 2020. The monitoring report of September 2020 has shown that the scheme is meeting its stated objectives.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 87**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Viresh Pahhlar

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

What positive change have LTN's driven in Lewisham Council? Provide hard data

**Reply**

The Council has been undertaking assessments and surveys within this area. Further details can be found in the following links below of reports of the Mayor & Cabinet sessions of January 2022 and September 2022:  
<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>  
<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=7912&Ver=4>

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 88**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Roger Stocker

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Please supply details of any LIP funding the council has received from Transport for London, for 2022/23 including a breakdown of individual allocations.

**Reply**

TfL have agreed a settlement with all London boroughs in September 2022 for delivery by the end of March 2023. This involves agreeing a programme that can be delivered within that timeframe and the Council is currently awaiting confirmation from TfL to proceed. The Council plans to publish the agreed details once approval has been given by TfL.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 89**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

Who decides when to reject a question to full Council from a member of the public and who reviews that decision? How does the Council decide whether to edit or redact details from a question and then answer the question rather than simply refusing to answer?

**Reply**

Thank you for your question Mr Bennett. The council's process of Full Council public questions are dealt in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules, which states the following: -

Scope of questions

The proper officer may reject a question if:-

- It does not relate to a matter for which the Council has powers or duties, unless it is a matter which affects the interests of local people.
- It is defamatory, frivolous or offensive; or
- It is substantially the same as a question which has been put and answered at a Council meeting within the last three months; or
- It requires the disclosure of confidential or exempt information; or
- That responding to the question would entail disproportionate labour or cost;

or

- That the question relates to the circumstances of an individual case; or
- It relates to any investigation by the Monitoring Officer or Standards

Committee.

The proper officer may put questions into an appropriate form without affecting the substance of the question and redirect them if necessary.

Disallowing questions

If any question is disallowed, the proper officer will write to the questioner explaining the reasons for that decision

The Proper Officer is the Chief Executive. However, the authority has been delegated to the Council's Monitoring Officer – the Director of Law, Governance & Elections.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 90**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Mark Morris

Relevant Directorate: Corporate Resources

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

A report to Lewisham Council's standard committee on the 5 July 2022 highlighted that in the year 2021/2022 only 47% of freedom of information requests were answered on time as set out by the 2000 Freedom of Information Act. In March 2019 the Campaign for Freedom of Information published a report based on a survey of London authorities stating "Lewisham answered only 61% of requests on time in 2015/16, improved to 73% in 2016/17 and returned to 61% in 2017/18." In September 2018 Lewisham Council also received an Enforcement Notice from the Information Commissioner's Office relating to the extent of its outstanding access requests. Why does Lewisham Council have such a long-term poor record in answering freedom of information requests? What actions are being taken to ensure that Lewisham Council's record in meeting statutory requirements on the answering of freedom of information requests is significantly improved?

**Reply**

The reasons why the Council's processing of Freedom of Information requests has fallen below the Information Commissioner's Office expectation is mainly due to difficulties experienced by services not providing the requested information in a timely fashion. This is largely down to significant workloads, competing priorities, changes in ways of working and several reorganisations which have occurred over the past 18 months which have led to a reduction in dedicated experienced staff available to deal with these enquiries.

In addition to this, the staffing resources in the Corporate Complaints Team is limited which means that it has been difficult to process requests promptly. We are looking to increase the level of resourcing in this team, despite the wider financial challenges, and this is being addressed in the Mid Term Financial Strategy process. We recognise that our performance needs to improve and more regular performance reporting by Directorate and Corporately to improve the collective attention to this challenge has been introduced so that we are better able to respond to queries in a timely manner.

Reports are circulated once a month and discussed at Departmental Monthly Team meetings. Performance is also reported to the Corporate Assurance Board so that there is increased visibility and transparency on performance. Meetings with underperforming managers are held as and when required to ensure a dedicated focus/attention on driving through improvements. These efforts are supported by our

Executive Management Team and we will continue to report openly and transparently on our performance.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 91**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Following the Council's recent felling of the mature London plane tree on Sydenham Park, residents have observed a noticeable increase in fly tipping in the location around where the tree was. Given that trees are proven to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour, can the Council commit to developing and implementing a landscape design for the footbridge environs that will compensate for the lost tree and deliver a safe and high quality environment for local residents?

