

## **RENEWAL AND RECREATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 6 April 2016

### **Present:**

Councillor Ian F. Payne (Chairman)  
Councillor Michael Rutherford (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Douglas Auld, Julian Benington,  
Peter Dean, Alexa Michael, Neil Reddin FCCA and  
Michael Tickner

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Peter Morgan

#### **43 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Angela Wilkins;  
Councillor Vanessa Allen attended as substitute.

#### **44 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Allen and Michael declared a personal interest in Item 10 (Mytime Active – Investment Fund Proposals 2016/17) as they were Members of Mytime Active.

Councillor Payne declared a personal interest in Item 13 (Town Centres Development Programme Update) as he was an Executive Member of the Salvation Army, located within site G of the Area Action Plan.

Councillor Morgan declared a personal interest in Item 13 (Town Centres Development Programme Update) as he was a Trustee of Bromley and Sheppard's Colleges.

Councillor Benington declared a personal interest in Item 13 (Town Centres Development Programme Update) as he was a Trustee of the Biggin Hill Memorial Trust.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

#### **45 QUESTIONS FOR THE RENEWAL AND RECREATION PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

No questions were received.

**46 QUESTIONS FOR THE CHAIRMAN OF RENEWAL AND RECREATION PDS COMMITTEE**

No questions were received.

**47 MINUTES OF THE RENEWAL AND RECREATION PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 26 JANUARY 2016**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**48 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES AND UPDATES**

**RESOLVED** that the Matters Arising report be noted.

**49 RENEWAL AND RECREATION PDS COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME (MAY 2016-APRIL 2017)**

**Report CSD16037**

Members reviewed the Work Programme for the new Municipal Year May 2016-April 2017).

The tender process for community-run libraries was currently underway and a special PDS meeting could be held to consider these upon completion. Further reports on the outsourcing of libraries would be submitted when available.

A report outlining the strategy for BIDS and the funding thereof would be submitted for consideration at the next PDS meeting on 5 July 2016.

Discussion took place in relation to updates concerning the Bromley Arts Council. Whilst it was acknowledged that the Council had no statutory duty to oversee art groups within the Borough, separate presentation meetings could be privately organised between Members and individual art groups. It was reported that the new Churchill Theatre provider hoped to appeal to a wider audience and the Assistant Director, Culture would try to arrange a tour of the Theatre for Members.

**RESOLVED** that subject to the addition of the reports and actions outlined above, the Renewal and Recreation PDS Committee Work Programme for the new Municipal Year May 2016-April 2017, be noted.

## **PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF RENEWAL AND RECREATION PORTFOLIO REPORTS**

### **50 BUDGET MONITORING 2015/16**

#### **Report FSD16022**

Members considered the latest budget monitoring position for 2015/16 for the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio based on expenditure and activity levels up to 31 December 2015. The total portfolio budget showed a projected underspend of £236k.

The level of expenditure and progress with the implementation of the selected projects within the Member Priority Initiatives was also reported.

It was noted that all carry forward requests listed in Appendix 1B would be made to the Executive at year end to enable completion in 2016/17.

As set out in paragraph 5.4 (page 40), a net underspend of £63k was projected for staffing within the Planning Strategy and Projects team, due to part year vacancies. It was reported that the volume of work was currently increasing and the vacant posts were being refilled.

Members were informed that the Priory Museum closed on 18 March 2016 and was expected to go out to market in the forthcoming week. A meeting to discuss the next process would shortly take place between officers, the Portfolio Holder and Ward Members. Meanwhile, security grills had been installed and guardians employed to secure and protect the building.

The community group which had shown an interest in acquiring the building, had been provided with relevant information, so they were aware of all the work that would be required to make the building fit for purpose.

With regard to the existing museum artefacts, an on-line catalogue was now available. The required temperature and humidity for the artefacts had been recorded and a number of them (including human remains), had been transferred to the Museum of London. A specialist Museum Design Consultant had been appointed to deliver the new exhibition at the Central Library. The design and detail process had been completed and works would be undertaken in September 2016. The new exhibition would allow for 50% more items to be put on display, including space for the Lubbock Collection, a local history collection and a 'Borough in Time' exhibition space which would concentrate on key moments in time.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:-**

- (1) endorse the latest 2015/16 budget projection for the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio; and**

- (2) note the progress of the implementation of the Renewal and Recreation projects within the Member Priority Initiatives.**

**51 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING Q3 2015/16 AND ANNUAL CAPITAL REVIEW 2016 TO 2020**

**Report FSD10629**

On 10 February 2016, the Executive received a report summarising the current position on capital expenditure and receipts following the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2015/16 and presenting for approval the new capital schemes in the annual capital review process.

