



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 19
January 2022

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 1

Priority 1

Question asked by: David O'Malley

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Regarding the LTN consultation. Why weren't the residents in Woodyates Road South (Bromley side of South Circular) issued hard copy consultation documents? Residents in Woodyates Road North (Lee station side of South Circular) just 21 meters from Woodyates Road South were issued hard copy consultation documents. Why were residents living in the same road treated differently and why weren't the residents in Woodyates Road South not given a hard copy consultation document?

How many hard consultation packs were issued, were they numbered and what procedure have LBL set up to stop fraudulent photocopying of this pack? Is there a list of roads that the LBL have issued these packs to which can be issued? Can LBL explain how many packs were issued and how many were returned?

Reply

We wanted to encourage as many responses as possible to the public consultation. It was done so by using a range of consultation methods, including distributing hard copies of the consultation material, an online consultation, social media, posters and door knocking. We recognise that providing a hard copy of the consultation material to as many people as possible would be ideal however the costs involved limit our ability to do this.

A total of 35,890 hardcopy leaflets and surveys were distributed across the consultation area. A map of the consultation area is included in the Mayor and Cabinet report.

Details of the consultation and responses received can be found in the consultation and engagement report, which is an appendix to the Mayor and Cabinet report.

The consultation was open to all and to raise awareness of the consultation posters were also placed on street, which included Woodyates Road.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 2

Priority 1

Question asked by: Roger Stocker

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Lewisham Council continues with its road and pavement renewal scheme. Does the highway team responsible for scheduling these works liaise with the councils 'Active Transport team' (if one exists) to assess the area to look at current best practice for active travel modes, using tools such as Healthy Streets scorecard, Pedestrian Comfort levels, PERS, London Cycle Design Standards, Junction Assessment tool etc?

Does the highways team contact local councillors in advance of the scheduled works seeking suggestions (missing drop kerbs, missing tactiles, minor highway improvements etc.)?

Reply

Liaison between the respective highway and strategic transport teams takes place regularly to schedule carriageway resurfacing and footway improvement works. Officers work to increase co-ordination of all planned works on the highway to support wider Council objectives, including to encourage more journeys to be made by public transport, cycling and walking.

Local councillors are consulted on an annual basis to seek their feedback and suggestions in advance of the carriageway resurfacing and footway improvement programme being finalised.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 3

Priority 1

Question asked by: Andrew Brown

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Given the increasing traffic on Leahurst Road when is the council going to make changes to what have now been “temporary” changes to the LTN that have been in place for over a year? Does the council acknowledge that the temporary changes have made conditions on Leahurst road worse for residents, cyclists and school children? When will action be taken to reduce through traffic?

Reply

On 12 January 2022 Mayor and Cabinet approved the recommendations that the LTN is retained alongside a package of environmental measures. The report is publicly available on the Council’s website.

Traffic counts for Leahurst Road at different times are available in the report and the report confirms that monitoring of traffic numbers and air quality will continue.

As the report has been approved, changes to the layout of the Leahurst Road modal filter will be investigated, as set out in the decision report and the Council will be corresponding with schools in the area including on Leahurst Road to consider how school streets can be implemented In addition a new package of complementary environmental measures will be introduced, including planters/trees and green spaces, additional electric vehicle charging points, additional bike hangars and cycle stands, additional and/or improved pedestrian crossing points and new seating.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 4

Priority 1

Question asked by: Edward Hayman

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Who is responsible for the Waterlink Way cycle route and might authorise barriers at the bridge and how much do the Council pay Glendale for maintenance?

Reply

The Council is responsible for the Waterlink Way cycle route and could authorise the use of barriers at the bridge if it were considered appropriate.

Glendale, our Park Management Contractor is paid £20,542 pa for infrastructure maintenance to Broadway Fields; Brookmill Park; Cornmill Gardens; Ladywell Fields; River Pool Linear Park and Riverview Walk that run along the Waterlink Way.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 5

Priority 1

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Paul Bell

Question

Lewisham & Greenwich NHS Trust included campaign groups in the panel that looked into the use of bailiffs to collect charges from people who were not eligible for free treatment. In the light of the trust's decision to include outside organisations, what can the Council learn about improving its own reviews? Had the Council considered including residents' groups in its recent (and presumably continuing) review of the way the Council's planning department operates?

Reply

The Council is committed to ensuring that Lewisham residents are encouraged to participate in the work of the Council, specifically so as the performance of Council functions and provision of services directly affect them. Our engagement with residents during the height of the Covid-19 pandemic highlighted not just the critical contribution that residents can play in galvanising the borough's response to a major crisis, but also the importance of engaging those with reach and influence in the community. Building on this experience and going forward, the Council is looking to further improve its resident engagement function to ensure that we are better able to service the residents of the borough. With regard to the Planning service, the Council are already engaging with community groups through the established Community Group forum and this will include changes to how the Planning service operates that will be delivered as a result of the Local Democracy Review.

It is worth noting that the Planning team are residents too. Whether that be in Lewisham or elsewhere. Our Planning department is small with officers working at great capacity for residents and for the Council. Austerity has and is affecting what can and is delivered. Cuts to officer posts, capacity and resources will make an impact to any service. I hope you will join with me in thanking the Planning service in doing what it is does, despite the many financial challenges it faces.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 6

Priority 1

Question asked by: Jean Parker

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Brenda Dacres

Question

In the light of the Sarah Everard case, what is the Council doing to make our streets safer for women at night?

I am particularly concerned about inadequate street lighting particularly in roads like mine where the number of lamps was greatly reduced when they were replaced some years ago. At night there are now huge dark pavement areas where cars are closely parked. These cars completely block light from the sparsely placed street lamps, making the dark areas treacherous because of uneven pavements – not to mention the possibility of strangers lurking in the shadows. Also the height of the street lamps, and their changed position nearer to the houses, cause many doorways now to be in dark shadow.

Reply

The Council has recently published its Domestic Abuse and Violence against Women and Girls Strategy 2022-27 which focuses on education and engagement to ensure the reduction of gender based crime in all in forms.

The Council works closely with the Police to review areas of high risk in order to 'design out crime' and we recently surveyed 503 residents to understand their concerns regarding safety on the streets and are working to address these wherever possible. We are also undertaking a safety audit of our open spaces with a view to ensuring that they are as safe as possible. In the more immediate term the Council maintains a network of CCTV camera which are monitored 24 hours a day.

The Council will carry out some tests to check the lighting levels to ensure the street lighting is compliant with national standards and assess the level of lighting. Please contact the Council's street lighting partner on 0800 0285986 to confirm the locations.

For information, the Council carried out a street light replacement programme between 2011-2016 and all the roads across the borough were re-designed to ensure the lighting levels complied with the British Standards. This involved changing the type of lighting column and their position to be at the rear of the

footway, where appropriate and possible, and the columns sited between the boundaries of any properties. This increased the quality of the lighting levels to those before, and as such did not require as many lamp columns.

Street lighting is designed to light up the carriageway and footway, with residents being responsible for their own properties and land.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 7

Priority 1

Question asked by: Gina Raggett

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Andre Bourne

Question

Can the Council provide an update on the new library in the Catford shopping centre? When will it open and to what extent will it be staffed by qualified librarians?

Reply

Works at the location for the new library are underway and ongoing. The project is on schedule for completion by March. Given a number of external factors, including the effects of Covid-19, the confirmed opening date will be announced as soon as practicable.

The Library and Information Service does not require staff to hold a library qualification but does ensure that all staff throughout the service receive training and support to enable them to deliver a high quality, community focussed library service.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 8

Priority 1

Question asked by: Martin Cox

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

What is the Council's annual revenue from the bulky waste collection? What is the Council's annual expenditure on dealing with flytipping?

Reply

The Council's revenue from bulky waste collection, which includes fridges and freezers, of the last financial year (Apr20-Mar21) was £146,856.

The Council's annual expenditure on collecting and disposing of flytipping over the same period was approximately £750,000.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 9

Priority 1

Question asked by: Iain Brown

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

There is no pedestrian crossing outside the train station on Perry Vale. It is a busy station and a busy road and the traffic does not generally give pedestrians any leeway to cross. I have seen people close to being hurt. For the safety of all pedestrians, please could a zebra crossing be installed?’