**Reply**

In order to allow for a vital replacement of the bridge deck for Sydenham Footbridge, the construction work required the use of a specialised mobile crane. This necessitated the removal of a London Plane Tree.

To compensate for the loss of the tree, the Council will be planting four additional trees in the local area. Further landscaping may be considered where feasible and subject to funding being available.

To report flytipping please see the link below or download the Love Clean Streets App on your smartphone.

<https://lewisham.gov.uk/myserVICES/environment/street-cleaning/flytipping/report-a-flytip>

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 92**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Mark Del

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Can the Council inform us how much has been raised in fines due to the LTN, in the financial years 20-21, 21-22, and current 22-23? Can you also inform residents what these raised funds have been put toward?

**Reply**

<b><u>FY</u></b>	<b><u>2020/21</u></b>	<b><u>2021/22</u></b>	<b><u>22/2023 (End of Oct)</u></b>
Income	£4,336,625	£3,479,776	£1,186,938

The use of all fines (Penalty Charge Notices or PCNs) for parking or motorists moving through traffic restrictions are ring-fenced by law. As such Lewisham reinvests these fines for the use of Concessionary Fares and for Highways Maintenance. For both these areas the cost of these services are greater than the income from PCNs and the Council subsidises these areas.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 93**  
**Priority 4**

Question asked by: Lee Powell

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

Will political parties (other than Lewisham Labour party representatives) be reached out to so that they are engaged in the current review of the council's constitution?

**Reply**

The Constitution Working Party has, as part of its Terms of Reference, responsibility for making proposals to the Council for any changes to the Council's Constitution it considers necessary. With limited exceptions only a meeting of the Council can make amendments to the Constitution. The views and any recommendations of the CWP are included in any report taken to the Council.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 95**  
**Priority 5**

Question asked by: Annie Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Children and Young People

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

**Question**

Have you considered the use of separate school coaches for each school, especially for Lee Green and Grove Park who are struggling hugely with delayed buses and long traffic queues?

If so, will they be electric buses and when might we see this?

If not, what is the reason?

**Reply**

With the exception of specialist transport for children and young people with special educational needs, the Council does not provide coaches to take children to and from schools. The Council strives to promote greener, sustainable transport, and the hope is that more children will walk to school where possible, or use public transport with the free Zip Oyster Cards available to all children via Transport for London.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 96**  
**Priority 5**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Does it generally take 3 months to collect wheelie bins from a resident who has reported it as surplus to their requirements via the Council's website? How often is the email account advertised on the Council's website for requesting the collection (NOT delivery) of a wheelie bin monitored? How many Council email addresses advertised on the Council's website are not regularly monitored?

**Reply**

We apologise for the delay in collecting the surplus wheelie bin. This delay is unusual as we aim to collect them as soon as possible, usually within 2 weeks. Please report any surplus bins via the following email address:  
[envirocasework@lewisham.gov.uk](mailto:envirocasework@lewisham.gov.uk)

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 97**  
**Priority 5**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

With plans to replace the footbridge over the railway at Sydenham Park 10 years in the making according to Council meeting minutes, why were local residents not informed of the Council's plans to fell the mature London plane tree until less than two weeks before the planned date for its felling?

**Reply**

The Council has carried out essential works to repair and refurbish the Victorian era Sydenham Park Footbridge so that it is safe for residents to use. This includes the replacement of the bridge deck. Without carrying out these critical safety works, the bridge would likely have had to close on safety grounds and would deny residents one of the few and crucial crossing point across the railway line

Until as late as possible in the project planning stage the Council explored other options to try and avoid the need to remove the tree but it was concluded that in order to allow construction work to take place, removal of the tree was the only viable option.

A written update on these works was provided to local residents in September, which included information about the removal of this tree. This was needed to facilitate the specialised mobile crane to replace the bridge deck.

