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PART ‘A’

21. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Due to the high number of public attendees the Mayor announced that he would be taking public questions first followed by the motion on the Impact of Council parking policy.
There were seventeen questions from twelve members of the public; the supplementary questions and answers are set out at Appendix A to the minutes.

22. MOTION - IMPACT OF COUNCIL PARKING POLICY ON THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

Councillor Shields moved the motion which was seconded by Councillor Crowley.

Following debate, in accordance with Council procedure rule 15.2 a roll call vote was taken (see below) and the motion was lost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion - Impact of Council Parking Policy on the local community (Motion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Manuel Abellan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Eric Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Martina Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ben Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Lily Bande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor David Bartolucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jenny Batt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Kevin Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Moira Butt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Richard Clare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Richard Clifton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Elliot Colburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Steve Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jean Crossby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tim Crowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Ruth Dombey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tom Drummond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jed Dwight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Trish Fivey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tim Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Vincent Galligan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Neil Garratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Peter Geiringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Martin Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Sunita Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Catherine Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jillian Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Amy Haldane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Drew Heffernan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Marlene Heron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor David Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Marian James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Edward Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Nick Mattey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Jayne McCoy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Joyce Melican and Jill Whitehead.

The Mayor made the following announcements:

The Mayor congratulated Christine Lindsay and her team for winning the London New Year Day Parade competition on behalf of the London Borough of Sutton and invited Christine to address the meeting. The Mayor had attended numerous events within the borough and throughout London since the last Council meeting, these included amongst others, Citizenship and Holocaust Memorial Ceremonies.

The Mayor informed the Council of the sad passing of former Councillor Janet Lowne who had died on the 19 January. She had supported the Mayor’s charity committee for many years. The meeting observed a one minute silence.

24. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

25. BOUNDARY COMMISSION REVIEW

The Mayor announced that this item had been withdrawn.

26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.
27. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

There were seven questions from five Councillors, the supplementary questions and responses are set out at Appendix B to the minutes.

28. PETITIONS

There were no petitions.

29. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND NOTICES OF MOTION

(a) Motion - Schools funding in Sutton

Councillor Batt moved the motion which was seconded by Councillor Heffernan. Following debate the motion was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED:-

Council notes that Sutton’s young people have a proud record of educational achievement with some of the best schools in the country in our borough.

Council therefore expresses its grave concern about the new funding formula introduced by the Government which will mean schools face cuts of £3bn nationally, according to the National Audit Office, and its potential impact on Sutton schools. This is equivalent to an 8.0% reduction in per pupil funding for mainstream schools in real terms between 2014-15 and 2019-20.

Council further notes that Sutton has historically been a low-funded borough - as identified by successive funding reviews. Sutton’s schools now face new inflationary pressures, such as the National Living Wage, National Insurance contributions and the Apprenticeship Levy.

Council is deeply concerned that, when combined with pressures in the high needs block for pupils with Special Educational Needs, with all London boroughs forecasting a deficit budget next year, funding in our schools is close to breaking point.

Council welcomes the Government’s recent announcement of additional SEND funding over the next two years but recognises that is not a long-term solution given rising levels of demand and supports the cross-party initiative through the Societies of London Treasurers and County Treasurers and the Local Government Association for a review of how SEND services are currently funded by the Government.

Council therefore calls on the Leader of the Council and Leader of the Conservative Opposition to write to both the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Education calling for changes to the Government’s funding formula to ensure continuing excellent education for all pupils in Sutton schools.

(b) Motion - Hindu and Buddhist New Year Celebration
In accordance with Council procedure rule 11.15 Councillor Nandha sought consent of Council to alter the motion which was given. Councillor Nandha moved the motion which was seconded by Councillor Drummond.

RESOLVED:-

This Council values the New Years’ day celebration for Hindus and Buddhists that takes place on April 14th. The Hindu/Singala New year falls on April 14th. This is an important festival for Hindus as well as Buddhists all over the world. The festival has religious and cultural significance for them and gives a lot of importance to maintaining and transmitting cultural values to future generation.

By the Council celebrating this day, it helps bring communities together and gives an opportunity to showcase our culture and also help to integrate society to live in peace and harmony.

Celebration of this day adds value to the community, especially young people who can enjoy and participate in various cultural activities which reflects the Hindu and Buddhist tradition. Above all Britain is a multicultural society and by embracing this celebration, our borough could lead the way in enhancing understanding between different communities.

The Council therefore agrees to:
- Promote the Hindu and Buddhist New Year celebrations through the Council’s media channels along with the major festivals of other main religions as notified to us;
- Contact local schools and local community groups to promote this event.

30. CLOSURE MOTION

Councillor Ruth Dombey, moved the closure motion which was seconded by Councillor Tim Crowley. The Mayor advised the Constitutional Review Report had been withdrawn.

RESOLVED:-

That, in accordance with Standing Order 12.8, all items remaining to be dealt with at this Council meeting be approved or noted as set out in their recommendations, subject to the leaders of the opposition groups being able to express dissent on them.

The following items were adopted or noted:

- Review of the Licensing Policy
- Appointment of Committee Chair
- Scrutiny Powers to refer
- Reappointment of Independent Persons
- Code of Conduct Investigation
- Committee Calendar
The meeting ended at 10.43 pm

Mayor: ............................................................
Date: ............................................................
London Borough of Sutton  
Council: Monday 28 January 2019  
Questions under Standing Order 8.7  
From Members of the Public  

1. Question asked by Bill Plummer to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

If this whole proposal is “to solve residents’ traffic and parking issues”, why will the plans reduce the amount of parking currently used by residents?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you for your question Mr Plummer I am going to try and give you a detailed response because I think it’s quite a complicated issue. I think I will just start by explaining that in your question you talk about solving all parking problems. I think it’s important to be realistic here we don’t think that we can with this strategy that we can fix every single parking problem in Sutton and in the area.

You did say solve residents parking problems, just wanted to clarify that if the ideas of this is going to fix everything I think we need to be realistic and we won’t be able to fix every parking problem. To do that we will need to have more kerbside space on the roads with the amount of cars that we have something we know is not the case we would also need to have enough driveways for people to park most of their cars there and then have enough space on the roads for commuters, visitors, businesses and other people. To put it simply the idea the parking strategy is to control something that many people have complained about which is commuter parking mostly around train stations, schools, town centres, and hospitals. The idea is to prioritise residents and implement sensible measures like in some cases double yellow lines at junctions to make our roads safer when emerging in and out of roads. We think that this is where we can realistically have an impact on improving parking in the area, obviously to control commuter parking and non-resident parking and to prioritise residents it’s clear that some levels of parking controls are needed and some management is needed to be able to prioritise residents that live in the areas that are suggesting for parking controls. As you know there are different parking controls some include bays, single yellow lines, others you only need a permit. Yes on some roads we might lose a bit of parking space especially if we put double yellow lines at junctions like I just said but we think there is a benefit to that in terms of safety. We do think that making our roads safer is important and in many cases we will need to implement those measures. We also think that we might in some areas loose a bit of space during the hours of operation of potential CPZ if we have things like single yellow lines. We also think we will gain some potential benefits commuters and non residents will not be able to park on those roads so we will gain some spaces from that. We do think in some cases single yellow lines are needed to make sure emergency vehicles and refuse trucks are able to enter some of the roads, and we've had a lot of problems as many of you know with collections in some roads. I thinks it’s important to remember to that these are only in force during the day so a lot of concerns are around overnight parking, if you have a single yellow line over a dropped curb or single yellow lines in most areas you will be able to park when you come back from work on those single yellow lines which I know is a worry for many people. I
think it's important to make that clear. For me the crucial point and this is for me the important bit is that for the next couple of months that we will need to assess again this was a consultation and we are waiting for the results we will need to assess the types of schemes that we propose for each one of the areas. There are different types whether there are CPZ free, CPZ, PPA and others and whether the current suggestions as put forward by our traffic engineers are the best for each area. We are going to need to look at the size of the proposed parking controls and whether they're too big, in some cases they might need to be reduced slightly and we will also need to look at whether we have too many restrictions, single yellow lines and so on, I think the idea is we want to have a balance between restrictions that will prioritise residents and give us benefits but also make sure we maximise the amount of spaces that you have on the roads for parking. I can re-assure you that a lot of the questions I have seen on the Facebook group are questions that I have already asked and we are asking and we are working with Sandra who is the person who created the group and one of the areas that we are challenging our Officers to come up with some answers in on the issue of PPA for those that know what that scheme is where you only need a permit to park in a specific area. We are not traffic engineers so we have a lot of questions around that and we will be asking those questions in the coming weeks and engaging with residents to hear what your concerns are. We already had a lot of responses to the consultation but are listening more and continue to hear so Mr Plummer I presume you have responded to the consultation, but if you have further concerns for the issues you want to discuss in more detail I am more than happy if you drop me an email to look into it further.