Reply

Thank you for your suggestion for a pedestrian crossing outside Perry Vale train station. This will be given consideration as part of future scheme identification to meet an objective of the Lewisham Transport Strategy that Lewisham’s streets will be safe, secure and accessible to all.

Unfortunately as a result of the pandemic the funding that the Council usually receives from TfL to implement schemes to deliver the transport strategy was suspended. It is our hope that a longer term funding agreement will be reached between Government and TfL soon so that we are able to continue to plan and deliver priority schemes for the benefit of our borough and residents, including improved pedestrian crossings.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 10

Priority 1

Question asked by: Carole Destre

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

I have a question about bike storages.

In a concerted effort, residents of our street, Revelon Road, asked for a bike storage to be installed about 2 years ago.

After having been told that TFL had no money left to support bike hangars (at a crucial time when councils are meant to support all ways to reduce CO2 emissions and transport is a huge emitter), a hangar appeared at the top of our street about four weeks ago. No-one in our street had been contacted to let us know this was about to take place (we have a whatsapp group to share news, info, borrow, lend and give things to one another).

We were very happy and excited, but we were given no information about how to use the hangar.

I waited a few days then called the company that produces the hangar, to be told....there was no space left, every bike space had been allocated! I was advised to write to the Road and traffic department of the council which I did, 3 weeks ago. I have not even received a response, nothing. I therefore do not know whether I am on the waiting list, nothing. Again no communication.

You can imagine my rage, yes, rage at the injustice of it: applying, waiting 2 years, thinking that the fact that we did not have a car would play in our favour....I guess it did, for the Hangar to be placed in our street....but not for at least one space in the hangar! No-one on our street seems to have a space....Yesterday I saw a lady picking up her bike from the hangar, asked her how she got the space...it turned out she applied but she lives on an adjacent street!

Could you please explain what this is all about? Why weren't we contacted, warned, explained the process to apply for bikes if we were to be allocated a hangar?

Could you please explain how to get another one of these, as we want to cycle and overcome the barrier of carrying the bikes everyday through the house (including my child)?

I assume there is no money left in the TFL pot....therefore could we get grants? How do we raise money for that?

Reply

We would like to sincerely apologise for your experience highlighted in your question to the Council.

The award of a space in the cycle hangars is managed by the hangar provider on behalf of the Council. It is done by application on the company's website and is done via a first come first served basis. Making a request for a cycle hanger does not guarantee a space, however we apologise that the upcoming installation of a cycle hangar on Revelon Road was not adequately communicated to enable you to make an application and we will liaise with our provider to ensure that communication is improved. Going forward we will ensure that interested residents are kept well informed and are notified when these measures are installed.

There is a desire to install more cycle hangars in proximity to your location. The level of funding available does not match the level of demand and we have tried to provide a spread of cycle hangers across the borough, however we regret that you and your neighbours have missed out on the opportunity to have space in the recent cycle hangar and will be in touch via our provider at the nearest availability.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 11

Priority 1

Question asked by: Patricia Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Andre Bourne

Question

Manor House Library:

The interior of the library building, south facing wall, between the original house and the 1930's extension, is suffering considerable damage to its plaster, paintwork and cornicing, both sides, due to ingress of water. We understand this was due to exterior damage, which was the responsibility of the council, and the council subsequently had the exterior leak repaired. Clearly there has to be a drying out process but what plans are there for interior repair? As the damage was caused by a council responsibility exterior problem will the council be taking responsibility and payment for the repair required in a Grade II* listed building?

Reply

The Council will consider internal repairs when the damage has been deemed to have been caused by a failure to the external fabric, which is the Council's responsibility. Any such repairs would likely take place later in the year, allowing the fabric to fully dry and any appropriate listed approvals to be gained.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 12

Priority 1

Question asked by: Dr Milos Stefanovic

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

It is quite evident that many roads in our neighbourhood of Lee Green require resurfacing. Would the Council be able to share information around the roads that have been repaved in the course of 2021 and which ones are planned for repavement during 2022?

It is also quite evident that many motorists continue to abuse the 20mph speed limit in some of the open side roads in our area, such as Manor Park, Southbrook Road or Micheldever Road, to name a few. What is the Council's plan to enforce the speed limits more effectively going forward given that various speed bump structures are simply insufficient?

What are the next steps around the LTN in the area? When will the public see some recent data around pollution levels in the areas where the LTN is in operation vs the period before the pandemic? How effective has the LTN been in terms of both reducing traffic levels, speed levels and pollution levels?

Reply

All roads included in this financial year's carriageway resurfacing programme have been identified following a condition assessment to inform priorities, which ensures that sections of road in the worst condition are the highest priority for funding. Based on the assessment process no roads within Lee Green were included in this year's programme.

Next financial year's programme is currently being developed and will be finalised once the available budget is confirmed. To report a highway defect or request that a road be considered for inclusion in a future carriageway resurfacing programme please visit the Council's web page: <https://lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/roads-and-transport>

Speed enforcement is legally the responsibility of the Police, as it is a criminal offence. However, 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 Members and / or the public. This liaison can lead to

police speed enforcement at the location being undertaken if certain criteria are met, or the location can be considered for the Community Roadwatch scheme.

The information provided by the Council, along with the results of any enforcement activity helps to create a 'Speed Dashboard', which provides TfL and the Police with an informed overview of the riskiest locations for excessive speed. It is our understanding that this is used to inform future work programmes.

A report on the Lewisham and Lee Green LTN public consultation and next steps was considered and approved by Mayor and Cabinet on 12 January 2022. The report is publicly available on our website and includes information on traffic levels, traffic speeds and air quality monitoring. Overall the LTN is considered to be meeting its aims.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 13

Priority 1

Question asked by: Jane Alaszewski

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

The Lewisham stretch of the A205 has dangerous air quality which, by the council's own admission, has further deteriorated since the LTN was installed adjacent. What mitigation measures are going to be put in place to reduce the road's air pollution? How will the council work with TFL to achieve this? Bearing in mind that ULEZ stretches 15 miles across north London but only 7 miles into south London, leaving much of Lewisham, including the south circular, out of ULEZ, will the council be lobbying TFL for a London-wide ULEZ?

Reply

There are a number of variables that will influence overall air quality in an area, such as weather conditions that may disperse air pollution from one area to another. Our air quality monitoring has shown a significant downward trend across the borough in the levels of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter since 2014.

The work that the Council is doing to further improve air quality across the borough is set out in the Air Quality Action Plan. This includes a number of measures to reduce the impact of vehicular traffic on the environment and encourage greater use of active and sustainable modes of travel. We will continue to work with TfL to achieve this and deliver improvements across the transport network in the borough.

The Council's response to the consultation on the Ultra-Low Emission Zone (ULEZ) expansion to include parts of Lewisham was supportive. However, it stated that our belief was that the expansion of the ULEZ for all vehicles should be London-wide. This position has not changed.

Meanwhile it is also worth noting there are wider air quality benefits of the ULEZ scheme beyond its boundary. For example, one of the key findings published by the GLA from the first month of operation was that "compliance with standards in the rest of London outside the zone was at 82%, an increase of 2% since the scheme went live".

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 14

Priority 1

Question asked by: Karen Pratt

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Paul Bell

Question

'Due to the additional population that the residential units will bring forward, there is the potential for impact upon local healthcare facilities and local schools. If the socio-economic assessment demonstrates that there will be an impact, mitigation will likely take the form of a financial contribution.' (Galliards' scoping letter dated 12th March 2021).

If the increase in residential units from 450 to 630 in the Leegate development goes ahead, what form will the financial contribution take? Will this be an S106 or CIL or both? And is any of the money likely to be spent on school places or new healthcare facilities?

Could Lewisham Council please inform us how exactly CIL and S106 money is spent and what are the mechanisms for applying for it? The Lewisham Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) is hardly enlightening on this matter, except for revealing how little of the money raised from other developers has yet been spent.

Reply

If an application for Leegate is approved, financial contributions would take the form of a CIL payment as well as any necessary site specific or 'non infrastructure' payments secured as part of the S106 agreement. CIL payments, although not ringfenced to specific projects, can be spent on healthcare and school provision as they are forms of infrastructure.