To compensate for the loss of the tree, the council will be planting four additional trees and will be working with local residents to agree the species and locations for these new trees in the New Year.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 98**  
**Priority 5**

Question asked by: Mark Del

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

At the last council meeting (28th Sept) Cllr Krupski mentioned that traffic data taken on Lee Rd during April 22 (partly during school holidays) was in line with the original sample data taken for the LTN. However, there was no sample data taken on boundary roads when the LTN was first implemented. Boundary roads have only been included due to residents putting pressure on the council to gather meaningful data. So this was the first time since that pressure was applied that data was being gathered. Can Cllr Krupski explain why this misleading information was given as a response to the supplementary Question for 23 (Question for council on 28th Sept), and why she also gave misleading information in the original response, when she stated that Cofles had returned on 25th April, when they in fact didn't return until 26th April. This data is very significant as not only was a day lost to a school holiday (22nd April), an extra day's data was then impacted due to the largest school in LTN (Colfes) being out due to teacher training (which massively impacts traffic within LTN). This could have been checked by looking at the schools website, or by calling the school.

**Reply**

The information was wholly accurate and relevant and no additional data gathering or additional surveys were considered necessary.

Any perceived concerns around Colfes School are not considered statistically significant to affect the overall results.

Further details can be found in the following links below of reports of the Mayor & Cabinet sessions of January 2022 and September 2022:

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=31225#mgDocuments>

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=7912&Ver=4>

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 99**  
**Priority 6**

Question asked by: Annie Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

On Monday 31st October, 2022 at 16.15pm, there was a collision on Lee High Road between a motor vehicle and bus.

Lee High Road was subsequently closed in both directions for approximately 3 hours.

During that time, vehicles trying to get to Hither Green, but more importantly, Lewisham Hospital, will have travelled either up Dermody Road or Ennersdale in a desperate attempt to get out of the road blocks.

It is very possible that it would have caused a lot of confusion and a higher number of vehicles passing through the Dermody and Ennersdale filters.

Will the council make exceptions for this time period and cancel any PCNs generated during the 2 way closure of Lee High Road?

Please do not answer with advice on how to make representations to the council and, if unsuccessful, how to take it to tribunal and appeal in court. My question is not how to appeal any decision.

My question is quite simply: will you make exceptions for any PCNs generated during that time by alerting the parking department and making them aware of this decision?

If not, why not?

**Reply**

The Council is aware of the incident which took place on the 31st October 2022, and aware of the road closures and the subsequent diversions. The Council is not able to alter the system as suggested. However, the Council will review any challenged PCN based on its individual merit by assessing the individual case based on evidence and mitigating circumstances presented against each and individual case.

This is to ensure our customers are being provided a fair and consistent service level and our practice satisfies all statutory requirements

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 100**  
**Priority 6**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

In the last Council meeting Chris Barnham responded to Q29 but admitted he hadn't attended the relevant meetings and said he could not speak on behalf of the Mayor. Q25 was answered by Paul Bell who didn't know the answer because he wasn't at the meeting in question. Why did the Mayor delegate questions specifically addressed to him to people who weren't at the relevant meetings?

**Reply**

The Council Procedure Rules state: -  
Questions about the work of the Executive will be replied to by the member of the Executive to whom it is addressed, or otherwise by the Mayor or the Executive member within whose area the subject matter of the question falls. In all other cases, questions will be replied to by the Speaker, or the Chair of the relevant committee.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 101**  
**Priority 6**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

When local residents started to express opposition to the felling of the London plane tree on Sydenham Park, the Council adopted a narrative of urgency and potential delay in relation to these works that is completely unfounded. Public records clearly indicate that the footbridge works have been on the Council's agenda for at least a decade, and the operatives felling the tree confirmed that they have been aware of the plans for six months. The Council communications strategy appears that it was intended to sow division and reduce support for the community group opposing felling of the tree. In particular, attempts to establish a narrative of being either for the safety of women and girls or for this single tree, are dishonest and entirely reprehensible. Can the Council apologise to local residents who, following the Council's communications, were falsely accused by members of the public of opposing improvements to the footbridge?