Supplementary question asked by Mr Bill Plummer

Yes I have, first of all I would like to thank the Councillor for his rather long drawn out answer. It answers none of the questions really in so much as one of the big issues is many roads that I have surveyed walked around distributing leaflets and having a look are similar to my little cul de sac we have just 20 properties, some people have more than one car some people have no cars at all one side of the road they can park up their drives so if they've got two cars they only need one bay. We have dropped kerbs the problem we get of a morning is commuters coming in and out, sometimes they steal our spaces if we have gone out, but because we have those dropped kerbs when we get back we can always park in front of one or another of our dropped kerbs because we give permissions to each of our neighbours. Now out of our 20 properties on some mornings there are up to 30 commuter cars or people from other streets who can't park because of parking pressure. If this scheme goes ahead and I have to just add proposals have been made over the last 20 years by the Council to our area and others where questionnaires have been sent out and responded to and the Council have always acknowledged that you are overwhelmingly in favour as keeping things as they are the status quo to remain. It is on that basis that I answered what turned out to be Stage 1 of a consultation process, when I received that first one it looked like junk mail to be quite honest with you, I didn't throw it away I did actually open it, it wasn't addressed to me and it was non de-script it didn't have any CPZ branding on the envelope I did not know what it was until I opened it, it looked like a kids graphic design play to be frank with you. It didn't say anything about this being a consultation process and that being Stage 1 it said we are asking your views. I took it to be a fact finding exercise like all the others otherwise we would have been galvanising the Facebook
Group a year and a half ago because Stage 2 told us that Stage 1 had snuck in under the radar.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Yes just say a few points, I'm going to touch a lot on the comms and the consultation I suspect in the next question, so I will add a lot more detail to the question from Mrs Ackland. I hear from what you say the status quo. We do resident surveys every 2 years by a professional polling company I think it's MORI that have done it for the last decade or so and the number one constant in every single one of those surveys is of the top priority top concern is parking. So we start on the basis, I will address that in more detail as well. We cannot turn a blind eye on an issue that a lot of people seem to care about. We hear it in our case work, we hear it from hundreds of conversations on the doorstep, we don't think we have all the solutions but I think we owe it to residents to have a look at this and to say well let's consult, so the first informal consultation was asking people is there a parking problem in your road? and I think one of the questions was would you support a measure like a CPZ but it was kept quite open the idea of that was to see if there was merit in progressing this any further because if most people said no there was no problem with parking in our area we would have stopped it there. There was a lot of responses saying yes there is a parking problem in our area so we did the sensible thing and we tasked our engineers and Officers to look at the responses and based on those responses and expertise come up with proposals that we could put back to the residents with a lot more detail and ask if this is the type of schemes that you think would fix not completely fix but appears an improved parking in your area and that was a consultation that just finished we decided to extend it because we saw that there was a lot of people hadn't had time to respond so we extended it to the end of the year. I am explaining the process, Mr Plummer complained about the consultation so I am just giving the context which I think is important and I think it's important that you get at least an idea where is our logic, where is our thinking behind it then you can make up your mind if this is something positive or not.

I am sure like in any very big consultation, this is one of the biggest we have ever done, there were mistakes made and we will learn from those mistakes and make sure that we improve the next phases for the next areas. I don't think we would say we are perfect of course there are mistakes. I hope that you acknowledge that at least we are trying to propose solutions to some of the problems that many of you have experienced for many many years, and you have had a chance and will continue to have a chance to voice your agreement whether you are for or against. Over the coming weeks we are going to be looking at the results of the consultation very closely we are going to be challenging our Officers and there is going to be another consultation in due course where you will see any changes made following the consultation, the informal consultation we just did. This is a process I'm sure some of you won't agree with us, some of you might it's a very complicated thing to get 43,000 households to respond to consultation we've done our best and will continue to listen and continue to do our best.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Ben Andrew

Thanks a lot Manuel, apologies if you covered this in your answer, I just wanted to get further clarity on dropped curbs which is something which has been raised with me quite a lot. Some residents are concerned about lines going across their dropped curbs whether or
not they are able to park across their dropped curbs. I just wanted to seek clarification on the logic behind that behind putting lines in front of dropped curbs in some cases.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you, and yes this is an issue that I know Councillors in the wards affected have been contacted about a lot and it’s something I have seen on the Facebook Group as well. I think just to clarify a few things some of the proposals that I have been told and I’ve seen is to put single yellow lines over some dropped curb. The reasons for that is these would be in force during the day during the hours of operation to prevent commuter parking and more importantly we get a lot of lot of complaints saying they cannot access and exit their driveways. We've had a lot of incidents of people having to go to hospital couldn't take their car to go to hospital, carers coming in 3 times a day can not go into the driveway, people parking their cars over dropped curbs, and they can't leave their house for 12 hours because a commuter put their car in front of the dropped curb. So we think there is a bit of unfairness there however, we do know in a lot of cases residents have a second car that they put in front of their dropped curb and that is absolutely fine and that's sensible. We also know that some roads have informal agreements amongst themselves where they sort of agree where everyone parks and that works quite well. On those two things it works well until it doesn't and we cannot guarantee that every single time it will work well. We have cases where people move into a road they don't agree with this sort of arrangement and they start being bad neighbours and the whole thing falls apart. And in some cases it is for an hour, in some cases its longer and if you think that for your area its better to have an hour I hope you responded to the consultation and get in touch with your local Councillors absolutely that is what we want to hear from you. If we’re going to get the best response as possible it would be absolute nonsense for us to not want to speak to residents that's exactly what we are trying to do. Engaging with residents means were getting better responses and better solutions and get your views implemented much more. I can reassure you Councillor Andrew that I will continue to look at the issue closely and we will implement the best solutions we can to maximising the space for residents.