The IFS for April 2020 – March 2021 will be published shortly and is the document which sets out how contributions are spent. CIL is spent in partnership with infrastructure providers to meet needs identified in the Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP). Projects are prioritised where they clearly demonstrate meeting identified need with reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan; contribute to delivering Lewisham's Corporate Strategy; form part of a comprehensive service strategy; offer value for money and meet the appropriate legal definitions and regulations.

I completely recognise that more people in residence will need more health service provision. We all know the difficulty in trying to get a GP appointment. Much of that provision is out of our control, but nonetheless we need to make sure developers pay contributions to NHS healthcare. The NHS is the greatest achievement this country has created. We must all have conversations to fund it and recognise the contribution NHS workers – whether directly employed or through a contract - have and are making to our lives.

In addition, the Council have awarded nearly £1m to Borough wide community projects via the NCIL programme and will be awarding an additional £2.9m for ward based community projects over the coming months.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 15

Priority 1

Question asked by: Liz Fox

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Please name which specific community groups you have included in the review of the Lewisham and Lee Green LTN.

Reply

Responding to the public consultation that was undertaken on the Lewisham and Lee Green LTN was the way that community groups could participate in the review of the LTN.

Information relating to the findings of the review of the LTN were presented to Mayor and Cabinet for a decision on 12th January 2022. This includes information relating to the responses received to the public consultation. Further details are provided in the consultation and engagement report.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 16

Priority 1

Question asked by: Kate Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Given that this year Lewisham is the London Borough of Culture. How is Lewisham going to show case itself in its best light given the amount of fly tipping and rubbish that is swirling around its roads and parks at any given time, including around the civic centre and the council offices?

How many fly tipping fines have they issued during the last 3 months? What does the council propose to do about the persistent fly tippers that come into the borough at night and tip their builders rubbish in streets? I am sure that LBL is aware where these hot spots are, is it possible to put cameras up at the worst sites?

Reply

The Council has a zero tolerance to fly tipping. The Council spends approximately £750,000 per year in collecting and disposing of litter and flytipping and has expanded its enforcement approach across the borough. The majority of flytipping in Lewisham that impacts the visual amenity of Lewisham's streets is black bagged waste that has been disposed of incorrectly and illegally by local businesses and some residents.

Services across the Council always work closely together and are continuing to do so in this Borough of Culture year to ensure Lewisham will be shown in its best light.

Our parks were of course rated the best in London in the Good Parks for London latest annual report.

In 2021, the Council embarked on its Cleaner Lewisham campaign to help reduce fly tipping, improvement engagement with resident and businesses and create a cleaner borough. We are working with residents and businesses to ensure they know how to dispose of their rubbish responsibly and prevent fly tipping in the borough, for example by promoting our low-cost bulky waste collections and free mattress collections. We have been engaging with residents and businesses through a variety of channels, including social media, posters, leaflets and in-person community engagement events, such as litter-picking sessions.

This engagement and education work complements our action to tackle fly tippers, which is undertaken by our new focussed Environmental Crime Enforcement team which was created in August 2021. In the last three months since October 2021, we issued over 597 fixed penalty notices for environmental offences – a significant increase compared to previous years. We also secured a successful prosecution in September 2021 after a skip company was caught dumping asbestos in a residential street, resulting in a £3,000 fine.

We are also using deployable CCTV to catch fly tippers from vehicles. We currently have five CCTV locations around the borough where vehicles are often used to fly tip. Fly tipped builders waste is often discarded in council car parks where CCTV is already installed. Unfortunately professional fly tippers who discard builders waste often use false number plates to avoid being traced.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 17

Priority 1

Question asked by: Bob Ashdown

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

For the last council meeting I submitted Public Question 28 but parts were not fully answered

I asked

Last year central government gave local councils funding for active travel and social distancing. Please could you tell me how much LBL received and how much was spent on the LTN? Was money spent outside the LTN, if so where was this and how much was spent?

The answer was that a small amount of the £99,000 of government money was spent on the LTN.

So could I have a breakdown of where exactly in the borough was the bulk of the money spent and what actually was implemented?

I also asked

“Who will be examining the consultation responses? Will it include people who actually live in the LTN?”

This was not been answered.

My concern is according to the October Lee Green Labour meeting minutes the 3 councillors who live in the LTN have had informal discussions with the Mayor and Pat Codd and informed them the LTN modifications made in Nov 2020 met their aim.

As the 3 councillors personally benefit from the LTN then to achieve an outcome free from the accusation of bias the consultation should be reviewed only by people who have no personal connection to the LTN.

Will the council ensure this will happen?

I would still like an answer to who made the decision on where the paper consultations were delivered?

It was stated they were delivered to households in the consultation area.

Please state who decided what streets would form the consultation area and why were roads such as Winn Road that have become so dangerous due to displaced traffic missed, and roads such as Woodyates where half of the road that is in the LTN received the consultation but the half that is outside the LTN did not?

Reply

The majority of the funding that the Council received from Government for emergency active travel measures was used to deliver measures outside of the Lewisham and Lee Green LTN. This was used to deliver individual modal filters at a number of locations across the borough, such as Scawen Road.

In relation to the consultation responses these have been examined by Council officers and are presented as part of the decision report that was considered and approved by Mayor and Cabinet, on 12 January 2022, as part of the decision making process.

With regard to which streets received hard copies of the consultation material, we wanted to encourage as many responses as possible to the public consultation. It has done so by using a range of consultation methods, including distributing hard copies of the consultation material, an online consultation, social media, posters and door knocking. We recognise that providing a hard copy of the consultation material to as many people as possible would be ideal however the costs involved limit our ability to do this. All of the information that was distributed in hard copy was also available online.

A total of 35,890 hardcopy leaflets and surveys were distributed across the consultation area, which is considered to be a high number of a scheme of this nature. A map of the consultation area is included in the Mayor and Cabinet report. Details of the consultation and responses received can be found in the consultation and engagement report, which is an appendix to the Mayor and Cabinet report.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 18

Priority 1

Question asked by: Mark Morris

Relevant Directorate: Children & Young People

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

Question

Please provide:

1. The number of looked after children that had been placed inside the borough who had been missing for 24 hours or more.
2. The number of looked after children that had been placed outside the borough who had been missing for 24 hours or more.
3. The number of incidents of looked after children going missing from placements within the borough for 24 hours or more.
4. The number of incidents of looked after children going missing from placements outside of the borough for 24 hours or more.

Reply

Caring well for children who need to be looked after by the local authority is one of our most important priorities. Under this administration, a comprehensive improvement programme has been in place, responding to the 2019 Ofsted inspection finding that our children's social care service required improvement.

Following a more recent visit last summer, I was pleased that Ofsted praised the progress being made, and the improvements achieved in supporting children in care despite the many challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. As Ofsted say in the report:

“Senior leaders and partner agencies have worked well together to deliver an effective response to mitigate the impact of the pandemic in Lewisham. The local community has been significantly affected by the pandemic...Despite the ongoing

pressures this has put on services, leaders have continued to prioritise improvements to children's services, underpinned by corporate and political support."

This is a very welcome acknowledgement of the hard work and dedication of our children's social care team, who have continued to protect our most vulnerable children throughout the challenges of the pandemic. We can be proud of the difference their work is making to the lives of children.

There is of course more to be done - we have always known that we were engaged in a multi-year improvement programme, against a challenging background of financial constraint and pressures on our families. Support for children in our care will accordingly remain a very high corporate priority.

Turning to your specific questions about children in care who at some point go missing:

- Between April 2021 – Dec 2021: 7 children looked after by Lewisham, placed in borough were reported missing for 24 hours or more.
- Between April 2021 – Dec 2021: 16 children looked after by Lewisham, placed out of borough were reported missing for 24 hours or more.
- Between April 2021 – Dec 2021: 57 incidents children looked after by Lewisham, placed in borough were reported missing for 24 hours or more. This includes 3 young people (aged 16-17) who were missing between 10-15 times.
- Between April 2021 – Dec 2021: 118 incidents children looked after by Lewisham placed Out of borough were reported missing for 24 hours or more. This includes 4 young people (aged 13-17) who were missing between 10-15 times.