**Reply**

The Council has carried out essential works to repair and refurbish the Victorian era Sydenham Park Footbridge so that it is safe for residents to use. This includes the replacement of the bridge deck. Without carrying out these critical safety works, the bridge would likely have had to close on safety grounds and would deny residents one of the few and crucial crossing point across the railway line  
In order to allow construction work to take place, a London Plane Tree also had to be removed. A written update on these works was provided to local residents in September, which included information about the removal of this tree.  
Removing a tree is always a last resort and we explored all possible options to avoid this outcome, including using a larger crane and delivering the new bridge span to site via the railway line. These options would have resulted in the removal of additional mature trees, delays to the project of up to five years – increasing the risk of closure – and additional costs of over £400,000 – taking money away from vital local services.  
To compensate for the loss of the tree, the council will be planting four additional trees and will be working with local residents to agree the species and locations for these new trees in the New Year.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 102**  
**Priority 6**

Question asked by: Mark Del

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Can the Council confirm when the St Margret's safer streets (Lee Church Rd) will be implemented. We were told by Christian Muncey (Traffic and Safety Manager) "A school street scheme is being developed for this school with a planned launch date in November 2022". We are now in Nov and there is currently no sign of this safer street scheme being implemented.

**Reply**

The school street at St Margaret's School was originally planned for completion in November 2022. To implement the scheme requires agreement with TfL as some of the signs and equipment need to be placed on TfLs road network. This has caused a short delay as the Council seeks their agreement.

As such it is anticipated that the school street will now be in place early in the New Year.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 103**  
**Priority 7**

Question asked by: Annie Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

What plans does the council have to introduce more LTNs in Lewisham?

**Reply**

The Council is currently assessing a programme of potential Healthy Neighbourhoods for the borough will be subject to available funding for implementation. The programme is anticipated to be included in the LIP submission for 2023/24.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 104**  
**Priority 7**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

**Question**

The Council disclosed in the High Court that its planning dept. does not read or save emails when it is sent a copy (i.e. the Council is included in the cc box). When did the Council decide to apply such a policy and when did they inform the public? Does the same policy apply to all Council departments or just planning?

**Reply**

The Planning Service inbox (planning@lewisham.gov.uk) receives over 400 direct emails on a daily basis (not including carbon copy and blind carbon copy emails). As a result of this large amount of correspondence received daily, it is not possible for carbon copy and blind carbon copy emails to be monitored. The approach of the Lewisham Business Improvement Team who monitor the inbox is to only monitor emails directly addressed to the planning@lewisham.gov.uk email address – to do otherwise would not be feasible given the volume of email traffic. No emails are deleted but as copies of correspondence rather than direct correspondence, it is expected that those who are the recipient of the emails action them and reply. This is not a Council wide policy but has been operated within the Planning Service for some years given the volume of emails received.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 105**  
**Priority 7**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Did the Council consider alternative, lightweight bridge designs that would have avoided the need for a large crane in the works to replace the deck of the Sydenham Park footbridge?

Recent works to fell the mature London plane tree on Sydenham Park involved unlawfully closing the right of way from Sydenham Park to Dacres Road via the footbridge over the railway. Why did the Council avoid going through the process of lawfully suspending the right of way?

Did Council cost management exercises for the works to the Sydenham Park footbridge consider:

- a) Compensation tree planting for the felled mature London plane tree?
- b) Maintenance of newly planted trees?
- c) Consultation with the community regarding new tree planting?
- d) Consultation with the community regarding re-landscaping the area where the tree once stood?
- e) The unnecessary police presence during the felling of the tree?

If the above points were not taken into account in the Council's consideration of costs related to alternative options for the bridge improvement works, please can the Council explain how the true costs of the chosen option were taken into account in decision making?

**Reply**

The Council has carried out essential works to repair and refurbish the Victorian era Sydenham Park Footbridge so that it is safe for residents to use. This includes the replacement of the bridge deck. Without carrying out these critical safety works, the

bridge would likely have had to close on safety grounds and would deny residents one of the few and crucial crossing point across the railway line

In order to allow construction work to take place, a London Plane Tree also had to be removed. A written update on these works was provided to local residents in September, which included information about the removal of this tree.

A range of design options were considered in the detailed planning stage.

Unlimitedly the design has had to meet the very stringent requirements of Network Rail who ultimately approved the design.

The temporary closure of the bridge to facilitate the works was authorised through a temporary traffic order which was in place to restrict pedestrian and vehicle access during the works for safety reasons.

All the costs incurred to complete the works referred to, including the planting of four new trees to compensate for the loss of the London Plane tree, are being funded through existing project budgets.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 106**  
**Priority 7**

Question asked by: Mark Del

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Can the Council share with us what benefits are being seen from the LTN so far?  
Has pollution in the borough and more importantly South East Lewisham dropped?  
have traffic levels in South East Lewisham reduced?