2. Question asked by Sandra Ackland to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

Due to the seemingly high number of people who have said that they did not receive a Stage 1 or Stage 2 questionnaire/consultation on the parking strategy, do you feel that there may have been an issue in the distribution of leaflets?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you for your question Sandra, and for the useful discussion we had last week with Councillor Dombey. The letter delivery for both stages of the parking strategy was undertaken by the Royal Mail so a reliable company. We have kept a record of residents contacting the Council who advised they were not aware of the consultation, and for a few streets that did not receive a letter they were also hand delivered by Council Officers where we found out about those mistakes. It happens when you do big consultations that people didn't receive them or they chucked it in the bin or what not. We are not aware and the Royal Mail did not tell us this was a massive problem. I do however and we've had these discussions about engagement and the amount of responses and I think it’s difficult often to get people to respond to many consultations. That’s why for this consultation given the
nature of it and how important it is that we would give ourselves 18 months between the first informal consultation and the final proposals for each phase. Most Councils don't do 18 months and the engagement they do is much more short and much more limited. So we are keen to hear from as many residents as possible as I have already said you also asked I think you asked us to for the process to be paused for me to be able to take that to our Officers and to my Group. I think it would be useful and perhaps you could touch on that in your supplementary if you could give us more details in what exactly you would be looking for in that exercise how long would you pause it for, would you be looking for a specific percentage of respondents and what would you expect the Council to do if that was the case. Would we be expected to continue to send questionnaires to people that did not respond until we hit the threshold how long would we do it for. Just so everyone knows it costs us £30,000 to send a batch of questionnaires to 43,000 people so it could escalate to hundreds of thousands of pounds so it would be just helpful to just get that context because you've made that ask and I want to engage on an issue you've raised with me.

Supplementary question asked by Sandra Ackland

Yes Ok so obviously you have stated that you don't really feel that there's been an issue in the distribution of leaflets, I don't know how many of you here today didn't get any leaflets? not sure? We ran a survey on Survey Hero on the Facebook Page which I'm sure a lot of you have participated in and only 4.5% of the people that took part believes this consultation so far has given a fair representation of Sutton residents views. Over 95% feel that we have not had a fair representation. Obviously touching back on what you were saying Manuel about how we're going to pause it. I personally feel we should go back to Stage 1. We should have a couple of months at least to rally together as residents to get this word out, street heroes that are prepared to go down each street and actually get people properly engaged so that everybody is actually aware Stage 1 is going to be going through their door and exactly what it is, it's not a friendly questionnaire it is the beginning of a legal consultation to literally make our lives difficult. So bearing on those percentages of whose had a fair representation or not how do you feel that 95% of Sutton residents feel that they have not got a fair representation, is that ok?

Reply from Councillor Manuel Abellan

We want as many people to respond as possible as I said this is for us the best way we're going to get the best solutions and we cannot do it without the residents so we want to work with your group and with others to implement the best solutions. I slightly disagree I'll be honest that we should go back to Stage 1, I think there is a lot of people that have been waiting for a long time for some sort of parking controls. In terms of engagement but just to give you and idea since January last year for the area that is going through right now we've had two informal consultations, two letters which servers delivered to 43,000 households, organised public meetings, we distributed our own news letters multiple times with updates, we did roadshows, library drop-ins, emails from the Council to over 10,000 people multiple times, we used social media, local press and we even extended the current consultation some people would say that's not enough and I'm sure if we had an unlimited budget we would do more but we feel like we have tried to engage as much as possible and we will continue to engage as much as we can so that we get the residents views and the right measures.
Supplementary question asked by Councillor David Hicks

Councillor Abellan has the consultation letter gone out to Belmont ward? Because I believe that is in the next phase of the consultation, some people have received it sadly I haven't and my neighbours and I wonder if it might be useful to keep me informed.

Reply from Councillor Manuel Abellan

You are correct the next phase the first informal consultation of the next phase which is in your ward started around mid January to distribute 43 or in this case will be less thousands and thousands of letters it can take a couple of weeks. It might not be the case that everyone has received it yet, if you have roads that haven't let me know and we will make a list and contact.

3. Question asked by Gerald Tasker to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

How were the CPZ stage 2 consultation proposals for roads such as Alexandra Avenue arrived at?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you for your question. The example of Alexandra Avenue is a good example that shows some of the challenges that we are facing when making decisions and decisions we will need to make in the future. The initial Stage 1 feedback from Alexandra Avenue did not support any parking proposals and when Officers looked at the surrounding roads that did support or indicate that had problems on the road and might be keen to get a wider scheme the engineers looked at it and said well if we leave them isolated one of the effects might be that that road may be targeted by displacement cars and they may suffer more from it. When they looked at the results from the latest, I haven't seen the results but I've been told that the results from the second informal consultation indicate that the road is still not in favour of parking controls, so Officers have done what will be done in most of your roads which is done a lot more of the leg work which is where we are getting at now, and review that on Alexandra Avenue there is not much kerb space available for on street parking its mostly driveways and they have agreed that in this case they recommend that its outside of it doesn't have a scheme and that they can accommodate residents views. Some of those roads might still have the double yellow lines on junctions for safety but in this particular case its a good example of trying to balance what engineers are saying and making sure that we have a strategic approach and not a referendum on every single road but also accommodating as far as we can on roads where residents say they don't want a parking scheme.

Supplementary question asked by Gerald Tasker

Yes thank you, first of all just to clarify as a point of information I was referring although I mentioned Alexandra Avenue I was in fact referring to all roads within Sutton and used that as an example Ok. My supplementary is what criteria were used which lead to for example Blenheim Road being placed in the blue zone all day CPZ and Waverley Avenue being
given free CPZ designation which just happens to be the leader of the Council’s road, thank you.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

You mentioned other roads there are 500 roads on this consultation I don't know the specifics Politicians often get accused for not answering questions and now when we give detailed questions it’s not good enough. So it’s kind of a lose, lose for me, so I have already answered the question I don't know the specifics of the roads in question because there are 500 of them and I can't know every single scheme for every single road. In answer to your second point on your question and I know there's been a lot of misinformation or confusion I can categorically say as the person leading on this strategy that the issue on no responses, no response means no response and it won't be treated as an agreement or against. Just to make it clear it was part of the question no response will be treated as no response and the only responses that will be looked at are the people that responded to them.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Steve Penneck

Thank you Mr Mayor, I think I should ask a question on this as the roads referred to are in my ward which is Sutton North, the reason why Officers have suggested that Blenheim Road should be included in the CPZ because it's nearer to the town centre than Waverley Avenue. My question is I've had meetings with the residents in Blenheim Road and I know they are not happy about that proposal can Councillor Abellan reassure me that when we see the results of the consultation which of course we have not seen yet and if in fact they don't support those proposals then we can have discussions about what alternative measures might be put in place thank you.

Reply from Councillor Manuel Abellan

Yes absolutely

4. Question asked by Kerrie Peek to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

What are your plans for bringing shoppers back to Sutton High Street?

Response

I am really pleased that you have asked this question. There is a lot of understandable concern about the future of high streets across the UK and here in Sutton there has been a huge amount of work going on for some time. However, this work doesn’t always get talked about as it is often ‘behind the scenes’ and ongoing.

There are three key strands of work covering the short term, the medium term and the longer term.

For the longer term we have a Town Centre Masterplan. This looks at major redevelopment and the infrastructure of the town centre and what is required to meet the needs of the high street of the future. We know that online retail has completely changed
the way people shop and what they want from their high street. The demand now is for more leisure activities, experiences and events. Our Masterplan is timely as we are able to plan ahead for that change. Increasing housing in the town centre will also bring more consumers to our high street and if we can get the Tram here it will help even more.

This longer term focus has already led to the change in ownership of the St Nicholas Centre; the redevelopment of Times Square and its purchase by Sports Direct; the redevelopment of the Empire Cinema; H&M taking over the BHS site; and developer interest in many of the key sites in the town centre.

**In the medium term** the Council has used its Investment Portfolio to attract and retain businesses that will ensure a vibrant high street. The Council already owns a number of properties in the High Street so it can help ensure we retain good quality businesses. It can also invest in new properties to prevent them being left empty or under-occupied as it has done with the BHS and RBS buildings. There are also exciting plans afoot to revitalise existing spaces.