As part of the wider improvement programme mentioned above, we have tightened up our procedures to work with children who go missing but this is inevitably more difficult with children who are placed some distance from Lewisham. Work has started on refreshing our Placement Sufficiency Strategy which seeks to improve the quality of the provision used, increase the number who are supported by Lewisham foster carers and reduce our dependency on high cost residential provision.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 19

Priority 1

Question asked by: Diana Cashin

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Lewisham's reuse, recycling and composting waste is 28% which is significantly less than many neighbours such as Bexley (50%) and Bromley (45%).

The council has announced new plans for waste management in Lewisham but what are the targets and critical success factors for this which will be monitored and assessed?

Reply

The Waste Strategy, approved by Cabinet in December 2021, is an opportunity for the authority to set out its ambitions on reuse, recycling and composting. To this end, a household and business recycling target of 50% by 2025 and 65% by 2030 has been set.

The strategy creates a 10-year vision and framework for action and the Council is developing a monitoring framework to track progress. Key performance indicators will relate to the amount of waste produced by residents that is recycled, composted and which is processed for energy recovery are already in place and these will continue to be monitored and reported through the Council's monitoring framework.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 20

Priority 1

Question asked by: Annie Kirby

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

- 1) In your executive summary, you state that key stakeholder groups were notified and encouraged to respond to the consultation. Please name ALL stakeholder groups to which this statement refers and why they were selected.
- 2) Where you state that key stakeholder groups were notified and encouraged to respond to the consultation, please name all specific disability groups that were consulted, including SEN taxis, care agencies etc.
- 3) What criteria was used to select stakeholder groups with whom you'd consult. Did they approach you or vice versa?
- 4) Residents were told quite categorically that the consultation was not a referendum. Was there a baseline percentage figure that would have demonstrated the strength of feeling in the community - enough for you to say it wasn't wanted and wasn't working, and for you to rethink the whole scheme? For example, over 70% against?
- 5) Why are you recommending the LTN when the consultation findings show it fails to meet any of its objectives?
- 6) Grove Park ward takes a huge knock from the LTN in terms of displaced traffic and traffic cutting through to avoid the South Circular. You obviously must know this from your careful monitoring. Specifically which roads will receive the ongoing monitoring you state will be in place and when?

Reply

As a Council we have a responsibility to make difficult decisions – we know that not everyone wants to keep the LTN, but after careful consideration, and balancing the benefits and impacts, we believe the revised LTN has an important role to play in tackling the climate emergency, by driving down traffic, improving air quality and encouraging people to use more sustainable and active modes of transport.

Full details can be found in the Mayor and Cabinet report on our website. This includes details of the public consultation and the stakeholder responses received. Please see appendix G for the consultation and engagement report. To confirm, there was no baseline or threshold figure set in terms of those who felt positive or negative about the scheme. The consultation responses were part of a wider review and were considered in that context.

As stated in the decision report the Council will continue to monitor air quality and traffic in and around the LTN area. Traffic surveys and air quality monitoring will be undertaken in the same locations so that there is comparable data and consideration will be given to any additional survey sites. Should new locations be included in future monitoring it should be noted that there will not be any before data. In addition, the impact of the new environmental measures on walking and cycling will be assessed and as part of this some new pedestrian and cyclist counts will be undertaken.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 21

Priority 1

Question asked by: Peter Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

I understand that Street Cleaning is managed and operated zonally.

This implies each zone would include a given number of streets within that zone would be located nearby one another.

Unfortunately, a number of residential streets close to my home (including mine) do not appear to have been swept since the time of the previous Full Council Meeting on 24th November 2021.

Are any street-cleaning records kept, and if there are, can the streets comprising my zone be named?

Reply

There are four operational areas across the borough. This ensures that the 737km of roads and streets in Lewisham are regularly swept. The East operational zone, comprising of roads including Manor Lane Terrace, Northbrook Road, Kellerton Road and Chalcroft Road, is swept on Mondays.

Council services continued to be affected by Covid. This means that service delivery may need to change or adapt according to the resources available.

The Council will undertake a review of street cleansing performance in the East operational zone. At a wider level, the Council is reviewing its performance management system with regards to local environmental quality and is continually looking at ways to improve efficacy of monitoring practises.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 22

Priority 1

Question asked by: Cheryl McLeod

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Paul Bell

Question

What discussions has the Mayor had with prospective and current developers about Catford as defined by the Catford Masterplan area? Please list the dates and participants and this question would include their public relations teams.

Reply

The Catford Town Centre Framework includes a number of development sites, including those within the council's control. Any conversations which relate to the council's own landholdings are commercially sensitive and any exercise to procure a partner, or partners, in the future will be through a competitive procurement exercise. The council, through its statutory planning function, will also engage with developments that come forward on privately owned sites. Information about these developments will be available on the council's planning portal as and when they come through the planning system.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 23

Priority 1

Question asked by: Sarah Montgomery

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

In the September and November Council meetings, I made the Council aware of traffic monitoring data held by Greenwich Council detailing the impact of the Lee Green LTN on Greenwich boundary roads. The responses led me to believe that Lewisham Council would consider this data in the review of the scheme. Why, then, in appendix K monitoring report November 2021, has Lewisham Council not taken into account data on Greenwich boundary roads such as Horn Park Lane, Weigall Road, Crathie Road etc?

Reply

The Council has consistently stated that the review would take account of data collected in accordance with the Council's monitoring strategy for the LTN and information provided by TfL, which is considered to be sufficient to inform the review.

The Council continues to liaise with the Royal Borough of Greenwich in relation to the Lewisham and Lee Green low traffic neighbourhood (LTN) and other schemes that potentially impact across the borough boundary.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 25

Priority 1

Question asked by: Sara Jones

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Why have you elected to continue with the LTN, when the majority of comments are against it? See attachment: 56% against, 21 positive, 72% responses from inside Lewisham borough, 7% outside.

Reply

The consultation was not a referendum. It was intended to help us to understand people's experiences of both versions of the LTN, and to feed into wider considerations. As a Council we have a responsibility to make difficult decisions – we know that not everyone wants to keep the LTN, but after careful consideration, and balancing the benefits and impacts, we believe the revised LTN has an important role to play in tackling the climate emergency, by driving down traffic, improving air quality and encouraging people to use more sustainable and active modes of transport.

Full details can be found in the Mayor and Cabinet report on our website.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 26

Priority 1

Question asked by: Julia Burke

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Re the 'consultation' on LTNs, it's 'findings' & the Council's conclusion -

May I ask why it is recommended that the current situation remain?

Reply

The consultation was not a referendum. It was intended to help us to understand people's experiences of both versions of the LTN, and to feed into wider considerations. As a Council we have a responsibility to make difficult decisions – we know that not everyone wants to keep the LTN, but after careful consideration, and balancing the benefits and impacts, we believe the revised LTN has an important role to play in tackling the climate emergency, by driving down traffic, improving air quality and encouraging people to use more sustainable and active modes of transport.

Full details can be found in the Mayor and Cabinet report on our website.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 27

Priority 1

Question asked by: Silvia Suarez

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

The LTN consultation result has found that:

-The majority of respondents oppose the LTN, 60% opposed the original scheme and 56% opposed the revised scheme.

-Only a minority of respondents felt positive about the LTN (24% in regard to the original scheme; 21% regarding the revised scheme).

-The respondents' postcodes are, in its majority, from within the LTN (72%).

Having this in mind, why is Lewisham Council intending to go against the results of the consultation and, rather, recommend that the Revised LTN scheme is made permanent?

Reply

The consultation was not a referendum. It was intended to help us to understand people's experiences of both versions of the LTN, and to feed into wider considerations. As a Council we have a responsibility to make difficult decisions – we know that not everyone wants to keep the LTN, but after careful consideration, and balancing the benefits and impacts, we believe the revised LTN has an important role to play in tackling the climate emergency, by driving down traffic, improving air quality and encouraging people to use more sustainable and active modes of transport.

Full details can be found in the Mayor and Cabinet report on our website.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 28

Priority 2

Question asked by: David O'Malley

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

The LTN's were set up to stop the spread of Covid. What evidence has LBL got that shows that the Covid spread within the LTN was lower than that outside the LTN? If there was clear evidence that there was a difference when was this information discovered and when was this information passed on to the local health authority or Schools and what action, after this fact was discovered, did LBL carry out to stop the spread of covid through the non LTN areas. How many lives did the LTN actually save? How many lives were lost outside the LTN zone?

Reply

The Council implemented the LTN following the Government issuing guidance that encouraged councils to urgently make significant changes to their road layouts to give more space to cyclists and pedestrians in response to the pandemic. This was at a time when people needed more space than usual in order to maintain social distancing whilst walking/cycling and space is constrained by a combination of narrow footways, shop queuing systems, parking, and high traffic volumes and/or speeds on the carriageway.

This was a part of a number of measures that the Government led upon to manage the pandemic, including the wearing of masks, physical and social distancing, enhanced hygiene, lockdowns and the vaccine roll out, amongst other Governmental initiatives.

It is not reasonably possible to directly respond to your query, however the scheme has played its role as part of a wider national strategy.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 29

Priority 2

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Paul Bell

Question

How many people housed in temporary accommodation by the Council has the Council attempted to evict over the last 12 months for allegedly making themselves intentionally homeless? How many of those planned evictions were implemented? Does the Council take into account affordability of the accommodation they offer before deciding someone is intentionally homeless and before attempting to evict someone?

Reply

Over the last 12 months (11/01/2021-11/01/2022) 12 households have been evicted. Eviction is a last resort for the local authority and follows intensive mediation by housing officers as well as a full consideration of any necessary safeguarding factors. No household will be found to be intentionally homeless where any property occupied was unaffordable, as this factor must be carefully considered before making an intentionally homeless decision.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 30

Priority 2

Question asked by: Martin Cox

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

When will the Council consider proposals for an LTN (Low Traffic Neighbourhood) for parts of the Grove Park ward, in particular the northern part between the Sth Circular, Baring Road, Mottingham Lane and Chinbrook Road? This area is used by high volumes of through traffic cutting between the A20, south circular and Baring Road and Burnt Ash Hill.

Reply

We remain committed to the outcomes that LTNs aim to achieve and we will continue to explore how best to achieve them and will ensure that residents are involved in shaping future plans.

Unfortunately as a result of the pandemic the funding that the Council usually receives from TfL to implement schemes to deliver the transport strategy was suspended. It is our hope that a longer term funding agreement will be reached between Government and TfL soon so that we are able to continue to plan and deliver priority schemes for the benefit of our borough and residents. In the meantime we are exploring other funding opportunities, such as section 106 funding.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 31

Priority 2

Question asked by: Patricia Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Kevin Bonavia

Question

How does the council define a "district centre" as applicable to certain areas in the borough?

At the Lewisham Council Community Forum MStems link on 9th December questions on the procedures, policy and direction on the distribution of NCIL funds at the local level were raised.

A senior planning officer and Cllr Bonavia (Democratic Review) agreed to look at the tightening up of rules involved, as well as clarifying the system so that the public could have confidence in the use of public money. Can the council say how far this has proceeded and when the public can expect clear direction and information so as to understand how its money is used and distributed?

Reply

The definition of a District Centre as outlined in the Council's draft local plan (appendix 2: Glossary) is:

District Centre – Distributed more widely than Metropolitan and Major centres, providing convenience goods and services, and social infrastructure for more local communities and accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. Typically, they contain 5,000–50,000 sqm of retail, leisure and service floor space. Some District centres have developed specialist shopping function.

It has always been the intention to review how the NCIL process operated and to take on board lessons learned when the process completed. This will be undertaken post May 2022 and any proposed changes to the process for future rounds will be reported to Mayor and Cabinet for approval.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 32

Priority 2

Question asked by: Jane Alaszewski

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Lewisham has poor public transport infrastructure according to the PTAL index, which TFL cites as the reason for high car use in the area. Given the Bakerloo line has been put on hold, and TFL is threatening to scrap the Bakerloo line entirely, will Lewisham be lobbying TFL for any alternative transport improvements in the area? If so, what?

Reply

The public transport accessibility level (PTAL) varies across the borough and is not as favourable as some other London Boroughs. We will continue to press TfL and other organisations for improved transport infrastructure so that there are accessible alternatives to private car trips. This will contribute to achieving one of the objectives of the borough's transport strategy – that travel by sustainable modes will be the most pleasant, reliable and attractive option for those travelling to, from and within Lewisham.

It is recognised that identifying funding for new infrastructure projects will be challenging. However, the Transport Strategy (table 3.3) identifies a number of medium to long term interventions to ensure the economic and social vitality of the borough and to support the Borough to grow, thrive and meet the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy outcomes up to 2041.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 33

Priority 2

Question asked by: Karen Pratt

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

By the Council's own admission, the Lee Green LTN is not functioning correctly, 'we are aware that some of the schemes delivered as part of this programme are not working as expected and have created issues which need to be addressed, particularly the Lewisham and Lee Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood' (answer to public question 2, November 2020). So, if the council decides to retain the Lee Green LTN, will it countenance further modifications to it?

How is it going to help those residents of roads which were sacrificed in version 2 of the LTN for the greater good of the boundary roads? Longhurst Rd, Leahurst Rd, Manor Lane and Manor Park have borne the brunt of redirected traffic; the solution would be to use the already existing cameras to control rush hour traffic. The introduction of ANPR (Vehicle recognition software), which could enable residents free access while restricting rush-hour traffic from outside the borough, has been rejected on the grounds of expense. Could the council please give us a breakdown of the cost of this sensible reform?

If the council is concerned about money, why did it not apply to the Future High Streets fund, which granted Greenwich Council over £17 million for the regeneration of Woolwich town centre? (See their answer to public question 20, January 2021, outlining the paltry sums they obtained from other applications).

Reply

The statement regarding the Lewisham and Lee green LTN not working as expected related to the original scheme that was implemented. As a result the scheme was amended in November 2020.

As set out in the decision report, a package of complementary environmental measures are also being recommended, including greening, electric vehicle charging points, cycle parking and improved pedestrian facilities. These will be delivered as soon as possible on completion of feasibility and detailed design work.

Alternative options were considered in response to the consultation responses received, as set out in appendix I of the decision report. However, these were not

developed further as they were not considered to meet the aims and objectives of the scheme. Therefore a breakdown of the costs was not undertaken. A link to the report is below:

[Lewisham Council - Agenda item - Lewisham and Lee Green Low Traffic Neighbourhood: Consultation and next steps](#)

An application to the Future High Streets fund was submitted, however, the LTN scheme would not have met the criteria associated with this funding.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 34

Priority 2

Question asked by: Liz Fox

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Kindly confirm that the Council are prepared to put people's lives at risk by not assessing the dangers of the Leahurst Road filter until the "review" is over? These dangers have been brought to the council's attention over a month ago, it is simply not good enough to play with people's lives just to conform with the council's diary.

Reply

The measure in question has been assessed and it was not considered dangerous. Making Lewisham's streets safe, secure and accessible to all is a key objective of the borough's Transport Strategy.

If changes were considered necessary it would not have been appropriate to make any significant changes to the scheme whilst the review of the LTN was being completed as it could be considered to pre-empt the outcome of the review.

However, we have taken feedback about this filter into consideration as part of the wider review and the decision report presented to Mayor and Cabinet includes that changes to the layout of the Leahurst Road modal filter will be investigated.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 35

Priority 2

Question asked by: Mark Morris

Relevant Directorate: Children & Young People

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

Question

Please state how many teenagers in the last two years who are in the care of Lewisham Council have been placed in “unregulated accommodation”, that of independent or semi-independent accommodation with limited support and which is not regulated by the quality inspectorate? Please also set out figures for (a) children under the age of 16, and (b) teenagers between 16 to 18.

Reply

Caring well for children who need to be looked after by the local authority is one of our most important priorities. Under this administration, a comprehensive improvement programme has been in place, responding to the 2019 Ofsted inspection finding that our children’s social care service required improvement.

Following a more recent visit last summer, I was pleased that Ofsted praised the progress being made, and the improvements achieved in supporting children in care despite the many challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. As Ofsted say in the report:

“Senior leaders and partner agencies have worked well together to deliver an effective response to mitigate the impact of the pandemic in Lewisham. The local community has been significantly affected by the pandemic...Despite the ongoing pressures this has put on services, leaders have continued to prioritise improvements to children’s services, underpinned by corporate and political support.”

This is a very welcome acknowledgement of the hard work and dedication of our children’s social care team, who have continued to protect our most vulnerable children throughout the challenges of the pandemic. We can be proud of the difference their work is making to the lives of children.