Members of this Committee were now requested to consider changes agreed by the Executive in respect of the Capital Programme for the Renewal and Recreation Portfolio.

Officers were waiting to tie in the post-completion review for Bromley North Village with the review of bus operations within the area. The Head of Renewal agreed to check the current position and report back to Members.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder be recommended to confirm the changes agreed by the Executive on 10 February 2016.**

**52 MYTIME ACTIVE - INVESTMENT FUND PROPOSALS 2016/17**

**Report DRR16/039**

Members considered Mytime Active's (Mytime) Investment Fund proposals for 2016-17. Mytime were seeking approval for the 2016/17 Investment Fund to be released to deliver the schemes as detailed in the report.

The Chairman emphasised that in accordance with contractual arrangements, the Council was obligated to release the Investment Fund for 2016/17, provided the Portfolio Holder was satisfied with Mytime's proposals. At the PDS meeting on 27 October 2015, Mytime submitted its Annual Report for 2014/15 which included proposals for the Investment Fund for 2016/17. At that time, the Portfolio Holder considered part of the proposals were not suitable for funding and declined to release the monies. Since then, Mytime had amended the proposals as required by the Portfolio Holder and Members were satisfied with these.

As a member of Mytime Active, Councillor Michael reported that having paid a substantial amount of money to renew her membership, she would like part of the funding to be spent on upgrading the lockers situated on the dry side area at The Spa, Beckenham and for the hand driers in the ladies' facilities to be repaired. This was noted by Marg Mayne, Chief Executive of Mytime, who was in attendance at the meeting.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted and the Portfolio Holder be recommended to agree to release the 2016/17 (Year 13) Investment Fund to Mytime to deliver the projects proposed in the report.**

**53 TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT AND LOCAL PARADES  
INITIATIVE UPDATE MARCH 2016**

**Report DRR16/037**

Consideration was given to the proposed extension of the Local Parades Improvement Initiative using an allocation of £250k, as part of a new £750k Members Initiative Fund announced following Full Council on 22 February.

Appendix 2 of the report outlined the parameters and criteria for the proposed scheme of delegation and rules of engagement for decision making on requests for expenditure from the allocated fund.

Members also considered the key developments and activities within the Town Centre Management and Business Support Team, along with options for the Council's future support for Christmas lights in non-BID town centres.

The Chairman reported on the success of the Local Parades Improvement initiative and emphasised that future proposals could only be put forward by Ward Members on the proviso they carried the full support of retailers. The final decision to sign-off proposals of up to £25k lay with the Portfolio Holder. Proposals above £25k would be submitted for scrutiny by PDS Members prior to sign-off.

The Vice-Chairman suggested that further updates on the initiative should include a list of Ward Member proposals and their reasons for requesting funds.

It was noted that the initiative should not be Resident Association driven however, it was acceptable for support from traders to be 'backed' by Resident Associations.

Repeat proposals would not be permitted e.g. whilst hanging baskets would be provided complete with bedding and flowers, replanting the following year would need to be carried out independently. Ward Councillors should liaise with trader associations and residents associations to ensure this happens.

With regard to the Bromley BID project (page 69), it was reported that at the request of the BID Board, the remaining sum of £7,456 from the funding allocated by the Executive in January 2014, would be provided to Bromley BID Ltd as a 'start-up' grant to assist with the cost of employing a BID Manager early.

The Head of Town Centre Management and Business Support confirmed that Ward Members would be informed when traders initially contacted officers in

regard to obtaining a grant. Traders would be notified through the BID Newsletter that they were required to approach Ward Members to apply for a grant. Members acknowledged the importance of ensuring they remained the main conduit for the continuing success of this initiative.

Turning to the provision of funding for Christmas lights, Councillor Tickner considered that as no BID existed for Beckenham and Penge, these areas would be most affected by the reduction and/or withdrawal of funding. He favoured the gradual reduction of option B as the best way forward.

It was suggested that Option A be chosen on the grounds that it would coincide with the start of the BID work and enable the Council to set a milestone for the provision of lights to become the responsibility of traders. It should be made clear that part of the BID was to pay for Christmas lights.