**In the short term** we encouraged the set up of the Town Centre Business Improvement District called Successful Sutton. It is known that places with BIDs tend to have more resilient and vibrant town centres. The BID supports local businesses and retailers, ensures the area is attractive for shoppers and has been responsible for all the major events such as the Christmas light switch-on, seasonal markets and the fantastic Big Bang event. These events are key attractors for shoppers and are supported by the local shops and businesses. The BID also helps to market Sutton as a place for business and investment and have been great partners for the Council in recent years.

5. **Question asked by Ray Eveleigh to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee**

   The London Borough of Sutton is under flight paths, why are the residents of the borough not being consulted about this when those on other boroughs have been consulted?

   **Response**

   Heathrow’s Airspace and Future Operations public consultation launched on 8 January and will run until 4 March 2019. It seeks feedback on three key areas: airspace design to make better use of existing runways; airspace design for an expanded Heathrow; and future operations for an expanded Heathrow. All the information about the consultation and relevant documentation can be found on the consultation website at [www.heathrowconsultation.com](http://www.heathrowconsultation.com).

   Consultation events are taking place in those boroughs closer to the airport where aircraft noise or traffic impacts are either already significant or where changes in operating patterns means that some residents would be subjected to increased noise, particularly in the mornings and evenings. The consultation documentation indicates that all proposed scenarios show aircraft travelling across Sutton borough at greater than 3,000 feet (in some scenarios greater than 7,000 feet). It is therefore unlikely that there will be any significant additional noise impact on addresses in the borough.
However, Heathrow advise that a consultation information leaflet has been posted to over 2 million properties in the area surrounding Heathrow Airport, including to households in Sutton borough, and residents are invited to respond. In addition, the consultation is being advertised in local/social media and digital advertising sites. The Council has been invited to attend local authority briefing sessions on the consultation proposals and will make representations as appropriate.

6. **Question asked by Philip Robinson to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee**

Could the Council please provide an update on progress with the construction of the proposed new secondary school on Rosehill Park?

**Response**

The proposed construction of the new school at Rosehill, which will be run by the Greenshaw Learning Trust, is a project that is being delivered by the Department for Education and not the Local Authority. However, as the body responsible for sufficient school places, we work closely with the DfE to ensure we are kept up-to-date with developments and to monitor progress.

As partial landowner of the proposed site, the Council has completed contracts with the Secretary of State and the tenant of the tennis centre in respect of the transfer of the site. However, the transfer will only take effect if the Department for Education is successful in securing planning permission for the development.

The DfE has been running a procurement process to appoint a preferred contractor which was completed (subject to a standstill period) at the end of January. As is the case with centrally delivered free schools, it is the contractor that prepares the planning application for the scheme, as well as actually constructing the building. The DfE is in the process of working up a detailed programme with the preferred contractor and we expect consultation, and eventually a planning submission, to take place in the coming months ahead of an anticipated opening for the new school in September 2021.

7. **Question asked by Darren Spink to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee**

Why wasn't St Helier Hospital encouraged to increase its car parking capacity and work together with London Borough of Sutton to make it unnecessary for staff and patients to park in local roads?

**Response**

Boroughs have to adhere to both local and national policies from a planning perspective, where additional car parking may be sought. The London Plan and the Sutton Local Plan have parking standards and criteria that seek to manage the availability of parking. The Council’s transport strategy (the ‘Local Implementation Plan 3’) is currently being drafted and seeks to promote non-car trips as the norm, following the guidelines set out in the Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy and ‘Healthy Streets’ agenda (outlined in the ‘City for
all Londoners’ document). This approach prioritises active travel and making walking, cycling and public transport the best and preferred choices for travel.

Travel planning is important in negating the impacts of large employers’ staff travel patterns on the transport system and the environment, where the road networks suffer congestion and delays during the busiest periods of the day. By managing the daily work-related trips, placing emphasis on more sustainable methods, smarter working and improved information, the number of trips can be reduced and more efficiently scheduled.

St Helier Hospital is responsible for its own staff travel planning and council officers have met with representatives from the Hospital who deal with travel planning. They advised that they are keen to reduce the number of people who are reliant on their private car to get to work, accepting that due to a number of factors some staff will still drive, such as shift work and distance travelled. The Council has offered further support to work with the hospital.

In the absence of any on-street parking controls, any vehicle can currently park on the public highway and the Council has no power to prioritise that space for any particular group.

8. Question asked by Graham Holcombe to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

The Stage 1 questionnaire was ‘to take residents’ views into consideration’, why then was the Stage 2 plan rolled out disregarding these ‘opinions’, (the work involved in creating these plans make this appear as pre-ordained whatever ‘residents’ opinions’)?

Response

This is not the case. Stage 1 questionnaire results, along with logged enquiries over a number of years, formed the basis for the development of the proposed schemes at stage 2.

9. Question asked by Robert Ede to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

On our facebook group (with 2600 members) we carried out a survey and asked specific questions to ascertain the true feelings of your residents. If we shared this raw data with the Council, not only as an overview but also a breakdown of information for each ward, will London Borough of Sutton take and use the findings as extra information and data to consider within the current parking consultation?

Response

The Council needs to be consistent and ensure that consultations are not subject to bias. We are concerned that there might be a number of problems if the information from the Facebook group is included as part of the consultation. For example, users may not have agreed or wish their views passed on to a third party, especially if there is no agreement that information would be passed on. We are also concerned that some of the Facebook group may have already submitted consultation responses and the inclusion of responses from a Facebook group may lead to a double-counting of responses and a correspondingly disproportionate bias to the results of the survey.
As such, it is not possible to have information from a Facebook group, submitted by an individual Facebook creator, considered formally as part of the survey result. However, I have received the results of your survey which I have looked at already and will be analysing in more detail over the coming weeks.

10. Question asked by Steve Alvarez to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

Why do you feel the need to rid working class estates in the borough of N1 company registered vans? What is your main reasoning behind this decision?

Response

The Council's Parking Strategy, adopted in 2016, is intended to deal with many issues around congestion and safety within the borough, taking account of a significant and ongoing number of concerns and complaints from residents. It outlines a number of changes to how we manage parking locally as well as permit conditions, not just a move to CO2 band-based pricing.

One change is restricting N1 type vehicles (goods vehicles or vans) by only allowing permits (which only apply during permitted hours) to those vehicles if they are registered at the address within the zone.

This issue was raised as part of the statutory consultation undertaken on CO2 band-based pricing which followed approval of the Parking Strategy and was duly considered at that time. It should be noted that the Council receives many complaints about commercial vehicles parking in residential streets, blocking sight lines and preventing residents' private vehicles from parking. Companies allowing or encouraging employees to take such vehicles home leads to more vehicles in already congested areas as users' families will generally have their own private vehicles too, as, unlike a ‘company car’, a van is not suitable for private/family use. The difference with a ‘company car’ is that very often companies allow private use of the vehicles and these are clearly more suitable for family purposes so may reduce the need for a private car in addition.

The Council's Environment & Neighbourhood Committee decided to implement the policy to discourage companies from using residential streets to park their fleet vehicles, rather than provide parking at their own premises, at their own cost, or at alternative locations. The main objective of any resident permit zone is to prioritise residential parking spaces for residents' passenger vehicles.

Self-employed van owners/users whose vehicle is registered at their address within the zone are still eligible for a permit. Company vans, not registered at the address within the zone, are not eligible though.

The proposed policy does not prevent the resident from using a van for work - instead it restricts the issue of a resident permit to park during controlled hours only.
Since the adoption of the policy in 2016 we have not received many complaints in the affected areas. However, we understand that this policy might have a different impact in areas like St.Helier that will potentially introduce some parking controls. We will wait for the results of the consultation and analyse the results before we take any decision. In the last few weeks we have raised with our officers a number of concerns about the impact that this policy could have on areas like St.Helier and we are in regular contact with residents that might be affected by this change.