**Reply**

The latest Lewisham and Lee Green LTN Monitoring report was approved by the Council's Mayor and Cabinet on 21st September 2022. The report sets out the results of the monitoring undertaken over the previous 6 months to assess the performance and benefits of the LTN. Please see link:  
<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=7912&Ver=4>

The key elements being monitored include traffic levels and speeds on local roads, air quality, bus journey times, impact on emergency services and collision levels. Full details are available in the report on the Council's website.

The overall concentration of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) has decreased with time across Lewisham as can be seen in the Council's newly published 2022-27 Air Quality Action Plan, which is also available to view on the Council's website.

Traffic levels in South East Lewisham like the rest of London were widely impacted by the pandemic which saw an approximately 25% reduction in traffic levels during 2020 however this has risen back to near pre-pandemic levels in 2022.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 107**  
**Priority 8**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

What problem does the Council believe will be resolved by imposing restrictions on public questions at Council meetings? How do the proposed restrictions give local people greater opportunity to engage directly with the Council?

**Reply**

There is no legal requirement for councils to allow for questions to be permitted, either from councillors or members of the public. It is a local choice matter and a wide variety of approaches are adopted by councils.

For this Council meeting 129 questions were received including 26 from one individual.

A summary of the arrangements regarding the number and limitations on council questions in other authorities is set out below: -

<b>Council</b>	<b>Allowed?</b>	<b>Deadline for submission</b>	<b>Time allowed</b>	<b>Limitations</b>
<b>Lambeth</b>	Yes, both	Questions to be submitted by 12pm, 20 days prior to meeting.	25 minutes	1 question only for Public
<b>Hackney</b>	Yes, both	Deadline is 12pm, 4 working days before the meeting. For Member questions it is 8 working days before the meeting.	30 minutes	Public get 1 question only. 50 word limit. Members can ask 2 questions
<b>Enfield</b>	Member only	Member questions deadline is 12pm 9 calendar days before the meeting.	20 minutes	
<b>Tower Hamlets</b>	Member only		30 minutes	
<b>Southwark</b>	Yes, both	Public, 3 working days before the meeting. Member questions, deadline is midnight 9 working days before the meeting.	15 minutes for public. 30 minutes for Members	Public get 1 question only. 50 word limit. Members also 1 question only

As can be seen, the approaches vary from council to council. All councils that allow public questions have provisions that restrict the number of questions. This restriction undoubtedly helps councils manage resources in the run-up to council meetings. Simplifying the Council's approach to align with the approach taken by other councils will assist members, officers and the public in asking and responding to questions, e.g. the removal of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, etc. preference questions. For effective management of resources and Council meetings, the following was recommended to a recent meeting of the Constitutional Working Party: -

### **Recommendations**

1. Public and member questions remain in the Council Procedure Rules;
2. Public questions are limited to two questions per member of the public and each question limited to 50 words;
3. The time limit for public questions remains at 30 minutes;
4. Member questions are limited to two questions per member and each question limited to 50 words;
5. The time limit for member questions remains at 30 minutes;
6. The provisions relating to order of questions, notice of questions, scope of questions, disallowing questions, record of questions, supplementary questions and the absence of the questioner remain as currently provided.

The Constitutional Working Party resolved to recommend the following to Council: -

1. The number of questions allowed for a member of the public and any councillor would be two.
2. The word limit for questions would be 100 words.

The Monitoring Officer assured the Committee the recommendations would be taken to full Council in November 2022 for a decision and be reviewed after 6 months.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 108**  
**Priority 8**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

For all future works involving the felling of trees, please can the Council commit to undertaking full costing of the value of the tree(s) in accordance with an established methodology, such as the Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT), and providing corresponding levels of compensation?

**Reply**

We do not use CAVAT to inform decisions on the removal of trees.

Currently, Lewisham Council only fells trees if it's necessary. This means that the tree is dead, diseased, or dying and/or poses a significant liability risk (if, for example, the tree is undermining the foundations of a resident's house as determined by a third-party surveyor) and all other options for managing the tree have been exhausted.