Comments from Ward Member for Penge and Cator, Councillor Kathy Bance, in support of Option A were reported at the meeting. Councillor Bance's full representation is attached as Appendix A to these Minutes.

As the BID could take up to two years to come to fruition, it was agreed that Option A be the preferred approach.

The Chairman referred to the number of shop vacancies within the Intu Shopping Centre. Members were informed that once vacated, leases tended to be reserved for high grade occupiers. A number of 25 year leases were also coming to an end. Several units were utilised by temporary traders during the Christmas period and vacated shortly after. The Assistant Director, Culture, agreed to find out if any meetings were held throughout the year between Council officers and the Executive staff of Intu.

The results of a feasibility study on a Beckenham and Penge BID would be reported to Members at the PDS meeting in July 2016.

An update on the potential changes to Bromley's regular market would also be reported to Members at the July meeting.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted and taking account of PDS Member comments, the Portfolio Holder be recommended to:-**

- (1) approve the expenditure of £250k for improvement projects at local shopping parades across the borough;**
- (2) approve the proposed scheme of delegation and rules of engagement for decision making on requests for expenditure from the allocated fund, based on the parameters and criteria set out within the report; and**
- (3) agree that Option A be the preferred approach to the Council's funding of Christmas lights in managed town centres in 2016/17.**

## **54 CRYSTAL PALACE PARK UPDATE**

### **Report DRR16/036**

The report updated Members on progress achieved with both the Improvement Scheme and the Sustainable Regeneration Plan for Crystal Palace.

The cost of conservation work to the Grade 1 listed Iguanodon was due, in part, to the specialist materials required to underpin and preserve the dinosaur for many years to come. Funding was obtained via the GLA with work being carried out on the remaining dinosaurs and regeneration of the park being undertaken in due course.

Access works for the pedestrian walkway on the Southwark side of the park would be funded partly by Southwark Council. Bromley's successful grant application to Historic England enabled conservation work on the South Terrace Steps to be carried out.

The Portfolio Holder expressed his gratitude to Lydia Lee, Community Development Manager and all Renewal and Regeneration Officers involved in pushing this project through and for the professional way in which the structure for management had been set up.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

## **55 TOWN CENTRES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME UPDATE**

### **Report DRR16/038**

Members received an update on progress made in delivering individual projects for the Town Centres Development Programme.

The Head of Renewal confirmed that despite the imminent change of the London Mayor, the current Mayor had made a delegated decision to designate Bromley Town Centre a Housing Zone. This would now be subject to ratification of relevant agreements between the Council and the GLA.

In order to provide wider frontage to the site, the red line boundary of the first phase redevelopment of Site G: West of the High Street, had been extended to include unit No. 102 High Street located adjacent to the Halifax Building Society. Members agreed that whilst the amendment to the red line boundary was a minor one, this matter should have initially been brought to PDS Members for scrutiny before being considered by the Executive. It was requested that this be done in future.

The site would formally go out to market in late April with formal selection of the Development Partner being concluded by November 2016.

Various updates on Site G would be reported throughout the year.

Referring to Bromley Central Area High Street Improvements, the Head of Renewal confirmed to Members that the detailed design project was on-going with anticipated completion by September 2016. Updates on this would be submitted to future meetings of the Committee when available. The Chairman requested that the Head of Renewal ensure that all future updating reports be submitted as agreed.

The reason for meeting with Kingston First was to look at their process for improvements/relocation and the possibility of applying such process to Bromley's scheme design which would be submitted for consideration by PDS Members in September.

In regard to the Beckenham Town Centre Improvements and the business case application submitted to Transport for London (TfL), it was reported that TfL had indicated the Council should be more ambitious. The Council's Business Officer would be meeting with TfL to discuss the case. Funding would be £4.6m in total with £1.3m provided from Bromley's Capital Funds and Section 106 monies. The remainder of around £3m would be provided by TfL.

The scheme would need to take account of the fact that Beckenham High Street had been designated as a Conservation Area.

Discussions with Network Rail about proposed improvements to Beckenham Junction Station were still on-going. Network Rail had informed the Council that the proposals were subject to the Hendy Review which was currently considering rail infrastructure upgrades. However, the Council's current budget was not dependent upon the contributions from Network Rail.

The Minutes of the Beckenham Town Centre Working Group held on 17 March 2016 were circulated to Members and a copy is attached as Appendix B to these Minutes.

