

QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS

Question Number	Question asked by Councillor:	Subject
CABINET MEMBER FOR HOMES & GATEWAY SERVICES Councillor Alison Butler		
PQ007-19	Alan Corline	Brick by Brick Shop
CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE & RESOURCES Councillor Simon Hall		
CQ013-19	Canning, R	Savings for paperless meetings
CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & REGENERATION Councillor Paul Scott – Job Share (Acting)		
PQ013-19	Derek Ritson	SPD2 Amendments
CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & REGENERATION Councillor Stuart King – Job Share (Non-Acting)		
PQ010-19	Mrs. V Mickelburgh	Surrey Street Pedestrian Zone Signage

CQ012-19 from Councillor Andrew Pelling

Councillor Alison Butler

Please advise of the number of responses to the Article 4 direction on HMOs consultation and detail the number of responses by those from within the Borough and those outside the Borough and to detail from those within the Borough as defined by the number of responders by each ward.

Reply

The Consultation on the Article 4 Direction was undertaken for a 6 week period, concluding on 8th March 2019, 50 representations have been received.

The consultations in accordance with the planning regulations do not require respondents to give their address so the second part of the question cannot be answered.

PQ007-19 from Alan Corline**Councillor Alison Butler**

I request a breakdown in costs of the new shop by the council's brick by brick including rental costs, wages and labour charges. This would be most useful to the council taxpayers of Croydon especially when brick by brick have yet to finish building anywhere!

Reply

Brick by Brick is delivering one of the largest housing programmes in London and is currently on site on over twenty sites throughout the borough. Units at two sites, Auckland Rise and Ravensdale Gardens in Upper Norwood, are currently available to purchase, with hundreds more being completed this year.

The Brick by Brick shop is a high profile high-street presence providing purchasing and financing advice for people who require housing. It is open 6 days per week and staffed by mortgage and sales advisors. The building also serves as the headquarters and offices of Brick by Brick and Common Ground Architecture.

The rental cost of the building is £45k per annum, less significant rent free and discounted rent periods which were negotiated for the first year.

Brick by Brick publishes a full Business Plan for examination in public in both Scrutiny and Cabinet. This includes detailed information on the costs and financing of the company, including operational costs. This is available from Brick by Brick and is also published on the council's website.

CQ013-19 from Councillor Robert Canning**Councillor Simon Hall**

What estimate has been made of the savings to the council tax payer from the switch to paperless working by Members of the Council?

Reply

Thank you for your question.

The move to a paperless approach was agreed with cross party support in 2016, and it had been predicted that this would provide a saving of up to £116,000 per annum. The cost of printing a single Council agenda varies, but considering the most recent was 392 pages, at a cost of 8p per page (printed in colour, double-sided), a single run for 70 councillors would be at a cost of over £1000. In reality these costs would be considerably higher, given the fact that this does not account for the cost of labour of those printing the agendas, distributing the agendas and maintenance of the print machines. Further costs are also associated with postal delivery and recycling papers after meetings, with the cost of recycling increasing steeply for confidential papers.

Aligning Members to the paperless approach adopted by the rest of the council not only saves financial expenditure, but also social costs; in the example of the recent council agenda, this has eliminated the environmental impact of using over 13,500 sheets of paper, and the plastic from 140 treasury tags.

PQ007-19 from Derek Ritson

Councillor Paul Scott – Job Share (Acting)

Should SPD2 give more guidance to access driveway dimensions to ensure ALL emergency vehicles and variant types of emergency vehicles can access the site safely rather than just stating the minimum width of 3.6m (which precludes Fire Tenders) to ensure that all variants of emergency vehicles can access the site from the road, have adequate road width to turn into the access drive and have turning heads on site to actually allow exiting the site in a forward gear?

Also, should SPD2 give more guidance to ensure that large Removal Lorries (Pantehnicos) can access the sites for delivery of furniture and household equipment nearer the appropriate dwellings to avoid having to park on the road outside the access and “hump” goods up the drive and into the newly built premises (possibly leaving the lorry unattended on the public highway blocking a narrow roadway whilst operatives transport heavy furniture or white goods from lorry to dwelling or vice versa if the resident is moving out to another location)?

Additionally, should SPD2 give more guidance to the appropriate maximum length allowed without kerbing as kerbing should be provided to prevent damage to fencing from vehicle drift? Should SPD2 give more guidance to precisely define the maximum distance of the driveway before requiring provision of a ‘passing-bay’?

Should SPD2 give more guidance to precisely define the maximum length of an access drive allowed ‘without’ a kerbed footpath and the minimum width of any required footpath to allow self-propelled or motorised wheelchair users or mobility scooter users safe passage? It is suggested that all these requirements should be considered and the final document amended appropriately before formally adopting the SPD2 as developments NOT meeting these requirements could be placing future occupant’s lives in danger and delivery operatives at an unavoidable possibility of physical injuries and also to comply with the guidance stated at new NPPF para 16 (July 2018).

Reply

As you are aware the consultation on SPD2 – Suburban Design Guide was undertaken during September and October 2018.

MORA made a considerable number of representations during the consultation and I'm grateful for your engagement in the production of the SPD. The Council's response to themes and issues raised during the consultation are set out in the Consultation Statement that accompanies the SPD, including changes we have made as a result of the consultation. With regard to your specific questions, received outside the formal consultation period, it is considered that they do not represent a reason not to progress with the adoption of the SPD tonight. It is important to note SPD2 is design guidance and focussed on the sustainable delivery of development in the suburbs. It is not a detailed technical design manual for access, which is covered by other policy or legislation (highway regulations and building regulations). However, regarding access for emergency vehicles SPD2 provides clear guidance in Section 2.29.10 relating to access requirements and signposts the legislation I refer to.

PQ010-19 from Mrs V. Mickelburgh

Councillor Stuart King – Job Share (Non-Acting)

Pedestrian Zone Surrey Street. 19,726 PCN's issued to motorists in 55 weeks seen entering the Zone. Croydon Council state the signage as ""Legally compliant and fit for purpose."" If the function of the signage is to prevent motorists entering zone it is clearly not working therefore ""unfit for purpose.""

Please could the Cabinet Member let me know what improvements will be made, if any, to reduce this.

Reply

The signage in Surrey St is compliant in line with the Traffic Signs and Regulations Manual. The rise in penalty charge notices in Surrey St in the past 12 months is due to changes in the approach to enforcement which has seen an improvement in its effectiveness. The specific changes involved are:

1. Surrey St was initially part time restrictions (5am to 8pm) and it is now 24 hour enforcement
2. A move away from a single officer viewing a live camera to the use of an Automatic Number Plate Camera which captures illegal entries throughout the day

Over the past few months there has been a decline in pcns being issued as a result of the ANPR camera and I am satisfied that this is evidence that a deterrent effect is taking place. Nonetheless the council will continue to review the adequacy of signage at this location in light of any Adjudicator decisions. It is worth pointing out though that the overwhelming majority of Adjudicator decisions at this location have found in favour of the council.