11. Question asked by Jill Keene to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

The residents are extremely concerned about the review process re the parking proposals for St James Avenue and surrounding streets. Could the Council please outline the process both mathematically and ethically that will be applied in considering the responses of residents to the questionnaire and other correspondence it may have subsequently received in order to properly evaluate the wishes of the electorate?

Response

Stage 1 of the public consultation asked residents whether they faced any particular parking issues and whether or not they would prefer the introduction of parking and/or waiting restrictions in their street.

Based on the responses received per street, the Council was then able to identify several clusters of streets where controls were requested by residents. The results for St. James Avenue came back as undecided on whether a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) would be the preferred option. However, it fell within a cluster of streets that supported the introduction of a potential CPZ and a decision was made to propose a free-bay parking zone. This design was put forward to the residents as part of Stage 2 of the public consultation and the results are currently being analysed by an external consultant so the Council cannot comment on these yet.

The same process will be followed, this time where the responses from each street will be further analysed, in order to determine whether residents support the introduction of the proposals or not. A more in-depth design will be provided as part of the upcoming statutory consultation (Stage 3), where all residents will have the opportunity to consider formally the proposals put forward by the Council. Residents will be able to either object to or support the proposals, while stating their reasoning behind any objections. If it is decided not to implement a particular parking zone, the Council will still consider corner/junction protection in the form of ‘no waiting at any time’ restrictions (double yellow lines) in order to promote safety and improve sight lines at locations where residents have raised concerns.

12. Question asked by Bill Plummer to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

Why is a Borough Wide scheme being proposed when according to your "Sutton Parking Strategy and Policy 2016-2021" of just 228 streets in the entire borough, 320 Parking Interventions were required and only 59 prioritised?
Response

Paragraph 3.3 of the Parking Strategy identifies that the numbers quoted are only for one particular year (2015-16) and this information is provided as a guide to the typical number of requests received each year. This demonstrates that the previously ad-hoc manner of dealing with parking requests resulted in only 20% of requests being progressed.

Paragraph 3.4 of the Parking Strategy confirms this approach and it was noted that in the following six-month period a further 205 enquiries were received. This illustrates the significant scale of parking issues in the borough and why the Council is responding to residents’ concerns by putting considerable time, effort and resources into trying to improve the situation across the board.

13. Question asked by Robert Ede to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

The Kingston & Sutton Shared Environment Service for Highways & Transport commissioned a survey to be conducted between Saturday 3rd November & Saturday 1st December 2018. Traffic Data Centre were appointed by the London Borough of Sutton to conduct surveys within the following nine wards: St Helier, Sutton North, Sutton West, Sutton South, Sutton Central, Carshalton Central, The Wrythe, Wandle Valley and Wallington North.

Where can we find the full and complete copy of the results of this survey for each street and overall across the borough?

Response

A ‘Parking Beat Surveys’ contract to be carried out at 46 road locations was put to tender. Traffic Data Centre Consultants were the successful bidder and are currently analysing the survey results and preparing a report. When this report is complete, it will be available on the council’s website. Completion of the report is due in February 2019. This report will give officers a greater understanding of the parking capacity of each road and the number of vehicles parked at various times on a typical day, as well as those vehicles that remain parked all day.

14. Question asked by Sandra Ackland to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

The Boroughs Parking Strategy & Policy 2016-2021 clearly states that the recent changes to the "Traffic Signs & Regulations and General Directions" provide opportunities to consider the use of Permit Parking areas which are a simple signing solution that provide area-wide controls for permit holders only. These schemes offer local authorities a much simpler restriction for road users to understand and will require significantly less signing and road making with consequent reduction to costs and maintenance.

Why is this not the first option considered?

Response
Permit Parking Areas (PPAs) are generally less restrictive than Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), but due to having no visible markings, such as single yellow lines or parking bays, they could be misinterpreted as having no controls. Therefore they tend to be simpler to understand if they are located in smaller areas such as cul-de-sacs, where it is more likely that drivers will remember that they are in a PPA, rather than in a larger network of roads. Permits would still be required by residents to park and the Council has identified an area in Hackbridge as being most suitable for a PPA. We will, however, consider other areas for PPAs once the consultation responses have been assessed.

15. Question asked by Steve Alvarez to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

As you know, you had a very low response rate and agree rate to Stage 1 of the consultation but you still put together a pretty extensive CPZ across much of the area affected by phase 1.

If you get a similarly low response rate to stage 2 how would you interpret the percentage of agree votes and disagree votes?

Will you assume that a lack of response means that residents agree with your plans?

Response

The Council only considers the responses received when making any decisions. All the responses received from a particular street are classified as: agree; disagree; uncertain. Those residents who do not respond to the consultation are not regarded as agreeing or disagreeing with the proposals. That is the case for all the consultation stages. The response rate to the consultation is not considered to be abnormally low for this type of consultation.

16. Question asked by Darren Spink to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

As advised in an email from Mark Johnson, Parking Programme Manager, the stage 2 consultation survey was primarily set for being online.

Why was this decision made instead of allowing residents to respond via Royal Mail?

Response

The large number of properties to be consulted (approximately 43,000) meant that it was deemed more appropriate to have all the drawings made available online, where residents could access all the information they needed, and could also have the opportunity to assess the potential impact the Council’s proposals would have on them, based on the proposals in surrounding areas.

A leaflet was delivered to all households in the area highlighting the consultation and online survey. This is increasingly becoming the preferred option when consulting across larger areas, especially as increasing numbers of residents have access to the consultation material online. Providing all the material in paper format to all 43,000 households would be prohibitively expensive compared to providing the same information online. Hard copies
were available on request and in the libraries and several meetings (committee and informal) were held with the public to answer questions.

17. Question asked by Andy Cook to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

The council has made a mess of the public consultation on parking, causing confusion and concern amongst residents, whilst seemingly pushing through an agenda to generate more revenue from residents, who are still suffering from the austerity measures forced on the population by the liberal democrat/conservative coalition.

Amongst all this chaos, it is clear that the London Borough of Sutton is way behind all other London and neighbouring boroughs by not offering pay by phone on street parking. This means that those using parking metres may have to over pay if they do not have the correct change as the antiquated parking metres on our streets don’t even accept payment by card; only cash and won’t give change.

Over the years, when this question has been posed, various Councillors have offered different excuses for the council’s parking strategy not allowing pay by phone on street parking.

Please clarify why this facility is still not available to residents and visitors in Sutton?

Response

New ‘Pay-and-Display’ machines were installed in 2017/18 without card payment as the initial capital cost, ongoing maintenance, security repairs and transactional costs were prohibitive. The machines still maintained a cash payment option.

New ‘Pay-on-Foot’ machines were installed in 2018 in both the Council’s multi-storey car parks with provision for card payment (chip and pin) and contactless payment. These are the only multi-storey car parks in Sutton to offer contactless payment and this has been well received by customers.

Sutton Council already provides pay-by-phone/SMART Phone App parking in all nine off-street car parks across the Borough, through RINGO. Meetings with a number of potential suppliers to continue this scheme and expand it into the Sutton Town Centre CPZ have been undertaken and the service will be procured by the end of this financial year. It is expected to go live early in the new financial year.
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1. Question asked by Councillor Neil Garratt to Councillor Sunita Gordon, Lead Member for Resources can you please respond.