In some circumstances we would give due consideration to the estimated age, size, and potential for carbon capture of a tree that is being removed. This information can then be used to inform the choice of species and number of trees used in any compensatory planting arrangements.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 109**  
**Priority 8**

Question asked by: Mark Del

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Road works on Lee road in the last 11 months have seemed to increased, with long delays between starting work and completing it. This has a detrimental affect on traffic on this road, which is more acute due to the pressure put on it from the implementation of the LTN and the road being used as a HGV cut through. The latest road works, at the south end of Lee Rd, started 27th Oct when traffic lights where installed and a hole dug, but since then work has stopped. This has led to large queue's of traffic building up on a daily basis. What are the council doing to make sure that when road works start, contractors have plans in place to limit the time road restrictions are in place? this would not only keep traffic flowing, but also help tackle climate change, and ensure resident wellbeing (physical and mental).

**Reply**

The vast majority of road works on the public highway, within Lewisham, are undertaken by utility companies. Under law these works are authorised by the Council as the highway authority by means of the London Permit Scheme. According to our records 16 sets of road works have taken place on Lee Road in the last 11 months. Some of these are planned works and some unplanned as are associated with utility emergency works.

Applications for any planned works are assessed against strict criteria and are either approved, refused or amended depending on the result of the Council's assessment. The specific details agreed include the proposed start and end dates of the works. End dates may be amended once works have started due to unforeseen circumstances, including where works are unplanned emergencies.

The works referred to that started on the 27th October were emergency works to repair a gas leak by the utility provider. As is common with gas leak excavations the hole often needs to remain open until gas in the area has dissipated and reached a safe level, which can sometimes take several days. Once open, excavations for gas leaks cannot legally be reinstated until fully repaired and certified as safe. According to council records the works were completed on the 8th November.

Where utilities and other contractors working on the highway overstay their agreed permit duration or break the rules of the London Permit Scheme the Council will seek

to use enforcement powers available under the relevant legislation where appropriate, including fines.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 110**  
**Priority 9**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Corporate Resources

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

**Question**

Over the last 12 months how many reports of concern has the Council received that in the past would have been addressed by the out of hours service (Q8 of 20.07.22 refers)? How many sites of interest have been identified?

**Reply**

During the period 1 October 2021 to 5 November 2022, the Council's Out of Hours service recorded 46 calls made by Lewisham residents relating to 'out of hours noise complaints'.

Thirty eight sites of interest were identified.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 111**  
**Priority 9**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

How will Lewisham Council measure and offset the estimated 5 tonnes of CO2 sequestered in the London plane tree felled on Sydenham Park, so that its destruction does not adversely affect the Council's commitment to achieve carbon neutrality within the next 7 years?

**Reply**

The Council has carried out essential works to repair and refurbish the Victorian era Sydenham Park Footbridge so that it is safe for residents to use. This includes the replacement of the bridge deck. Without carrying out these critical safety works, the bridge would likely have had to close on safety grounds and would deny residents one of the few and crucial crossing point across the railway line. In order to allow construction work to take place, a London Plane Tree also had to be removed. A written update on these works was provided to local residents in September, which included information about the removal of this tree. To compensate for the loss of the tree, the Council will be planting four additional trees which are anticipated to be between 10 and 14 years old at the time of planting with the potential to develop a significantly greater canopy cover than the mature London Plane could. The Council remains committed to planting new trees across Lewisham, as part of our mission to tackle the Climate Emergency and become carbon neutral by 2030. Since 2018, the council has planted over 730 streets trees across the borough, in addition to 24,000 tree whips at Beckenham Place Park.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 112**  
**Priority 10**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

**Question**

In his written response to Q29 of 28.09.22 Chris Barham didn't answer the question about the Mayor having ever raised with the local police commander whether there are any officers still working in Lewisham who have been accused of domestic abuse. In the meeting he said he could not speak on behalf of the Mayor. Can the Mayor confirm whether he has ever raised this issue with the local police commander? When is the next meeting scheduled?

**Reply**

The Mayor's next meeting with the Borough Commander takes place on Monday 5th December.

The theme of the meeting is Violence against Women and Girls and this issue will be raised.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 113**  
**Priority 10**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Can the Council please provide data on numbers of trees felled and trees planted on Council-owned land in Sydenham, Forest Hill and Perry Vale wards in the last 10 years?

How does the net loss of trees (e.g. street trees) on Council-owned land in Sydenham, Forest Hill and Perry Vale wards in recent years align with Council strategies and policies regarding tree coverage, microclimate, green infrastructure, biodiversity and climate change?

**Reply**

Following a review of our records for tree planting across: Sydenham, Forest Hill, and Perry Vale wards between 2013 and the end of the current tree planting season in early 2023, I can inform you that the Council will have planted:

Planted 299

Felled 252

Net Gain +47

Unfortunately, when managing a large urban tree stock there will be occasions when trees will have to be felled for various reasons, including the risk posed to the health and safety of the public by a dead or dying trees, trees proven as implicated in damage to property of infrastructure.

In addition to the work that has taken place in recent years to plant many new trees across the whole borough including 25,000 trees planted as part of our regeneration of Beckenham Place Park.

I am really pleased to announce that we will be planting a further 550 new trees in partnership in the current planting season with our partners Street Trees for Living and we are committed to planting a many more trees in future years. This aligns well not only with our manifesto commitment to:

“Plant more street trees and launch the Tree from Every Window programme which aims to make sure every child can see a tree or greenery from their home. We will also plant more tiny forests and community orchards” along with our other strategies that are in place to ensure Lewisham Council plays its part in tackling the Global Climate Emergency.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 114**  
**Priority 11**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Sophie Davis

**Question**

What problems with the way Lewisham Homes manages property has the Council identified and how does Council believe those problems will be resolved by changing from a wholly owned subsidiary of the Council?

**Reply**

The proposal to bring back the landlord management services to be directly managed by the Council is in part a response to the changes in the legislation and regulations, particularly after the Grenfell fire. Lewisham, like most other councils that had ALMOs, is looking at the best way to respond to these changes and remove an additional layer of governance.

Tenants' priority is improving repairs as shown in the consultation with residents over the proposed changes.

Directly managing the service will generate savings by reducing the overheads of running the service and these savings can be invested in improving the service.

Improvements will also be made by joining up the landlord management services to other services in the Council and increasing accountability.

There is widespread support from tenants and leaseholders to the change as demonstrated in the response to the consultation – 71% of responses to the survey support insourcing Lewisham Homes.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 115**  
**Priority 11**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Ward councillors have said that they were not made aware of the Council's plans to fell the mature London plane tree on Sydenham Park until less than two weeks before the planned date for its felling. Why was this the case?

**Reply**

The Council has been in regular liaison with stakeholders and informed of the felling of the tree at the appropriate time.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 116**  
**Priority 12**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Construction contributes up to 11% of global carbon emissions. What role if any does the Council have as a planning authority in reducing those emissions by favouring conversion of existing properties rather than demolition? Is the carbon footprint of a proposed development a material consideration in deciding whether a planning application should be agreed?

**Reply**

London Plan policies SI 2 and SI7 provide detailed guidance on reducing carbon emissions and making use of whole life-cycle carbon studies to demonstrate actions to reduce carbon emissions. This is therefore a material planning consideration. Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy in the London Plan promotes material re-use.

Through the Development Management process officers will encourage the retention of buildings and re-use of materials where appropriate.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 117**  
**Priority 12**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Why did the Council not undertake a bat survey of the recently felled tree on Sydenham Park until alerted to the potential legal ramification of felling the tree without confirming absence of bat roosts by a local resident?

**Reply**

In order to allow for a vital replacement of the bridge deck for Sydenham Footbridge, the construction work required the use of a specialised mobile crane. This necessitated the removal of a London Plane Tree.

Upon initial assessment of the tree it was not deemed necessary, and a subsequent bat survey validated the original decision.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 118**  
**Priority 13**

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Chief Executive

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

**Question**

At the Council meeting on 28th September the Chair interrupted three members of the public asking supplementary questions to tell them to hurry up. He did not interrupt Chris Barnham's speech in response to Q29 and he never interrupts any of Paul Bell's speeches. Do different rules apply to responding Councillors (as opposed to the public) during the public question session?