A report on the completed design for College Square, Orpington, would be submitted for scrutiny at a future meeting of the PDS Committee. Designs for the proposed terrace alongside the new restaurant would be submitted to the July meeting of the PDS Committee.

It was reported that in addition to the proposals for improvements to Empire and Arpley Squares in Penge High Street, officers had engaged with stakeholders to look at possible improvements to key zones along the High Street.



Officers were currently working with traders on ways to improve shop fronts and signage.

A report on the full review of the Growth Projects in the Cray Corridor and Biggin Hill will be reported to a future meeting of the PDS Committee.

**RESOLVED that progress made on the delivery of the Town Centres Development Programme be noted.**

**56 CHAIRMAN'S ANNUAL REPORT 2015/16**

Members considered the Chairman's Annual Renewal and Recreation PDS Committee report for the year 2015/16. This was previously provided to the Executive and Resources PDS Committee on 16 March 2016 and would subsequently be considered at a meeting of Full Council on 11 April 2016.

The final sentence of paragraph 1.14 – Site C: Town Hall, was amended to read:- 'They aim to open the hotel and conference centre in the Spring of **2018**'.

**RESOLVED that the Chairman's Annual Renewal and Recreation PDS Committee report for the year 2015/16 be approved.**

**57 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) (VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000**

The Chairman moved that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the item of business listed below as it was likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.

**58 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE RENEWAL AND RECREATION PDS COMMITTEE HELD ON 26 JANUARY 2016**

**RESOLVED that the exempt Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.**

-----  
Any Other Business

As this was the final meeting of the Municipal Year, the Chairman thanked Members for their continued support and excellent scrutiny.

Officers were congratulated for all their hard work undertaken throughout the year and for their professionalism when dealing with contentious issues.

*Renewal and Recreation Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee  
6 April 2016*

Finally, the Chairman thanked the Democratic Services Officer for her continued support and provision of quality Minutes.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

Chairman

### **Item 11 – Town Centre management and Local parades Initiative Update March 2016**

#### **Comments received from Councillor Kathy Bance, Ward Member for Penge and Cator**

##### **‘Christmas Lights Policy**

Thank you for allowing our submission to be heard.

We are very grateful that we have been allowed to retain a TCM for this year but as the post holder is new to our High Street, it will take a little time for them to meet and engage in this work with our local businesses.

We Councillors are working with other local organisations to encourage all our local businesses to join our Traders Association and so overcome the reluctance amongst businesses to contribute to Christmas decorations and other Town Centre events. We have depended on a few very generous and supportive traders for too long.

We Councillors and our traders are very much committed to being a BID town; it is the future we want, so will support LBB and our TCM in doing our best to achieve a successful outcome. We have already requested a meeting with the TCM as have our traders and last night we put forward suggestions for our previous TCM to have a desk in the high street (shop front) so that she can continue working with the traders and us during the handover period.

This very short timeframe for the TCM change and BID process has caught us mid-stream in our own work plan so without LBB funding this year, December 2016, we will be unable to put Christmas lights on our High Street. We are not looking to stay dependent but we are very much working to become an independent BID town.

We ask for just a little more support in this journey.

Please support Option A:-

- a) Commission and fund lights in Beckenham and Penge, with some contributions from local businesses where possible (similar to the model for previous years). This would cost a minimum of £10k (possibly more as the existing lights for Penge are coming to the end of their useful life).

If you are not able to do so, would you please consider Option B so we can have some lights this year:-

- b) Make a modest contribution (up to £5k) to the funds raised locally by the business associations or town teams in Beckenham and Penge.’

This page is left intentionally blank

## APPENDIX B

### RENEWAL AND RECREATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

#### BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 17 March 2016

#### Present:

Councillor Michael Tickner (Chairman)

Councillor Sarah Phillips

Marsha Berg, (Beckenham Business Association)

Nick Goy, Beckenham Resident

Alan Old, (Copers Cope Area Residents Association)

Dr John Parker, (Beckenham Society)

Marie Pender, (West Beckenham Residents Association)

Janice Pilgrim, Kent Association for the Blind

Emma Rogers, (Central Beckenham Residents Association)

Chloe-Jane Ross, (Copers Cope Area Residents Association)

Cliff Watkins, (West Beckenham Residents Association)

David Wood, (Beckenham Civic Society)

Jackie Groundsell, (Chair, Beckenham Business Association)

