



THE LONDON BOROUGH  
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Lisa Thornley  
[lisa.thornley@bromley.gov.uk](mailto:lisa.thornley@bromley.gov.uk)

DIRECT LINE: 020 8461 7566

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 20 March 2015

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Meeting to be held on Tuesday 24 March 2015**

**Please see the attached report marked “to follow” on the agenda.**

**7 BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE CONSERVATION AREA (Pages 1 - 6)**

*Copies of the documents referred to above can be obtained from*  
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>

This page is left intentionally blank

Report No.  
DRR15/033

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

**Date:** TUESDAY 24 March 2015

**Decision Type:** Non-Urgent                      Non-Executive                      Non-Key

**Title:** BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE CONSERVATION AREA

**Contact Officer:** Robert Buckley, Principal Conservation Officer  
Tel: 020 84617532    E-mail: Robert.Buckley@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Chief Planner

**Ward:** Clock House; Copers Cope; Kelsey and Eden Park;

---

1. Reason for report

A consultation was undertaken on a proposed conservation area in Beckenham Town Centre. A questionnaire was sent to every property in the area and also to some selected adjoining properties. The deadline for responses was the 24th October 2014. 102 responses were received.

---

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **Following the consultation exercise adopt new conservation area named “Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area” to the boundaries set out in the accompanying map in section 3.**
- 2.2 **DCC are requested to recommend this proposal to the Executive.**

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council Quality Environment Supporting Independence Vibrant, Thriving Town Centres Not Applicable: Further Details
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Regeneration
  4. Total current budget for this head: £314k
  5. Source of funding: Existing controllable revenue budget 2014/15
- 

## Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional):1
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:72
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance None: Further Details
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): NA
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes

Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Local Ward Councillors, through their involvement on the West Wickham and Beckenham Working Group are aware of the results and welcomed the positive response.

### 3. COMMENTARY

In addition to the Beckenham Society, APCA and English Heritage the following residents were consulted.

2 – 292 (even) High Street,

1 – 251 (odd) High Street,

Odeon Cinema High Street,

Beckenham Junction Station, Rectory Road

1 Southend Road,

2 Southend Road,

1 – 11 (odd) Rectory Road,

22 Rectory Road,

1 – 5 (odd) Bromley Road,

2 – 16 (even) Bromley Road,

46 Bromley Road,

St George's Church Bromley Road,

Bromley Road Infant School Bromley Road,

Knoll Lodge, the Knoll,

1 – 5 (odd) The Knoll,

2 – 4 (even) The Knoll,

Beckenham Methodist Church Bromley Road,

1 – 10 Fire Station Mews Bromley Road,

1 – 3 The Mews High Street,

2 – 20 (even) Manor Road,

1 – 49 (odd) Manor Road,

1 – 29 (odd) Kelsey Park Road,

4 – 6 (even) Kelsey Park Road,

Telephone Exchange Kelsey Park Road

1 – 9 Stanmore Terrace,

6 – 14 (even) Fairfield Road,

Christ Church, Fairfield Road,

Harvey Hall Fairfield Road,  
1 – 3 Christ Church Road,  
Coach & Horses PH Burnhill Road,  
1 – 6 Kelsey Square,  
Kelsey Lodge Kelsey Square,  
1 – 12 Coopers Mews, High Street,  
1 – 7 (odd) Village Way,  
2 – 6 (even) Village Way,  
St Edmund of Canterbury RC Church Village Way,  
Prebytery Village Way,

431 – 439 (odd) Croydon Road,

408 – 436 (even) Croydon Road

1-13 Lea Road

Owners/Occupiers were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the proposal to designate a new Beckenham Town Centre conservation area. The feedback was as follows:

55% Strongly agree

22% Agree

15% Neither agree nor disagree

4% Disagree

4% Strongly disagree

Many comments gave only a name or were anonymous so it was not possible to accurately gauge differences in views between residential areas and the High Street commercial occupiers.

### **General Comments**

Most comments were positive, acknowledging a desire to protect and improve Beckenham's character but also to ensure its future vitality as a town centre. Comments were received relating to the following issues: parking and CPZs around the town centre, the poor street surfaces, the proliferation of charity shops and empty units, concern over extra restrictions, pedestrians should be given preference over cars.

Several comments were also received about the proposed boundary and these included:

#### Suggested Additions

- Addition of Bevington Road, Manor Grove and Downs Road ( all cul de sacs off Manor Road)
- Addition of 8-14 Kelsey Park Road to join the opposite side of the road which was included.
- The Drive, Church Avenue, the Crescent and Rectory Road
- Lait House Albermarle Road
- Bromley Road, from Public Hall to Junction with Wickham Road/Manor Road
- Faverham Road

#### Suggested Removals

- Robinson Escott Planning objected to the inclusion of 408-436 Croydon Road ( building containing Tesco near the war memorial) on behalf of the owner.
- Addition of Faversham Road on the basis that it had sufficient merit
- Removal of Manor Road on the basis that it has been too altered.
- Removal of Beckenham Junction Station area as this could prevent improvement and redevelopment.
- Knoll House

#### Key Stakeholder Comments

No formal comment from the Beckenham Society was received although some individual respondents were members.


The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas welcomed the proposal generally and in particular felt that it could improve the area around Beckenham Junction. They felt however that Manor Road has been altered too much and is not worthy of inclusion.

English Heritage were favourable and noted the requirement of the NPPF to ensure areas designated as conservation are fully justified. Whilst they support in particular the inclusion of the war memorial area and Beckenham Junction they raised concerns about the addition of Manor Road and suggested that a comparative study between this road and the already designated Elm Road, could reveal if the area warranted designation and what measures would need to be taken to reverse the negative changes. They also highlighted the need for a guidance document to be produced in order to positively manage the area.

## CONCLUSION

On the basis of these comments received it is proposed that Manor Road should not be included. The final proposed boundary is therefore as follows in the map below:

**NOTE : The proposed name for the conservation area is” Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area”**



## 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Once designated a guidance document for future development in the area would need to be written and adopted.

## 5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 None arising directly from this report.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Legal, personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	none