**Reply**

Thank you for your question Mark Bennett, I would like to start by stating there is a clear difference between asking a question and answering it. Also, the Speaker is responsible for the conduct of the Council meetings and takes advice from the Monitoring Officer. The Council Procedure Rules state: - If the Speaker agrees, a questioner who has put a question may put one supplementary question to the member who has replied. A supplementary question must arise directly out of the original question or the reply given to it.

The opportunity, if allowed by the Speaker, is for a supplementary question. The Speaker is clear that it must be a question, as opposed to a statement, and it must arise directly out of the original question or the reply given to it.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 119**  
**Priority 13**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

For the recent felling of the mature London plane tree on Sydenham Park, the Council mobilised three police officers who sat nearby in an unmarked police car for a number of hours. Their presence proved unnecessary as local residents peacefully observed the destruction of the much loved tree. Please can you provide an estimate of the cost of the police presence?

**Reply**

The Council works closely with the Police on many issues as a matter of course, including in this instance, and their presence was not an additional cost to the Council.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 120**  
**Priority 14**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Can the Council commit to a timetable for the publication of a feasibility study for creating step free access across the footbridge on Sydenham Park?

Should studies prove that step free access for the railway crossing at Sydenham Park is technically feasible, can the Council commit to delivering this within a specified timetable?

**Reply**

The Council has undertaken a preliminary study to provide step free access which is not feasible due to significant costs and space constraints. The Council considered a ramp option but as stated this was rejected due to the resources required, potential planning constraints and the felling of mature trees.

The Council is currently considering an additional assessment on the feasibility of a hybrid stepped access as an alternative. The Council will commence the additional assessment this financial year and any implementation will be subject to available funding.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 121**  
**Priority 15**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

Does the Council undertake carbon accounting?

How is the Council measuring its progress towards its declared goal of carbon neutrality by 2030?

Does the Council's carbon accounting take account of trees felled by the Council/contractors acting on behalf of the Council?

**Reply**

The Council commissioned a costed analysis of the actions needed to deliver the ambition for Lewisham to be net zero carbon by 2030 which was published alongside the Council's Climate Emergency Action Plan in 2020

<https://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s72556/Annex%20C%20Routes%20to%20Carbon%20Neutral%20Report.pdf>

The Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy publishes an annual data set of carbon emissions at a local authority level across the UK. The latest data covers 2020 identifying 690.6kt CO<sub>2</sub>e in Lewisham, a reduction of 44% since the baseline of 2005. <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/uk-local-authority-and-regional-greenhouse-gas-emissions-national-statistics>

In terms of the Council's corporate emissions, Lewisham is part of the London Councils emission reporting group and has updated its corporate carbon reporting to follow the standard agreed by that forum of reporting using the Local Partnerships Greenhouse Gas Accounting Tool <https://localpartnerships.org.uk/greenhouse-gas-accounting-tool/>. Data for the years 2018/19 to 2021/22 will be published on the Council's website by the end of the 22/23 financial year.

The Council's corporate carbon accounting does not include any adjustments relating to trees however in 2021/22 there was a net gain of trees: the Council planted 294 street trees and 174 trees in parks as well as 790 'whips' or young trees. In that same period there were 79 trees on Council land that were lost.

**COUNCIL MEETING 23/11/22**  
**PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 122**  
**Priority 16**

Question asked by: Brendan Cuddihy

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Louise Krupski

**Question**

The webpage on the Lewisham Council website that describes the improvements to the Sydenham Park footbridge (<https://lewisham.gov.uk/sydenham-park-footbridge>) mentions "pruning". Why was the planned felling of the mature London plane tree not mentioned?

**Reply**

The council has carried out essential works to repair and refurbish the Victorian era Sydenham Park Footbridge so that it is safe for residents to use. This includes the replacement of the bridge deck. Without carrying out these critical safety works, the bridge would likely have had to close on safety grounds and would deny residents one of the few and crucial crossing point across the railway line

As part of these works, some of the trees and bushes on the path leading up to the bridge have been pruned in order to improve the visibility of the path – this is the 'pruning' referred to on the webpage.

In order to allow construction work to take place, a London Plane Tree also had to be removed. A written update on these works was provided to local residents in September, which included information about the removal of this tree. This was needed to facilitate the specialised mobile crane to replace the bridge deck.

To compensate for the loss of the tree, the council will be planting four additional trees and will be working with local residents to agree the species and locations for these new trees in the New Year.