Colin Hughes (Langley Park Residents' Association)

#### Also present:

Chris Cole, (LBB Environment & Community Services)

Martin Pinnell, (LBB Environment & Community Services)

Nick Goy, Beckenham Resident

Kevin Munnely, (LBB Head of Renewal)

Stephen Oliver, (LBB Project Planner)

Andre Masters, Artist/Sculptor

Dan Pearce, Artist

Gloria Brown, Beckenham Resident

Paul Brown, (Kelsey and Eden Park Conservatives)

Hannah Sierp, (Beckenham Resident)

Sue Woodward, (Beckenham Resident)

Stephen Wood, (LBB Committee Services)

Jean Appleton, Beckenham Resident

<b>36</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>
	Apologies were received from Cheryl Curr, Gail Low, Cllr Diane Smith, Cllr Russell Mellor, Dave Hignet from Network Rail, and Nina Peake from South Eastern Railways.

37	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10TH DECEMBER 2015.</b>
	The minutes of the meeting held on the 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2015 were agreed.
38	<b>SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS FROM THE MEETING ON 10TH DECEMBER 2015</b>
	<p>The Group noted the action points that had arisen from the previous meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that an email account had been set up to receive feedback concerning the sample paving that had been laid in the High Street near Kelsey Square. The associated plaque had not yet been laid. The email address was not available on the evening, and it was agreed that this be sent out with the minutes. It had previously been requested that a postal address be used for feedback as well as an email address, and this had been actioned.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note:</i></p> <p><i>The email address for comments about the paving samples is:</i></p> <p><a href="mailto:beckenhamimprovements@bromley.gov.uk">beckenhamimprovements@bromley.gov.uk</a></p> <p><i>The Postal Address is:</i></p> <p><i>Regeneration and Transformation, Strategy and Renewal, Room P49, London Borough of Bromley, Civic Centre, Stockwell Close, Bromley BR13UH.</i></p> <p>The Chairman enquired if up to date plans had been uploaded onto the Bromley website. Stephen Oliver (Project Planner) stated that the latest plans would be sent for uploading the day after the meeting if they met with the approval of the Group. It was explained that the process for doing this was not straightforward, and involved submitting a request to the LBB Web Team who worked part time; this meant that it could take another 2 weeks for the plans to be uploaded and appear on the Bromley website.</p> <p>It was noted that the plans could be uploaded immediately onto an external website which was <a href="http://beckenhamhighstreet.co.uk/">http://beckenhamhighstreet.co.uk/</a>. Chloe Jane Ross stated that the information could also be uploaded to the website of the Copers Cope Area Residents' Association--<a href="http://www.coperscope.org.uk/">http://www.coperscope.org.uk/</a> .</p> <p>The Group felt that there was a problem concerning the time taken to upload anything to the Bromley Council website. The Chairman and Cllr Sarah Phillips stated that this was an issue that could be raised as a question at the next Full Council meeting.</p>

A similar situation existed with an “Accident Map” that Chris Cole (Transport Programme and Major Projects Manager) was attempting to upload to the Bromley Council website—this had also been delayed.

The list of action points noted that an update concerning the Purple Flag status would be provided. It was also noted that an update concerning this would be provided later in the meeting as it was listed separately on the agenda. The Albemarle Road Junction action point would be dealt with under the “Traffic Update” item on the agenda.

The Group asked why there was no update provided concerning Article 4 Directions, and who the responsible officer was that had not provided the update. Kevin Munnely (Head of Renewal) stated that an Article 4 Direction may not be justified. Chloe Jane Ross referred to Article 4 Directions that had recently been obtained by Richmond Council, and noted that it did not appear to be cast in stone that Article 4’s were not retrospective. In Richmond, the Secretary of State intervened to make Richmond’s Article 4 retrospective, therefore LBB would need to lobby the Secretary of State to not make this intervention for Beckenham. The offices that had prior permission for conversion to residential (but had not converted) could be saved.