There is of course more to be done - we have always known that we were engaged in a multi-year improvement programme, against a challenging background of financial constraint and pressures on our families. Support for children in our care will accordingly remain a very high corporate priority.

Turning to the specific issue of accommodation, we have no children under the age of 16 in an unregulated placement.

33 young people aged 16-18 currently live in semi-independent provision. These placements are 'unregulated' in the sense that they are outside the Ofsted inspection framework, however they are legally permitted. For all of these young people the placement is to help prepare them for independence and is part of their care plan, and appropriate support is provided from our children's social care service.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 36

Priority 2

Question asked by: Diana Cashin

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

The Council said that the trial School Streets will be monitored and evaluated including gathering data on children's mode of travel to schools.

These have now been in place for a year – what data is available?

Reply

School Streets were funded as part of the Covid-19 emergency response by TfL as part of the Streetspace programme. Due to the emergency nature of the work they were introduced under an Emergency Temporary Traffic Order.

School Streets have been delivered during an unprecedented pandemic which has affected travel behaviour and traffic. As such it has been difficult to predict how traffic would behave in such circumstances. This and the speed of delivery of each School Street has made it challenging to collect and collate the data available.

The School Streets are currently being reviewed and as part of this process there will be a period of time to allow for consultation, capturing feedback from both residents and the school community, and collect further traffic data. The measures and data will then be reviewed to inform the future of the school street schemes.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 37

Priority 2

Question asked by: Cheryl McLeod

Relevant Directorate: Chief Exec's

Member to reply: Councillor Kevin Bonavia

Question

How many twitter accounts does Lewisham Council have? And, how many twitter accounts are run on behalf of Lewisham Council's linked companies such as Lewisham Homes and Catford Regeneration Partnership Limited? What other marketing does the Council commission?

Reply

The Council has three active Twitter accounts: @lewishamcouncil, @wearelewisham and @lewishamlibs. In addition, a number of historic, subsidiary accounts exist that the Council's communications team is in the process of closing to streamline our communications channels. A Twitter account @teamcatford is managed by a local agency delivering engagement and communications in Catford on behalf of the Council.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 38

Priority 2

Question asked by: Peter Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Andre Bourne

Question

Understandably a number of Lewisham's local branch libraries such as Manor House Library, had published opening hours prior to the run-up to the Christmas and New Year holiday periods.

Understandable and expected.

However, finding closed access doors in to the library space at The Manor House a few days before Christmas Eve, I was puzzled - as were a few other members of the public.

Searching the access door to the Manor House lobby at the top of the access steps I noted a small notice claiming "Because of Covid, the library would be closed from 17th December 2021 and hoped to re-open on January 5th 2022.

Were any other branch libraries in the borough so affected?

Reply

None of the Hub Libraries in the borough were affected by unplanned closures, however the impact of the Omicron variant meant that some of the Council's partner organisations in the Community Libraries were unable to open due to staff shortages, as was the case at Manor House.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 39

Priority 2

Question asked by: Sara Jones

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Why have we been told there is no money for traffic measurement in the Grove Park ward, when more money will be spent in the Lee Green ward? The displaced traffic in Grove Park on Senlac/Exford/Winn/Burnt Ash Hill/baring Rd is appalling.

At what areas on Burnt Ash Hill have you monitored traffic?

Why has traffic not been monitored on periphery roads eg South Circular. Eltham Road? The impact of more traffic on these roads must be considered in a proper manner.

Reply

Since the LTN has been implemented the Council has been undertaking monitoring to understand how it is operation, its impact and whether it is achieving its aims. Details of the monitoring undertaken can be found in the report being presented to Mayor and Cabinet and the monitoring reports (appendices E and K).

We have worked closely with TfL to understand the impact on their road network, which includes the South Circular, and bus journey times. This information is included in the monitoring report.

Unfortunately as a result of the pandemic the funding that the Council usually receives from TfL to implement schemes to deliver the transport strategy was suspended. It is our hope that a longer term funding agreement will be reached between Government and TfL soon so that we are able to continue to plan and deliver priority schemes for the benefit of our borough and residents. In the meantime we are exploring other funding opportunities, such as section 106 funding..

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 40

Priority 3

Question asked by: David O'Malley

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

The LTN road closures were carried out after LBL went to the court requesting the LTN roads to be closed because of the spread of Covid. What medical evidence was presented to the court to prove that point? Now the Covid threat has been lowered and we are all back to work or our children are attending School, will LBL return back to court to lift the LTN road closures because the Covid threat now does not exist? For what reason does the LTN exist today and where is the evidence that Winn Road, Senlac Road, Ashdale Road, Exford Road, Woodyates Road South, Horncastle Road, Baring Road, Farmcote Road, Harland Road and Burnt Ash Road have actually benefited from the Lee LTN road closures? Where is the evidence that roads outside the LTN zones are benefiting from the Lee LTN? Why was Upwood Road closed, which had only 3,000 vehicle movements a day, whilst the Senlac Road / Exford Road junction which has over 6,500 vehicle movements a day, not closed?

Reply

We are unclear with your comment regarding the use of courts. To clarify the LTN was implemented following the Government issuing guidance that encouraged councils to urgently make significant changes to their road layouts to give more space to cyclists and pedestrians in response to the pandemic.

Unfortunately the threat of Covid continues with infections continuing to rise – case rates here in Lewisham are currently among the highest in the country.

The review of the LTN has indicated that the existing, revised Lewisham and Lee Green LTN has met its primary aims, is in line with the Council's corporate objectives and policies and wider London policies, and has started to positively influence behaviour and encourage people to travel more sustainably. The full reasons for why it is recommended to retain the LTN was set out in the report presented to Mayor and Cabinet on 12th January for consideration. The report is publicly available and includes information relating to the monitoring undertaken and the findings of the review which has been completed.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 41

Priority 3

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Community Services

Member to reply: Councillor Amanda De Ryk

Question

What fuel source do the Council's cremation facilities use? If gas or oil, does the Council have plans to replace them? Does the Council have plans to further reduce the carbon footprint of burials (e.g. by banning the use of polished granite headstones)?

Reply

The current fuel source for cremations is gas. Lewisham Bereavement Services has in place heat recovery plates (transfer exchangers) which recycles heat generated from the cremators to heat the chapel and public access areas. The council has a ten year contract for the provision and maintenance of its cremator and mercury abatement equipment, which expires in 2024.

The intervening period will provide the opportunity for review and will allow time for the newer alternative of cremations fuelled by electricity to be tried and tested by the few crematoriums that have recently installed electric cremators. Any change in cremation plant is extremely costly and disruptive and must be undertaken from a fully informed position.

Lewisham Bereavement Services are in the process of putting together an Environmental Policy document that covers the operation of the crematorium and the cemeteries. We are aware of the environmental concerns surrounding the use of imported granite and are considering the best way to discourage its use. Lewisham Bereavement Services only permits memorial masons with NAMM or BRAMM accreditation to operate on Council sites and as members they are trained to the required standard to ensure materials are used responsibly and understand the impact their work has on the environment. Timber used by Lewisham Bereavement Services in the preparation of a burial is also sourced from companies where timber is produced by Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®) certified companies and sourced through the chains of custody, a process overseen by the WWF Forest and Trade Network and used responsibly by trained staff to prevent unnecessary waste.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 42

Priority 3

Question asked by: Jane Alaszewski

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Traffic drives at dangerous speeds down Manor Park, Manor Lane and Leahurst. What is being done about this? Given that the road has borne the brunt of the redirected LTN traffic, are there any planned mitigation measures for this road such as a segregated cycle/scooter lane, speed control and pedestrian crossings?

Reply

As set out in the decision report, a package of complementary environmental measures are being recommended for implementation in the LTN and surrounding areas. This includes greening, electric vehicle charging points, cycle parking and improved pedestrian facilities. The Council has also provided areas where speeding has been a concern to residents, including the roads above and as provided by the consultation returns, to the Police, who are responsible for enforcing speed limits.

In addition measures for Leahurst Road will be considered as part of the school streets and changes to the layout of the Leahurst Road modal filter will be investigated.

These will be delivered as soon as possible on completion of feasibility and detailed design work.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 43

Priority 3

Question asked by: Karen Pratt

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

How does the council justify retaining the restrictions imposed on residents driving from Hither Green East to West, the direct route to Lewisham hospital for many, when people with severe Covid symptoms are being encouraged to find someone to drive them to the hospital in private cars rather than wait the six hours for an ambulance?

Reply

We believe the revised LTN has an important role to play in tackling the climate emergency, by driving down traffic, improving air quality and encouraging people to use more sustainable and active modes of transport. Full details can be found in the Mayor and Cabinet report on our website.

It should be noted that all destinations remain accessible by motor vehicle, but alternative routes may have to be taken. By encouraging non-essential vehicle trips to be made by active and sustainable modes of travel by those that can, such as walking and cycling, frees up capacity for essential vehicle journeys.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 44

Priority 3

Question asked by: Patricia Richardson

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Paul Bell

Question

Planning applications are sometimes described as "outline planning applications."

What is to be understood by this term and what does it encompass?

Reply

Outline applications are defined in legislation by the Development Management Procedure Order (DMPO) 2015. That definition states:

“outline planning permission” means a planning permission for the erection of a building, which is granted subject to a condition requiring the subsequent approval of the local planning authority with respect to one or more reserved matters. In effect this means that applications for outline planning permission establish the scale and nature of a proposed development and if it would be acceptable, before a fully detailed proposal is put forward. This type of planning application allows fewer details about the proposal to be submitted. Once outline permission has been granted, details about the scheme are submitted for approval as a “reserved matters” application which will seek approval for details such as design, exact height of a building, and landscaping etc.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 45

Priority 3

Question asked by: Cheryl McLeod

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Paul Bell

Question

How much is the budget for regeneration initiatives such as Team Catford and what does this cover?

Reply

The Catford Town Centre Regeneration Programme has a budget of £900k for 2021/22 to cover the broad activities of the Catford Regeneration team, which includes the finalisation of the Town Centre Framework, the budget for Team Catford, including the Catford food market, engagement and communications activity, as well as the project and programme management costs for delivering the first phase projects in the Framework. It is anticipated that there be will some carry forward of this budget into the next financial year.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 46

Priority 3

Question asked by: Sara Jones

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Why has Lewisham not followed up on its assertion given in the public meeting at Trinity School on February 11 2020, that two weeks after the instigation of the LTN, traffic would evaporate?

Why was misleading info given in the above meeting by a council officer regarding statistics in the Walthamstow LTN and how this would relate to the Lee LTN?

If Lewisham considers traffic idling so unhealthy why has it created more, and continues to endorse the creation of more?

Reply

The LTN was implemented during an unprecedented pandemic which has affected travel behaviour and traffic. As such it has been difficult to predict how traffic would behave in such circumstances.

Low traffic neighbourhoods do not create more traffic. We have seen signs of a car based recovery as we have emerged from the pandemic as confidence in using public transport was low. Measures need to be implemented to protect against a car based recovery and the negative impacts associated with vehicular traffic.

LTN's aim to improve air quality and public health, reduce noise pollution and make roads safer by creating an environment which encourages greater levels of sustainable and active travel, such as walking and cycling.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 47

Priority 4

Question asked by: David O'Malley

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Why on the electronic consultation did LBL ask "do you live in the LTN zone". Does LBL consider that all the people who ticked that box actually live in the LTN? What checking mechanism has LBL put in place to prove that the people who have ticked this box don't actually live in Scotland, Manchester, Devon or anywhere else in the UK and not in the LTN zone? What weighting difference have LBL put on the consultation between those residents who live in the LTN and those living outside the LTN ie are we all being treated equally? Where is the formal document explaining why the consultation was set up, who agreed to the questions in the consultation document, why certain questions were not asked ie "do you want the LTN ...yes or no", how the consultation documents would be distributed, how were the questions established, who would mark and verify the marking of the consultation documents and what external body would peer review the LBL consultation process, marking and then sign off the summary and conclusions of the consultation?

Reply

The purpose of the consultation was to gain an understanding of people's views and experiences of both versions of the LTN (original and revised), to consider alongside the evidence we have gathered on whether the LTN is meeting its aims and objectives.

People were asked to provide a postcode so that we could analyse responses by location and understand people's views by geographic area. The data has been presented in this way to show people's views that are within the LTN, within the consultation area, the borough and outside the borough.

All responses received were considered equally when analysing and presenting the data. There was no locational bias. All data was checked for any obvious duplicated responses and all analysis was undertaken once duplicates were removed from the dataset.

We wanted to encourage as many responses as possible to the public consultation. We used a range of consultation methods, including distributing hard copies of the consultation material, an online consultation, social media, posters and door knocking. We recognise that providing a hard copy of the consultation material to as many people as possible would be ideal however the costs involved limit our ability

to do this. All of the information that was distributed in hard copy was also available online.

A total of 35,890 hardcopy leaflets and surveys were distributed across the consultation area, which is considered to be a high number of a scheme of this nature. During the consultation using the postcode data, we were able to identify areas of low response which allowed for us to target those areas with additional consultation materials, posters and door to door knocking.

Overall, the consultation responses are part of the wider review; the decision will be made on a wide range of evidence and set in the context of the Council's agreed policies and strategies.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 48

Priority 4

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Paul Bell

Question

Has the Council met Milford Towers' residents since the demonstration outside the Council's offices in October? Since those meetings, what has Council agreed to do to address residents' concerns?

Reply

A meeting took place on 22nd November 2022 with LRU and attended by Cllr Bell and senior officers from Lewisham Council and Lewisham Homes. Cllr Bell gave an undertaking at this meeting to fully explore concerns raised by residents and to work with partners to provide full and informed responses. Lewisham Council officers are currently working with partners to implement a number of undertakings given during this meeting. Additionally, council officers and Cllr Bell have met with senior personnel from Notting Hill Genesis and Lewisham Homes to discuss issues raised by residents and the LRU, and identify constructive measures to address legitimate concerns. Cllr Bell has written to LRU with updates on progress. This work is on-going and Cllr Bell has committed to attending a further meeting of resident representatives in February and a site visit when Covid-19 restrictions allow.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 49

Priority 5

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

With reference to Public Q1 of the Council meeting on 21.07.21 will collecting food and garden waste separately increase the carbon footprint of the service? Is the service as currently structured carbon neutral and what will the position be when the two are collected separately?

Reply

As approved at Mayor & Cabinet on 12 January 2022, the Council is currently procuring a food and garden waste processing contract which will provide the Council with the opportunity to have separate food and garden waste collection. The separate collection of food and garden waste is a national policy driver, and we anticipate that all authorities will be required to have separate collections in place at some point during the life of the recently adopted Waste Strategy.

By offering separate food and garden waste collections, this will reduce the amount of food waste sent to incineration, instead diverting it to treatment via anaerobic digestion which will generate biogas for the energy market.

This is in line with our Waste Management Strategy, approved at December's Mayor and Cabinet meeting, which aims to better manage waste. Through avoiding incineration, the anaerobic digestion of the borough's food waste can instead be used to generate green electricity and contribute to the Council's target to become a carbon neutral borough by 2030.

In addition, this contract will enable the Council to move forward with measures to broaden food waste collections to estates, council facilities and businesses.

The Council intends to undertake a carbon footprint evaluation of its waste services in the near future.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 50

Priority 6

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Children & Young People

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

Question

A review carried out by the Competition & Markets Authority (CMA) uncovered profiteering by private providers of children's homes and foster care services. Which private companies does the Council use to provide these services? Does the Council know if any of them are owned by private equity firms?

Reply

We welcome the review by the Competition and Markets Authority. There is no doubt that in general the so-called placements 'market' is not providing enough suitable places, and some providers appear to be making excessive profits. This is a challenge faced by local authorities across the country, and we will continue to press central government to grapple with the problem in its review of the social care system.

A list of placement providers that we use is below. We do not know which of these agencies are private and to establish this would require considerable time and capacity, that we do not have available. It is also important to note that due to the low availability of suitable placements nationally, we are not be in a position to avoid the use of privately run provisions. We review the quality and value of placements on a case by case basis, focusing on the outcomes for the child/young person.

As noted in our reply to question 18, work on our placement sufficiency strategy will continue to seek to reduce our dependence on external providers.

List of IFA providers

Action for Children
Affinity Fostering Services
Aim High Fostering Services
Alliance Foster Care
Anchor Foster Care Services
Ansacare Fostering Agency
Apple Fostering .
Banya Family Placement Agency
Barnardo's
Be My Family Fostering Agency
Brighter Futures Foster Care
Fostering for You
FOSTERING HEARTS
Fostering Innovations
Fostering Options
Fostering Solutions
Fostering Support Group
Fosterplus
Fusion Fostering
FUTURES FOR CHILDREN
Heath Farm Family Services
Horizon Fostering Services
Hythe House Support
Infinity Foster Care
Integrated Fostering Services
Kasper
Sure Start Fostering Agency
Swiis Foster Care
Synergy Fostering

By The Bridge
Capstone Foster Care
Children First Fostering Agency
Children of All Nation (COAN)
Chrysalis Care
Compass Fostering Central
Compass Fostering East
Compass Fostering London
Compass Fostering North
Compass Fostering South
Connect Fostering Services
Credo Care
Diversity Foster Care

Kent Homefinding and Fostering
Lighthouse Fostering
LiKa Family Fostering
Little Acorns Fostering
Lotus Foster Care
Love for Fostering
Mosaic Foster Care
Next Step Fostering Services
Nexus Fostering
Orange Grove Foster care
Outset Fostering Agency
OwnLife Fostering
People Who Foster
Tact Agency
Talawa Fostering Services
The Children's Family Trust

Family First Fostering
Family Fostering
Family Works Fostering
Familyplacement.com
Fitzgerald Fostering & Consultancy
Five Rivers Child Care
Following Whispers Family Service
Fortitude Fostering
Foster Care Associates
Foster Care Link
FosterCare UK

Phoenix Community Care
Quality Foster Care
Rainbow Fostering Services
Regional Fostering
Ryancare Fostering
Safehouses
Select Foster care Services
Shared Care Services
SHINING STARS
FOSTERING AGENCY
Silver Lining Fostering
Sunbeam Fostering Agency
Sunbeam Pride Fostering Service

THE NATIONAL
FOSTERING AGENCY
WellCare Fostering Services

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 51

Priority 7

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Children & Young People

Member to reply: Councillor Chris Barnham

Question

What percentage of Lewisham's children in (a) residential placements and (b) in fostering placements are more than 20 miles away from where they would call home (or 20 miles outside the borough if "home" is too vague a term)?

Reply

Caring well for children who need to be looked after by the local authority is one of our most important priorities. Under this administration, a comprehensive improvement programme has been in place, responding to the 2019 Ofsted inspection finding that our children's social care service required improvement.

Following a more recent visit last summer, I was pleased that Ofsted praised the progress being made, and the improvements achieved in supporting children in care despite the many challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. As Ofsted say in the report:

"Senior leaders and partner agencies have worked well together to deliver an effective response to mitigate the impact of the pandemic in Lewisham. The local community has been significantly affected by the pandemic...Despite the ongoing pressures this has put on services, leaders have continued to prioritise improvements to children's services, underpinned by corporate and political support."

This is a very welcome acknowledgement of the hard work and dedication of our children's social care team, who have continued to protect our most vulnerable children throughout the challenges of the pandemic. We can be proud of the difference their work is making to the lives of children.

There is of course more to be done - we have always known that we were engaged in a multi-year improvement programme, against a challenging background of financial constraint and pressures on our families. Support for children in our care will accordingly remain a very high corporate priority.

Turning to the specific issue of the location of children's placements, it is of course desirable in most cases for our children to be located within reasonable distance of their previous home (although in some cases there are good reasons of safety why a child should be accommodated further away).

As at the end of November 2021:

Total no. of children looked after by Lewisham = 465

% who live in a residential placement = 12%

% who live with a foster carer = 66%

The remaining children live in either: Kinship arrangements, semi-independent/supported accommodation, or (a very small number) are placed for adoption or in secure/prison.

Of those:

Overall, 20% of Lewisham children looked after live more than 20 miles from their home. The proportion of children in foster placements who are more than 20 miles from home is a little lower, at 19%. Just over 5% of looked after children are in a residential placement 20+ miles from home.

An important priority in the development of a new placement sufficiency strategy is action to increase the number of Lewisham children who are cared for by Lewisham foster carers.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 52

Priority 8

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Paul Bell

Question

To what extent can the Council insist that new homes in the borough are built to reflect both an increase in home working and climate change e.g. through improved natural ventilation and with larger rooms?

Reply

New housing developments need to meet the Councils adopted policies and the nationally adopted residential standards which set minimum sizes for dwellings. These policies however, do not have an explicit requirement to provide home working space.

New developments must also meet policies for carbon reduction, including use of renewable technologies. The Government has also published the National Design Guide which sets an expectation for developers to meet design standards and consult with the local community.

In the future, we also need to think about future working patterns. The centre of London is not the same as it was before the pandemic. Do we want to see economic activity lesson post-pandemic or increase in central London or for the spend to be entirely local? I myself always wanted to work from home but now prefer a hybrid approach.

However, all of the above will be irrelevant if the human race does not address climate change now. Lewisham Council is doing its part through encouraging a modal shift in how people get around the borough and changing our limited catering arrangements – for events. But, the biggest single change we can all make is to become vegan. While our government attends conferences and procrastinates about what to do, we have no power in that process. We do have the power to change what we eat, for the planet but also to cease the exploitation of animals and the taking of their lives for our plates.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 53

Priority 9

Question asked by: Mark Bennett

Relevant Directorate: Corporate Resources

Member to reply: Councillor Kevin Bonavia

Question

What improvements to information governance have been delayed (Audit Panel September report refers) and when will the issues be resolved?

Reply

In summary, here is update on progress of information governance improvements:

Corporate training

Information Governance has developed a new mandatory, data protection course for all Officers and Councillors that now takes into account hybrid ways of working. This, and policy acceptance, will launch January 10th 2022.

Information Governance will also be launching cyber awareness training from January 2022. The current online training solution has been upgraded, resolving long standing reporting issues.

Audit actions

All audit actions have been closed.

Service structure

The information governance service transferred to IT and Digital Services (ITDS) in January 2021 and a new Head of Service appointed in May 2021. A restructure of the service will be submitted to the Director for ITDS by 13 February 2022 with an implementation date by 31 March 2022, based on current schedules.

PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 54

Priority 1

Question asked by: Colin Roden

Relevant Directorate: Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm

Member to reply: Councillor Patrick Codd

Question

Following the publication of the key findings from the Lee Green LTN, I'm surprised and disappointed to see that the recommendation from the Lewisham administration is to retain the LTN despite the data collated from respondents.

The report shows that respondents with negative feelings about the LTN were significantly more prevalent than those with positive feelings.

I have some questions I hope you can address.

- 1) Why have Lewisham supported the minority and ignored the majority?
- 2) If Lewisham are confident this is the appropriate way to address pollution and improve air quality in the borough, where and when will the next LTN be implemented?
- 3) other than physical road blocks associated with LTNs being implemented throughout the borough, what other air quality improvement measures are being pursued (tree planting, bus route diversions, zebra crossings, intelligent one-way systems etc.) what is the anticipated time frame/schedule for their rollout and what areas will be selected?

Reply

The consultation was not a referendum. It was intended to help us to understand people's experiences of both versions of the LTN, and to feed into wider considerations. As a Council we have a responsibility to make difficult decisions – we know that not everyone wants to keep the LTN, but after careful consideration, and balancing the benefits and impacts, we believe the revised LTN has an important role to play in tackling the climate emergency, by driving down traffic, improving air quality and encouraging people to use more sustainable and active modes of transport.

Full details can be found in the Mayor and Cabinet report on our website.

We remain committed to the outcomes that LTNs aim to achieve and we will continue to explore how best to achieve them and will ensure that residents are involved in shaping future plans.

The work that the Council is doing to improve air quality across the borough is set out in the Air Quality Action Plan. This includes a number of measures to reduce the impact of vehicular traffic on the environment and encourage greater use of active and sustainable modes of travel.

As set out in the decision report, a package of complementary environmental measures are also being recommended, including greening, electric vehicle charging points, cycle parking and improved pedestrian facilities. These will be delivered as soon as possible on completion of feasibility and detailed design work.