The Liberal Democrat Council sold The Lodge in Carshalton to EcoLocal, of which Tom Brake is a trustee and director, for at least a million pounds below the going rate, with no one else allowed to bid. In defending this decision, the Liberal Democrats assured residents that the building would revert to public ownership after 125 years - is that true? EcoLocal are redeveloping the property into flats which will be sold leasehold on the open market - will residents who buy the flats be able to extend their lease?

Reply from Councillor Sunita Gordon

Thank you Mr Mayor. EcoLocal proposals for The Lodge were presented to a special meeting of the Carshalton and Clockhouse Committee on the 15 September 2011, that was called to invite proposals and ideas from the local community on the future use of the Council's buildings in Carshalton. EcoLocal's use of The Lodge was supported overwhelmingly at this meeting this resident driven decision was to ensure the freehold remained with the Council rather than it being sold off to private developers. Recommendations of EcoLocal to progress the scheme were agreed in October 2014 by Strategy and Resources Committee, it is not the case that the Council refused to allow others to bid for The Lodge rather the decision to take forward proposals presented by EcoLocal was a direct and positive response to residents wishes. Community value is a mechanism introduced by the central government to allow transfers of assets at lower than market value so that they can be used by charitable and voluntary organisations for the public good, rather than simply being sold to private developers. This is the reason the Council was never looking for full market value, it is also not the case that residents were told that the building would revert to public ownership after 125 years on the contrary the report to the Strategy and Resources Committee on the 28 September 2015 specifically highlighted the probability that a 125 year lease may be required to make the residential lease attractive to the market. Thank you.

Supplementary question by Councillor Neil Garratt

Thank you Mr Mayor. Councillor Wales when he was in that position stated very clearly that it was not being sold off because it would revert back to ownership by the public of this Council. Are you saying that it will never revert? or are you saying that people cannot extend their leases as only one of those things can be true?
Reply by Councillor Sunita Gordon

What I am saying is that people cannot buy that lease because it's a mixed use building, out of the 9 developments 7 are going to be sold and 2 are going to be rented, so they cannot buy the lease. Thank you.

Supplementary Question from Councillor Tim Crowley

Would Councillor Gordon agree with me that if that were the case you would not be able to get a mortgage on the property so therefore that cannot obviously be the case.

Reply from Councillor Sunita Gordon

Councillor Crowley I do not have the exact answer to that technical question, I will get back to you.

2. Question asked by Councillor Tom Drummond to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee.

For decades Victoria House in North Cheam has stood derelict and an eyesore to the surrounding area. What are the Council’s plans to bring an end to this blight on the landscape?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you for your question Councillor Drummond, and I’ve got very positive news on Victoria House, as you know the Home Group who own the site had put in a Planning application that was refused, and that refusal was upheld on appeal. But Home Group remained undeterred by that set back and quite quickly after their refusal on appeal contacted the Council to seek to understand what they need to do to make a development on the site get Planning permission. I personally met with Home Group along with Planning Officers and to discussed the inspectors notes for refusal at appeal, and how they might actually change the design of their proposed development to better reflect the local character and my personal advice to them was to go and talk to the residents and get something they find acceptable as they did with the first scheme. So I know that they are working on a new application now and hope to progress speedily, and if they can secure local support for a scheme then the current blight on the landscape will be removed.

Supplementary question by Councillor Tom Drummond

Thank you very much for that and it does sound like great news and I do hope it comes to fruition. However, Councillor McCoy the Conservatives gave you a solution back in 2011 which you rejected. Since then you have been burying your head in the sand hoping this issue will go away. Why did you procrastinate so long when you had powers under the Town and Country Planning Act that allow you to make sure the owners Victoria House fix both windows stop the debris from falling from the building and clean up the graffiti and fly tipping it should have been done a long time ago, and although I welcome the news I think the residents have been let down.
Reply from Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you Councillor Drummond that isn't a solution that just gets rid of an ugly looking building were talking about re-developing the site and getting the whole thing demolished, that's just tinkering around the edges. On response to that question in 2015 I said the plans were underway then we were working on and getting them developers interested in the site and we did see the site purchased by a developer and a successful planning application achieved, so things did happen in the way that we wanted them to. Unfortunately rather than developing the site they sold it on to the Home Group as developers do we didn't know that, that's a shame. The new owners have every intention of developing the site and I think we all agree the best solution for that site is to get on and develop it and then the building will come down and it will be erased. Now yes we can demand that they do something a bit of tartying up now but if there going to actually demolish very soon I think that's actually a bit unreasonable to ask them to waste all that money on fixing a few windows because it's going to come down short term I say if we can get on with this new application if we can get a scheme that works we will see it completely removed.

Supplementary question from Councillor Eric Allen

I think Councillor McCoy will recall I actually asked her the question in 2011 regarding the use of Section 215 The Town and Country Planning Act to bring that building back into an acceptable condition you refused to do that said you would re-look at it it's now 8 years. Now I also recall that in the election 2014 the Liberal Democrats put out an Intouch, sorry, Focus at the time of the election 2014 saying Great News Victoria House is going to be demolished in August, you didn't say which year you just said August your now saying its going to be demolished will it be this August?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you. As I'm sure you will understand the development world moves quite you know moves in an awful lot of changes going on that affect things. At that time we expected we had a planning application and it got permission so we expected things to go. We didn't know that they were going to sell the site on. We now were in the same position now we can look at the Section 215 notice to try and get them to do stuff and we will be looking at that but it depends how fast they move. So if they're moving very quickly and we can see them demolish soon I think that's the best solution. If they're delaying if we think they are not going to get planning permission then we can serve that notice and Officers are committed to doing that.

3. Question asked by Councillor Peter Geiringer to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment and Neighbourhood Committee.

What progress is the Council making to ensure that in conjunction with Veolia, reported missed collections are picked up the next day without fail?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

So on the issue of the bins we are making good progress just to clarify a missed collection is any waste that has been presented correctly but not collected on the schedule they have for collections and its important to make this point because that is what we look at when we look
at contract performance. If the collection has been rescheduled for reasons such as breakdowns or restricted access you should be advised about it on the website and this is one of the things we pushed for in the last year which is when we know of roads that haven't been collected for those specific reasons that residents see that. Similarly if the collection has not been made because of contamination or the bin not being presented then you will be advised when attempting to report it that technically it's been collected and we've had cases where that has not always been the case and we pushed our Officers to find solutions if a report of a missed collection is logged within 2 days then crews should return by the end of the next working day to pick it up and the integration between the CRM and Veolia's echo system ensures that this goes straight to the crews which is good progress. We're also developing a new digital platform that will make it easier to report issues and a much more user friendly service which is also progress. We've seen the number of complaints for repeated missed collections go down dramatically in the last year and the number of missed bin reports in December were 49% down on last year. So overall if you look at the fact that we are re-cycling 50% of what we produce, top 3 in London, the service has been stable for the last three months except for some disruption in August which we all know about, that we've had a much improved Christmas collection service this year including the Christmas trees and that we are delivering our important savings that are protecting key services like Social Care and services like Meals on Wheels we are making good progress and we still have more work to do but I think we are in a much better place.

Supplementary question by Councillor Peter Geiringer

Yes your worship I certainly do. I mean Councillor Abellan never answered the question it's a very simple question so let me carry on with this. In past years when the Council used to run its own bin collection service and residents complained to Councillors that their bins were not collected we would get in touch with the relevant Officer and the waste would be collected either that day or the next. Contrast that with what we are currently having to put up with Veolia. All we hear now following our complaints is that they are sorry and the bins will be collected asap without a firm time scale all too often over recent weeks the same residents get back to us some days later to say that their bins still have not been collected, this is intolerable for my residents and a marked drop in the standard of service expected by all of us. So what are you going to do to ensure that when complaints are received that the bins are collected that same day or the day after the complaints have been received and if they're not what is being done to ensure that Veolia are held accountable for their performance Thank you.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

I have already touched on some of the things we are doing I mean one of the main things which makes I think this system much more efficient than the one you just described is that when there is a reported missed collection it goes straight to the crews in the cab that are meant to pick it up and they go the next day and pick it up. The statistics and the performances is much better than last year. So I think you are over exaggerating an issue that is not there.

Supplementary question from Councillor David Hicks

I would like to thank Councillor Abellan for the answer. Its intriguing really how long have we had this contract in place and we are still considering ways of reporting issues to get them
put right. We have already spent hundreds of thousands on systems and they are not working, how much have we actually spent trying to get a system working which is not responded to by Veolia anyway.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

I don't have the figures but I would disagree with you. I think the system is working much more efficiently than when we started the contract than in many ways much better than it was when we ran it in-house and we relied on a lot of paper and local knowledge as opposed to sub-digitalised.

4. Question asked by Councillor Param Nandha to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

A number of residents have reported poor street cleaning around Sutton Common Road and Stonecot Hill areas, this has been brought up in Local Area Committee meeting and at the first meeting of Full Council in September. What assurances can the council give to residents to ensure proper checks will be in place to improve street cleaning?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you Councillor Nandha for your question. Street cleaning is an important service for Sutton Council just to give you a bit of information on your question. The Neighbourhood Services Team monitors CRM data and members enquires and reviews the performance of Veolia, this includes streets that are below the grade that is acceptable and identifying hot spots where there may be repeated reporting where appropriate solutions and action plan is agreed and put in place to help resolve the concerns. This includes things like deep clean work further training for operatives and additional monitoring for supervisors and Neighbourhood Services. Neighbourhood Services also undertake random independent monitoring and joint inspections with Veolia of street cleaning standards throughout the borough which is quite important. Last year 619 inspections were undertaken across the borough of which 73% were at the required standard or above for litter. We want to do much better but that is already quite high. 42 of these inspections were in the Stonecot Ward with 71% of those inspected of standard or above. I have asked Officers today to look further and contact you directly about this specific issue which you have raised about Stonecot Hill and around Sutton Common Road and if we need to put an extra plan in place and do some deep clean work there I am sure our Officers will assist.

Supplementary question from Councillor Param Nandha

Thank you Mayor and thank you for the answer, I am pleased to hear that you asked the Officers to inspect the area and Sutton Common Road. My general question is not only that Stonecot Ward is around the Sutton because you said early evening that you are willing to engage and learn from the lessons on other aspects, so this question being brought up in our Local Committee Meeting and also first Council Meeting as well and you said the same answers, so what sort of extra measure you are going to take and if Veolia is failing to do the job what we are asking to do what consequences they have to pay thank you.
Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

I have just said that if there is a need to put the specific concern which you have raised on a list of hot spots and identify initial works deep cleaning and what not, and find a permanent solution that's what I have asked Officers to do so I would expect that the relevant Officers will get in touch will you to discuss this further if they need more information and you know to work out an action plan. I think that it's especially for issues like this it's important that the Ward Councillors are in charge and able to drive and be in touch with some of these action plans, it wouldn't be fair for me to find the solution that is acceptable to you, that's why I have asked them to get in touch with you and do what we need to do to improve the service.

Supplementary question from Councillor Eric Allen

At the last Area Committee Meeting we were informed that all roads were inspected on a fortnightly basis, an you please confirm this is correct and if so why in Grove Road in Sutton outside the Sutton High School outside the pre-school entrance there is the remains of a smashed car window which has been left on the pavement now for 4 weeks.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

The first thing I will ask is that is I hope you have reported it on the Council Website and if you have a CS number do send it to me. I am not aware of the specifics around this issue but I'm more than happy to look at it and I can also confirm that each road is inspected once a fortnight and yes, um yes well I can't comment further because I don't know the details of it, I will give you and example you inspect the road you clean it the next day it's there you see it you say it's been there for a week you clean the road two weeks ago its very easy to have the perception that it's been there for 4 weeks. I don't know the details of this I will take your word for it if you have a reference number which, if it's been there for 4 weeks as an experienced Councillor I would imagine you have a reference number so send me the number and we will deal with it.

5. Question asked by Councillor Tony Shields to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

Is the outside company that was given the contract for cleaning the boroughs streets by the Liberal Democrat Council doing a good job for the residents and how many letters congratulating the Council on the decision to award the contract have been received?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

This is a similar question to the one I have already answered so I would repeat what I have already mentioned to Councillor Nandha, which is that we've had 619 inspection which were undertaken across the borough of which 73% of those were inspected on standard or above for litter. Between October and December of 2018, 69% of requests for street cleaning in residential roads were responded to within the standard set out in the contract of 24 hours. Again we know that improvement is still required and Officers are working with Veolia to achieve this. If you have any specific examples like the ones that have been raised I will be happy to take them up.
Supplementary question from Councillor Tony Shields

I am sure all Councillors have a lot of contact from residents and in just in passing when people know you’re a Councillor and the state of the streets is a very common thread, the bins is the most common, the state of the streets is simply too regularly remarked on by residents. I hear what you say on the 619 inspections but that is 12 a week by our staff and I don't know how many roads we've got in the borough is it 196 something like that but it is 12 a week clearly the self monitoring by the contractor is not delivering the results so the asking of you to dedicate a bit more resources to make sure just 12 roads a week aren't inspected but maybe double or treble that. Resident satisfaction is very important to people on this side of the party this side of the chamber and I'm sure it should be to you as well. But 12 a week inspections is paltry would you not say.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Yes I think you would see that when you are monitoring roads you don't need to go over every single one of them you have a rota where you make sure that you look across the borough and you have a good picture of the service you are getting. You did mention resources which makes me I would like to laugh but it's a bit too serious to laugh. We have 4 members of staff that are looking at full time to the waste and street cleaning contracts which is not very much I wonder why maybe because we've had austerity over the last 8 years which you know. So I thought that you been claiming that a few meetings that austerity is over but clearly it's not and you are still supporting it. The reality is that our environmental services have been cut to the bone in order to protect services - I don't know why you are smiling at the back over there it's not funny - residents care about this issue and yes they care about this issue and we've had to run a very tight service with very little resources and kept it at very high standards, we used to employ 5,000 people at this Council before 2010 and now we employ less than a 1,000 when you do austerity it has an impact it has an impact and this is one of the impacts.

Supplementary question from Councillor David Hicks

My heart bleeds for the Councillor and his lack of staff but I would like to offer you a possible solution. In my ward alone there are two very active Residents Associations who inspect streets on a regular basis and report them on a regular basis and report them to me on a regular basis. Now I would be very happy with those Residents Associations and local residents to sit down with Officers on an ongoing basis and be part of that monitoring process. Now they can then concentrate on the contractual issues while we provide them with actual evidence of the problems with the service. Would you be willing to ask the Director of Environmental Services to set that process up as a matter of urgency at least for the South Sutton Local Committee and I’m sure other Local Committees might like to take it up. Thank you.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

If you want to put that in writing with a bit more detail I am happy to take it up. I wonder if this is a type of resources that Councillor Shields was referring to because whereas I agree that getting residents to help us with the monitoring is good, and welcome and it seems on the surface you are making a very good point. I would have also thought what Councillor
Shields meant was much actual Council staff being able to do that and in order to do that we need a bit more money. So austerity you can't complain and ask for more resources but then keep on voting to cut every single one of our services so I think I would be let's look into it further but I hope when you meet with those residents that you also paint the true picture of why we are in this mess.

6. Question asked by Councillor Peter Geiringer to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

Has the Council made any assessment of the likely effect of the borough wide parking strategy on the total number of available on street residential parking spaces and the number that may end up in controlled parking zones?

Response from Councillor Abellan
At this stage officers are only seeking to establish the level of support for changes. Any final design could be affected by a number of issues, such as street furniture, vehicle crossovers and utility access points. To assign officers to examine the effect on the total number of available parking spaces at this stage, when the final proposals haven’t been established, would not be cost-effective. Once the results of the consultation have been assessed and decisions made on the final proposals, officers will undertake a detailed design of those areas and will be able to evaluate the total number of parking spaces within each phase of the scheme, based on a site survey of each road.

A number of ‘Parking Beat’ surveys have been carried out at a range of road locations to support the design process. These surveys will allow officers to make an assessment of what level of on-street parking is currently for non-residents and therefore how much parking needs to be provided for residents, visitors, etc. Consultants are currently analysing the results and preparing a report. When this report is complete it will be available on the council website. The report is due for completion in early February 2019. This report will give officers an understanding of the percentage/capacity of the road with vehicles parked and the time period vehicles are parked for throughout the day.

7. Question asked by Councillor Param Nandha to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

To improve cleaner air and promote public transport, what is Sutton doing to establish what new bus services are needed in the borough and how is the Council working with TfL to deliver them?

Response from Councillor Abellan
As set out in our Sustainable Transport Strategy and our Local Implementation Plan, the Council continues to lobby TfL through regular dialogue for improved bus capacity, both to improve public transport accessibility levels across less well-served areas in the borough, and also to manage the increased demand for school travel, while reducing the number of car journeys to school. This is common to most South London boroughs and includes:

- increased capacity on existing routes, particularly those used heavily by schoolchildren such as the 154 bus
- interchange opportunities to Crossrail 2 and the Sutton Link tram extension
We also hold regular meetings with TfL on the impact of local developments on bus operations and TfL and bus operator representatives attend the council's Public Transport Liaison Group on a regular basis to update councillors and stakeholders on current and future issues.

The proposed re-organisation of bus services in Inner and outer London, although affected by delays to Crossrail and subject to the current funding issues faced by TfL, will be an opportunity to bid for resources, as well as ensure that vehicles deployed in the borough are of the highest environmental standard. All buses on TfL routes built from 2014 onwards meet the current Euro VI standard and the 5,000 or so existing fleet of older Euro IV and Euro V vehicles are being converted to Euro VI as soon as possible. Electric/Hybrid buses and fully electric buses are already entering service, so it can be expected that the majority of buses re-deployed in the first instance will be Euro VI standard.

The Council has also expressed an interest in piloting smaller, non route-specific, demand-responsive buses that can be booked online and serve those areas of the borough with low accessibility. TfL are due to make an announcement on the first operators of these services shortly and Sutton anticipates being successful in hosting one of the trials.
1. **Question asked by Councillor Neil Garratt to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee**

In considering the overall quality of service currently being delivered through the Veolia contract to collect household waste, sweep streets, and empty litter bins, does the Administration believe the quality of the service is better, worse, or about the same as that delivered prior to the Veolia contract?

**Response**

The Veolia contract agreed by all the four local authorities in the South London Waste Partnership has provided significant financial benefits to the Council and we also have one of the most improved recycling rates in the country as a result of the new contract.

It is difficult to make a direct comparison as the two contracts are by their nature very different. This is now a four-borough service compared to Sutton’s own managed and provided service previously. We recognise though that the new waste and recycling service did not start well and some residents experienced difficulties, particularly with the capacity and provision of containers, and changes to the collection frequencies. It is likely though that the same disruption would have occurred under the previous contract arrangements. The initial problems with the new contract have been highlighted several times in the thorough scrutiny review and at several council meetings.

Council officers are continuing to work with Veolia to improve the reliability of the service. The administration has made it a priority that residents continue to receive their scheduled waste and recycling collections on time, and that capacity is improved. We recognise that there is ongoing work to do, particularly with flats in the borough. Council officers and Veolia are continuing to work with residents and managing agents on this aspect of the service.

With regard to street cleaning, the contract with Veolia requires them to ensure that the streets are kept to a specified ‘standard’ as prescribed through legislation - the Environmental Protection Act. This is the same standard to which the Council was required to maintain and clean streets prior to the change in contract.

In 2018, 619 inspections were undertaken across the borough by council officers. Of these, 73% of those inspected were at the required standard or above for litter. Improvement is still required though and members and officers are working with Veolia to achieve this.
2. **Question asked by Councillor Elliott Colburn to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee**

How many vehicles are owned by the London Borough of Sutton (excluding contractors, e.g. not counting Veolia bin lorries or IdVerde vehicles), broken down by the type of vehicles owned by the London Borough of Sutton, e.g. number of motorcycles, small vans, large vans, etc?

**Response**

The Council currently own two vehicles. These are as follows:

- Kubota Mini Tractor - Biodiversity - Diesel
- Ford Transit Van - owned by Cognus but registered to Sutton Council - Euro 4 Diesel

We are transferring the Ford Transit to Cognus ownership and have no current plans to upgrade the mini tractor to electric.

3. **Question asked by Councillor Elliott Colburn to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee**

How many vehicles, owned by the London Borough of Sutton are run on petrol, how many are run on diesel and how many are run on electricity, and does the Council have any plans to upgrade its fleet to include more electric vehicles?

**Response**

The Council currently own two vehicles. These are as follows:

- Kubota Mini Tractor - Biodiversity - Diesel
- Ford Transit Van - owned by Cognus but registered to Sutton Council - Euro 4 Diesel

We are transferring the Ford Transit to Cognus ownership and have no current plans to upgrade the mini tractor to electric.

4. **Question asked by Councillor Catherine Gray to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee**

Why was the Sutton Christian Centre, 25 Tate Road, Sutton, SM1 2SY, in my ward of Sutton West not consulted during phase one or two of the parking consultation? This is a busy community hub that holds funerals, play groups, drop in sessions for the elderly, in addition to being used by Age Concern and the Food Bank, and they rely on local parking for members and visitors.
Response

Officers have checked the list of addresses used for both public consultations and the Sutton Christian Centre was included in the list provided to the printers and Royal Mail for delivery.

5. Question asked by Councillor Catherine Gray to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

Please provide me with the data for the roads that have been grouped together under ‘other’ for the Parking Survey Local Area reports for all wards available?

Response

The data referred to relates to the other streets from where residents have taken part in the whole consultation, but are outside the local committee area to which the specific report relates.

The data for each of these ‘other’ streets is contained in the other local area reports. All reports are accessible on the council website at:
https://www.sutton.gov.uk/info/200195/parking/1775/improving_parking_across_sutton_phase_1_consultation/2

6. Question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

Please could you provide the equality and impact assessments that were carried out prior to the parking policy being adopted by the Strategy and Resources committee in 2016? These need to relate to the impact on individual householders and van drivers and also the economic impact on local residents of that strategy.

If any updated impact assessments have been carried out since the adoption of the policy in 2016 could these also be provided?

Response

The impact assessment can be found online at:

Further impact assessments will be undertaken as the scheme proposals are developed.

7. Question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee
Could you provide the number of N1 van drivers in the borough and how many will be affected?

Response

Since the introduction of the new terms and conditions (November 2017) there have been 10 applications refused where the vehicle was a company vehicle (N1) not registered to the address within the existing zone. The terms do not restrict all N1 vehicles, they restrict those not registered in Sutton (in the zone where the controls are) and only during controlled hours.

Council officers use the Eligibility Requirements and Terms and Conditions (available online https://www.sutton.gov.uk/downloads/file/3379/cpz_eligibility_requirements_and_terms_and_conditions) when assessing applications.