Marsha Berg noted that Kensington and Chelsea Council had recently put in place an Article 4 Direction that had been applied borough wide. The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea made an Article 4 Direction on 15 April 2015 to remove permitted development rights for basement extensions (the Article 4 Direction defines the rights that will be removed) to single dwelling houses across the Borough. The Council consulted on the Article 4 Direction between 24 April and 8 June 2015. The Article 4 Direction was confirmed by Key Decision on 2 March 2016 and would come into force on 28 April 2016. It will apply to the entire area of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

Marie Pender asked for confirmation to be provided from Mary Manuel (LBB Head of Planning Strategy), concerning the planning requirements that would currently need to be met when applications to convert from office to residential were being considered. She was of the view that LBB should adopt very strong planning policies for Beckenham to maintain the town as a business and commercial centre. She felt it was important that although permitted development rights may be agreed, other planning and building regulation standards for residential development should be rigorously enforced, for example, space standards and insulation standards. The Working Group asked for confirmation from Planning Policy that these standards will be enforced to high standards.

	<p>Mr Munnely reminded the Group that an Article 4 Directive would take a year to come into force. He stated that this was a phenomenon that was happening all over London, and that the Local Government Association were lobbying the Government for change, as was the London Mayor. David Wood asked if the fact that Beckenham was situated in a Conservation Area would make a difference. Mr Munnely responded that Article 4 sat outside Conservation Area regulations. He acknowledged that the new regulations permitting the conversion of offices into residential premises had caught many boroughs by surprise. It was a difficult situation, as there was a demand for both offices and residential premises.</p> <p>Chloe Jane Ross raised a matter concerning the signing off of building regulations when it was done by external parties where borderline/grey areas may be signed off contrary to Council preferred practice. She suggested that LBB may not have the requisite in-house expertise to sign off large office to residential conversions, and that these may be signed off by third parties and consequently could present a risk.</p> <p>Mr Munnely responded that the practice of using external contractors was not because the Council lacked expertise, but to encourage competition. It was the case that the same building regulations would apply in all cases.</p> <p>Mr Nick Goy asked the Chairman if he was concerned about the current permitted development rights in Beckenham. The Chairman responded that he was concerned, but that the current situation was bit like a double edged sword—there was a need for both houses and offices. Mr Goy asked if permitted development also applied to retail units. Mr Munnely answered that it did apply in a small number of limited circumstances, but that it was not across the board.</p> <p>It was noted at the meeting that not all of the offices in question in Beckenham had been vacant. It was the case that some businesses had been required to vacate.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED that an Article 4 update for Beckenham be provided to the Working Group with the minutes.</b></p>
39	<b>TRAFFIC UPDATE</b>
	<p>The Traffic Update was provided by Chris Cole.</p> <p>The initial part of the update related to parking schemes. The problems that had existed with the traffic signs in Fairfield Road had been rectified, and a missing sign had been ordered. Lawn Road had been closed on a temporary basis, but would now remain closed</p>



	<p>permanently to allow a new roundabout to work properly. There was a reference to the vacant pay and display bays in Copers Cope Road, and the Chairman expressed the view that these bays were too expensive. An additional sign had been ordered for Village Way.</p> <p>With respect to the Albemarle Road junction, it was still the case that no detailed design had been received from Virgin. Mr Cole explained that work on the junction could not commence until this issue had been resolved. The Chairman was of the view that LBB should seek legal remedy. He felt that it could not be the case that utilities could do what-ever they pleased. Mr Cole stated that LBB could not pursue a legal remedy. The cables were an asset that belonged to Virgin, and could not be moved without their permission. A date was required from Virgin so that work could be coordinated.</p> <p>A member of the public enquired what was planned for the junction. Mr Cole responded that the basic plan was to make it easier for HGV's to turn left, and that details were in the previous minutes. It was the case that Virgin were not co-operating, and that LBB were pursuing.</p> <p>Mr Cole next addressed the issue of the Waitrose car Park entrance road junction. The modelling report from Arcadis had been incorporated into the agenda at the request of the Chairman. Mr Cole clarified that that there would still be a need for a controlled crossing, even if a mini roundabout was used, therefore the modelling report was correct. The junction would not pass a safety audit without a controlled crossing due to traffic and pedestrian volumes. Ms Jean Appleton felt that a pedestrian crossing should be retained.</p> <p>The modelling report concluded that by converting the existing signalised junction to a mini roundabout, overall traffic queueing on each approach would increase. The report further outlined particular concerns regarding the restricted bridge width between the Waitrose Junction and the Albemarle Road-High Street Junction, which was predicted to consistently fill up on Southend Road northbound during peak hours.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED that the Traffic Update and the Modelling Report from Arcadis be noted and a line drawn under the proposals.</b></p>
40	<b>DAVID BOWIE MEMORIAL</b>
	<p>For the David Bowie memorial update two local artists and a sculptor attended.</p> <p>Andre Masters (trading as "All Handmade") attended to offer his advice with respect to designing a David Bowie memorial. He was able to offer a design using a variety of mediums, including</p>

sculpture, illustration and design, 3D modelling and printing and computer graphics. His website is:

<http://www.andremasters.co.uk/index.htm>

Dan Pearce (a local artist) also attended to offer his services; this would be likely to take the form of a wall mural.

<http://www.danpearce.com/>

The Group were informed that Beckenham Society were organising a David Bowie evening on April 19<sup>th</sup>. This was going to be held at Zizzi's in Beckenham High Street at 7.30pm. The cost of this was £25.00 per ticket, and included a meal and one drink. It was also noted that Mary Finnegan (former landlady and lover) would be attending. Posters would be displayed in a variety of locations, including the Beckenham Bookshop, where tickets were on sale.

The Chairman opened the meeting for members and guests to express any views or ideas that could be progressed with respect to a memorial for David Bowie. Mr Masters stated that David Bowie was a star, a world icon, and that it would be good to have a memorial in Beckenham as a tribute to his creative time here. It would also help with regenerating the local area and economy. The Chairman asked Mr Masters if he was able to put forward ideas, designs and an estimate of costs. Mr Masters replied that this was variable, depending on what was required. It was also important to consider private sources of funding as well as public sources of funding.

The Chairman declared that LBB were keen to develop and progress with a memorial, as this would also be good for business in Beckenham. Mr Masters stated that it was difficult to define costs at this stage, but gave an estimate for a statue between £20k and £150k.

Mr Munnely stated that the memorial did not have to take the form of a traditional vertical statue. Mr Masters explained that the memorial could take the form of a memorial in the floor, and that it could take the form of stylised artwork rather than traditional sculpture.

Nick Goy commented that he had not realised that David Bowie was ill, and questioned whether or not Mr Bowie would have wanted a shrine, as he did not want a public funeral.

Councillor Sarah Phillips provided the Working Group with some history of the local bandstand that had previously been used by David Bowie, and was keen to renovate the bandstand in some way as a memorial. Mr Goy expressed concerns around this in terms of

ongoing maintenance costs. Mr Masters suggested that a theme be developed to celebrate his life, with the possible development of the theme of “Star Man” in the sky.

Dan Pearce suggested that a large mural be painted on the side of a building. A sample design was passed around the Group.

A member suggested that Kelsey Square should be renamed “Bowie Place”, and another that “Shannon Way” should also be renamed as that was where his former home had stood.

Councillor Phillips stated that she was also the Treasurer of The Friends of Croydon Road Recreation Ground, and that their remit was focused on the park. She was keen to refurbish the bandstand, as this was well overdue. She mentioned that Bowie had previously used the bandstand during the Beckenham Arts Lab Growth Summer Festival in 1969. He performed on the bandstand at the free festival, wrote a song about that festival which ended up on his “Space Oddity” album, and wrote “Life on Mars” on the steps.

She mentioned that The Friends of Croydon Road Recreation Ground had some money, but this was limited. They had applied for Heritage Lottery Funding, but the application had failed. They had raised £20k to date, and appeals for further restorative funding were ongoing. Further details could be found on their website at: <http://becrec.net/>

Ms Appleton wondered if a revised application for Heritage Lottery Funding would be successful. Hannah Sierp responded to this by stating that it would probably be worth reapplying, and to follow the guidance that was given on the previous application that had been rejected. She also expressed her enthusiasm for a David Bowie mural that would be positive and colourful, possibly based on a “Space Oddity” theme. The cost of this was estimated to be in the region of £2K to £3k. Some members of the working party thought that this was a bargain, and that work should commence as soon as possible.

Stephen Oliver suggested that in the region of Kelsey Square, Bowie themed coloured lights could be installed into footways, which would be particularly effective at night.

Chloe-Jane Ross advised that the Town Centre Team (TCT) Alleyway Project nearing completion could not host a Bowie Mural. She advised that a Bowie mural had been considered by the TCT, and they came to the conclusion that installing in an alleyway would not be appropriate. Further, she advised that the most suitable places in the High Street were the Lidl forecourt, Sainsbury’s forecourt and outside Zizzi’s.

	<p>The Chairman concluded the David Bowie item, by requesting that any suggestions for the nature of the memorial, murals, locations and name changes etc., be submitted to the Committee Clerk via email, and these would be considered at the next meeting. Once decisions had been made, the matter of funding could be investigated.</p> <p>Chloe-Jane Ross offered TCT support in meeting with Andre and Dan to look at suitable sites for the Bowie Memorial.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Andre and Dan for attending the meeting, and for sharing their suggestions with the Group.</p>
<p><b>41</b></p>	<p><b>MAJOR SCHEME UPDATE</b></p>
	<p>The Major Scheme Update was provided by Mr Stephen Oliver.</p> <p>The Chairman enquired if Julian East from East Architects would be attending. Mr Oliver responded that it was more cost effective in this case if he presented. It was confirmed that the budget for the major scheme was now £4.6m, and that the funding for this was going to be provided by LBB and the Mayor for London. Final approval from TfL was awaiting, but it was not anticipated that there would be any problems with this.</p> <p>Mr Oliver distributed A3 colour copies of plans. The Group noted the plans showed a long timber bench seating and a monolith that would be located outside Beckenham Junction Station. There would also be “Legible London” signage. It was suggested that it would be good to have a proper fixed base for the flower stall to operate from.</p> <p>Mr Oliver outlined the plans for the area around Beckenham Green and the Train Station. It was noted that some of the existing signage would be retained, and that new Sheffield type stainless steel cycle stands would be installed. There would be new pedestrian islands and new carriageway surface material would be set flush at crossing points, and 60mm below kerb level elsewhere. The existing planters would be removed and replaced with new brick and precast concrete planter seats. There would be new surface treatment and facilities provided to facilitate market stalls. New tree lights would be provided and new power bollards for the market would be installed. The Purple Flag would be displayed on a pole. The Chairman hoped that there would be three flagpoles that would be illuminated. Mr Goy stated that he was not impressed with the designs for the new planters or the cycle stands.</p> <p>Reference was made to the possibility of coloured lights being embedded into pavements to enhance the experience of people using the area. Janice Pilgrim made the point that people with sight impairment would struggle greatly with these, as they would</p>

	<p>exacerbate the depth perception difficulties that people with sight impairment have when mobilising in poor daylight conditions. They may also make the pavement look as though it were moving, and would be hazardous.</p> <p>When brindled paving was being discussed, Janice Pilgrim (Kent Association for the Blind) raised the point that highly contrasting colours of mottled paving mixed together, such as dark blue/black, cream and red, could be extremely hazardous for sight impaired people as, it was difficult to tell whether there was just a change in colour or also a change in level.</p> <p>The Group heard that in the vicinity of the Odeon Cinema there would be a new paved area of granite and new bound or bonded gravel paving. There would also be an “O” shaped bench in the cinema grounds. It was noted that the Post Office lease was ending, and it was likely that the current post office would close, and counter services would move into nearby retail units.</p> <p>Reference was made to the possibility of coloured lights being embedded into pavements to enhance the experience of people using the area. Janice Pilgrim made the point that people with sight impairment would struggle greatly with these, as they would exacerbate the depth perception difficulties that people with sight impairment have when mobilising in poor daylight conditions. They may also make the pavement look as though it were moving, and would be hazardous. Mr Munnelly stated that the feedback on the lanterns was noted, and that revised ideas would be circulated in due course.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED that the feedback provided by the Group concerning street lighting be noted, and that revised ideas be presented at the next meeting.</b></p>
<b>42</b>	<b>TOWN TEAM UPDATE AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS GOING FORWARD</b>
	No update was provided at the meeting as there was insufficient time.
<b>43</b>	<b>PURPLE FLAG AWARD</b>
	The Group noted the update that had been incorporated as an agenda item. However, no further discussion concerning the Purple Flag award took place due to insufficient time.
<b>44</b>	<b>BECKENHAM JUNCTION STATION UPDATE</b>
	The Beckenham Junction Station update was deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time.

<b>45</b>	<b>ARTICLE 4 UPDATE</b>
	<p>A discussion of this issue had taken place under the agenda item concerning Action Points.</p> <p>It had been noted that an Article 4 update had not been provided for the meeting, but it had been agreed that an update be circulated with the minutes.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED that an Article 4 update be circulated with the minutes.</b></p>
<b>46</b>	<b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS-PREVIOUSLY NOTIFIED</b>
	<p>No other business was discussed.</p>
<b>47</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>
	<p>The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> May 2016 at 7.30pm.</p>

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm