

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

BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE WORKING GROUP

Meeting to be held at **7.30 pm** on **Thursday 2 July 2015** at
Beckenham Library, Beckenham, BR3 4PE*

***PLEASE NOTE STARTING TIME**

AGENDA

- 1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11TH DECEMBER 2014 (5 MINS)
(CHAIRMAN) (Pages 1 - 8)**
- 3 OUTCOME OF THE TRAFFIC MODELLING IN SUPPORT OF MAJOR SCHEME (5
MINS) (CHRIS COLE) (Pages 9 - 10)**
- 4 UPDATE ON HIGH STREET/RECTORY ROAD JUNCTION REALIGNMENT (5
MINS) CHRIS COLE) (Pages 11 - 12)**
- 5 CONFIRMATION OF BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE CONSERVATION AREA AND
NEXT STAGE--VERBAL UPDATE**
- 6 TOWN TEAM UPDATE (5 MINS) (CHLOE-JANE ROSS)**
- 7 MAJOR SCHEME CONSULTATION RESULTS AND NEXT STEPS (JULIAN LEWIS,
EAST ARCHITECTURE) (Pages 13 - 18)**
- 8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS--PREVIOUSLY NOTIFIED**
- 9 DATE OF NEXT MEETING TO BE AGREED**

Contact Officer:

Stephen Wood

LBB Democratic Services Manager

25 June 2015

0208 313 4316

stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

This page is left intentionally blank

RENEWAL AND RECREATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 11 December 2014

Present:

Councillor Michael Tickner (Chairman)
Councillor Ian Dunn
Nick Goy, (West Beckenham Residents Association)
Jackie Groundsell, (Beckenham Business Association)
Maggie Hopgood, (Beckenham Resident)
Gail Law, (The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association)
Julian Lewis, (East)
Ian Muir, (Eden Park Residents Association)
Pam Notcutt, (Beckenham Society)
Marie Pender, (West Beckenham Residents Association)
Janice Pilgrim, (Kent Association for the Blind)
Chloe-Jane Ross, (Copers Cope Area Residents Association)
Terry Stanley, (Beckenham Resident)
David Wood, (Beckenham Civic Society)

Stephen Wood (LBB Democratic Services)

Also present:

Robert Buckley, (LBB Regeneration & Transformation Service)
Chris Cole, (LBB Environment & Community Services)
Cheryl Curr, (LBB Environment & Community Services)
Ayesha Malik, (LBB Regeneration & Transformation Service)
Kevin Munnely, (LBB Regeneration & Transformation Service)

10	WELCOME AND APOLOGIES
	Apologies were received from Councillors Vanessa Allen, Russell Mellor and Sarah Philips. Apologies were also received from Mr Cliff Watkins. Cheryl Curr notified in advance that she would be arriving late owing to other commitments. It was also noted that this would be the last meeting that Ayesha Malik (LBB Regeneration and Transformation Service) would be attending as she was shortly to take up alternative employment. The Chairman expressed his thanks to Ayesha for her valued contribution to the Working Group.
11	MINUTES OF MEETING ON 6TH NOVEMBER 2014 AND MATTERS ARISING
	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed with minor

	corrections.
12	PROPOSED BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE CONSERVATION AREA
	<p>Mr Robert Buckley (LBB-Regeneration and Transformation) appeared before the Working Group to provide an update on the proposed Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area Summary, and to answer any questions.</p> <p>The Group heard that a consultation had been undertaken, regarding proposals for a conservation area in Beckenham. The response to this was generally positive; 77% of respondents stated that they either agreed or strongly agreed with the concept.</p> <p>It was noted that no formal response had been received from the Beckenham Society, and that the Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas welcomed the proposals. English Heritage was also supportive of the Conservation Area proposals. Both English Heritage and The Advisory Panel were of the opinion that Manor Road should be excluded from the Town Centre Conservation Area scheme.</p> <p>The Chairman queried what would happen next, and asked the Group for feedback on their views concerning Beckenham Junction Station being included in the Conservation Area proposals. The Working Group agreed that Beckenham Junction Station should be incorporated in the conservation area proposals.</p> <p>The proposals would be brought to the Development Control Committee in 2015, where they would be updated with the details of the consultation. If the DC Committee approved the proposals, then the details would be passed to local residents, and LBB would have to deal with any subsequent objections.</p> <p>The Group concluded discussion on this matter by agreeing to move forward with existing plans, thus avoiding any further delay.</p> <p>A report will go for decision to the Council's Development Control Committee by the end of February 2015.</p>
13	UPDATE ON HIGH STREET/RECTORY ROAD JUNCTION REALIGNMENT
	<p>The update was provided by Chris Cole (LBB-Environment and Community Services). Previous delays had been caused by BT, but the good news was that BT had now confirmed a date of January 2015 to commence the work concerning the essential relocation of cables. It was anticipated that this work would take eight weeks, and that there would be no loss of broadband services to local residents.</p>

	<p>After this, LBB's Civil works could commence.</p> <p>It transpired that LBB had made progress on this issue after the matter was raised with TfL. It was not possible for any sanctions to be made against BT for delay, as the cables were their asset. LBB had programmed in engineering works, based on the estimated completion time provided by BT. It was therefore anticipated that the project would be completed around April/May 2015.</p>
14	TOWN TEAM UPDATE
	<p>The Town Team Update was presented by the Team's Chairman, Chloe Jane Ross.</p> <p>The London Mayor's High Street Fund had recently been created to release £9m towards the regeneration of town centres. Small businesses and community groups on London's High Streets had been encouraged to apply for funding to help revitalise and potentially change the way High Streets appear, and were used.</p> <p>The Regeneration Team were looking to use the new funding to support ideas that went beyond 'business as usual' activities. They were keen for small businesses to take a leading role in bidding for grants to boost their local town centres. Grants could be used to smarten up shop fronts, improve public spaces or to hold mini festivals but the aim would be for firms and community groups to be at the heart of that funding.</p> <p>The Town Centre Team had applied for funding in respect of a project called "do up our alley" for various minor works/improvements to the town centre. The application was currently being assessed, and the Group would be updated in due course.</p>
15	EAST KEY STAGE REPORT PRESENTATION
	<p>The East Key Stage Report Presentation was given by Mr Julian Lewis from East Architecture.</p> <p>A brief overview of the presentation was provided to set the direction for the meeting; this consisted of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recap of the Scheme Objectives 2. Latest Plan Overview 3. Project Elements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key spaces treatments

- Footway/Pavement treatments
- Parking Spaces and Loading Bays
- Lighting
- Materials
- Furniture
- Alleyways

4. Next stage of the Design Process

Recap on Scheme Objectives:

The recap on the scheme objectives was sub divided into seven areas:

- Removing or reducing the level of HGV usage in the High Street. The Group had agreed that the Albemarle Junction should be redesigned.
- Improving the pedestrian experience of the High Street, with enhanced crossings and wider pavements. The Group commented that it should be borne in mind that room was still required for traffic. The plans would endeavour to create more space, improve the local economy, and the social aspect of the area.
- The improvement of parking and loading provision for visitors and businesses
- Improving the opportunities for regular street markets. The Group noted that Beckenham Green was commonly used for markets, and thought that more consideration should be given to see what could be provided in the High Street
- Improving the quality of the public realm, incorporating coordinated and harmonious design, reduction of street clutter, and the increased use of soft landscaping.
- Improving traffic flow at major interchanges, especially during rush hour
- The Working Group were in agreement that enhancing the public realm and pedestrian accessibility at the War Memorial was important, and that this was a good objective.

Latest Plan Overview:

The Working Group were informed that the Beckenham High Street Overview plans were supported by Urban Design London, and that the plans were currently at stage "C". The next stage would be for

the plans to be submitted to LBB Planning Department. East Architects were confident that a well-defined plan would be submitted.

Project Elements:

Key Space at Beckenham Junction Station and Albemarle Rd – High Street Traffic Lights

One of the project elements being considered was a key space at Beckenham Junction Station which could incorporate a flower kiosk. Public Realm improvements at Beckenham Green would support events and social activity. Regarding the space between High Street and at Beckenham Green, the intention was to keep the trees, and to try and make the shops feel close to the Green; kerb alignments would change.

Canopy at Beckenham Green

The Working Group discussed the option for a canopy at Beckenham Green. It was suggested that a stage canopy be constructed using permanent columns, and demountable canopy material; the guys would be roped like a circus tent. It was suggested that when only the columns were visible, they would blend in with the trees. Some of the Group members expressed concern about possible traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Green, and debated if one or two road carriageways should be used. Chris Cole (LBB) stated that modelling would be undertaken to find the best plan, and that then the results of the modelling could be fed back to the Group.

It was noted that the canopy was still at a design stage, and that then precise technical details had yet to be confirmed. Some members of the Group expressed concerns with storage, and with mounting and demounting the canopy, and thought that it may be better to go for a permanent option.

Key Space at Thornton's Corner.

The Group discussed proposals concerning the Key Space at Thornton's Corner. Members expressed concern that there were parts of the High Street in this area that were difficult to cross, and that there was a disjointed feel to the buildings and alignment of the roads. Members felt that wider footways may be required, along with proper kerbing to help protect properties when occasional flooding occurs from the River Beck. The Chairman suggested the possible use of a mini roundabout.

Members of the Group were shown a photograph depicting what was termed an "example of how improving relationships between

carriageway and footway can enhance quality and atmosphere of space". A lively debate ensued concerning the issue of using kerbs, as opposed to utilising roads/pavements at the same level, but made of different materials. There seemed to be a lack of agreement concerning this matter.

East and some of the Working Group were comfortable with using same level pavements and road surfaces. They adopted the view that same level surfaces were being used widely anyway, and that it created a better town centre atmosphere.

Others in the Group expressed the opinion that standard kerbs and "crossover" ramps were required as these would be better for safety reasons. Some members of the Group expressed road safety concerns in that drivers may be tempted to cut corners in a way that they would not be able to do if proper kerbs were used. The representatives from Guide Dogs for the Blind, and from the Kent Association for the Blind expressed concern that blind people would not be able to differentiate between the road and the pavement where there was no kerb.

Key Space at Kelsey Square

Members of the Working Group proceeded to discuss the possibility of a new key space at Bromley Road. Suggestions made were to widen footways, improve current crossings, make a new crossing, and to remove guardrails. East Architects proposed a new southern pedestrian crossing. The Working Group were updated concerning proposals for Kelsey Square with additional seating, and materials reflecting the old red brick buildings—there would also be special lighting. The main concern revisited by members of the Working Group was possible confusion over the pavement and roadway where there was a flat surface with no raised kerb. A diagram and a photograph were displayed to demonstrate how the footways and roadways around Kelsey Square could become better connected with a uniform surface, and the use of high quality materials.

Key Space at St George's Church – High St/Bromley Road

Suggestions made were to widen footways, improve current crossings, make a new crossing, and to remove guardrails. East Architects proposed a new southern pedestrian crossing.

Proposed options for improving the War Memorial Roundabout and associated area

There were three options proposed by East Architects for traffic model testing:

- **Option 1**--wider footway at cinema side, wider crossing

	<p>points, enhanced crossing east to west through roundabout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 2--wider footways at all sides, especially at post office, wider crossing points, smaller roundabout • Option 3—much wider footways at all sides for shoppers and visitors. Traffic light junction. <p>The Working Group were largely opposed to option 3, as it was felt that this would create traffic jams. Chris Cole informed the Group that TfL still wanted this model to be tested. TfL could give consideration to pass models as long as traffic along the strategic route network was not made worse.</p> <p>The Chairman requested a show of hands concerning the War Memorial proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 members preferred option 1 • 8 members preferred option 2 • 0 votes for option 3 • 4 votes to leave things as they were <p>Photographs were shown to illustrate that existing footways in Beckenham High Street were too narrow; some felt that this created a feeling of clutter in the High Street. Other photographs were shown to the Working Group to provide examples of how new wider footways, with parking and loading incorporated into the footway could help improve access, capacity and the quality of the public environment.</p> <p>Some members of the Working Group responded to these photographs by stating that they still had reservations concerning public safety; there were issues around a seemingly confused layout, issues with who had right of way in different scenarios, and the problems caused by Utilities digging up surfaces and relaying them in a different manner. Chris Cole stated that such schemes were being used all over London, and were subject to Safety Audits.</p> <p>East appraised the Group regarding new footways and layby surfaces and informed that more parking spaces and loading bays were planned. A member of the Group asked if local traders would be consulted.</p> <p>East referenced the different types of lighting that could be utilised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lighting on columns • lighting fixed to buildings • park lighting (Victorian Style). • special lighting at passageways and yards
--	--

	<p>East referenced the different types of seating that could be utilised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • informal seating • park benches • special perch seating • special seating <p>East then updated members of the Working Group with details concerning proposed new cycle parking and signage.</p>
16	AOB--PREVIOUSLY NOTIFIED.
	No further business was discussed.
17	DATE OF NEXT MEETING TO BE AGREED
	<p>The date of the next meeting was to be confirmed.</p> <p>The Meeting ended at 9.30pm and was followed by the Chairman's Christmas Reception.</p>

Beckenham Town Centre Major Scheme Report on Traffic Modelling

The London Borough of Bromley (LBB) commissioned Hyder Consulting to undertake traffic modelling of Beckenham Town Centre in order to test proposed carriageway alignment options previously developed by East Architects. Specifically, the modelling assesses the impact of the options along the three signalised junctions of High Street and options at the War Memorial roundabout.

To assess the proposed options, the first step was to develop base traffic models for the road network affected by the proposals. To ensure the validity of the base modelling, TfL undertook independent audits on the models. Once this approval process was complete the base modelling could be completed and subsequently taken forward to test the proposals.

Base modelling Results

The base modelling, which was backed up by on-site observations, concluded that the majority of the junctions operated under capacity although the High Street/Rectory Road junction was identified as the pinchpoint, where more than one approach operates close to capacity during each of the peaks.

LBB is content, therefore, that the base modelling replicates the normal traffic and congestion.

Modelling Results – High Street Options

The proposed options along the High Street include at-grade pedestrian crossings including other pedestrian crossing improvements, junction footprint reductions and carriageway width reductions. These are the options shown in the consultation documents.

The traffic modelling shows an increase in delay of less than a minute in each direction along the High Street caused by these improvements.

Given that the aim of the project is to improve the shopping environment, and that relatively few vehicles traverse the full length of the High Street, LBB is content that the additional delay caused by the proposals is within acceptable limits. From a traffic point of view, therefore, there are no objections raised to the proposals. The modelling will need to be undertaken with the final proposals for TfL's approval, but unless there are significant alterations to the design, the modelling results shouldn't noticeably change.

Modelling Results – War Memorial Roundabout Options

Three options have been developed by East Architects at the War Memorial roundabout.

- Option 1 reduces the size of the central island, allowing the kerb to be built out between the northwest and north eastern approaches. Zebra crossings are retained on all four arms.

- Option 2 involves maintaining the existing traffic island but with a raised table structure along the eastern side to encourage pedestrian access to the central island and memorial. Zebra crossings are retained on all four arms with an additional pedestrian crossing allowing access to the central island from the western footway.
- Option 3 converts the roundabout to a signalised crossroads junction.

The traffic modelling has showed that all of the proposed options create significant additional traffic delay. Option 1 experiences an increase in journey time of a minute along Rectory Lane Southbound. Option 2 experiences an increase in journey time of nearly 3 minutes along Rectory Lane Southbound. For Option 3 the modelling showed the design would operate well over capacity resulting in huge queues developing during the peak periods.

Given the volumes of traffic using Rectory Road/the roundabout, it is felt that this level of delay would be unacceptable and lead to rat-running along the High Street. LBB does not, therefore, recommend that any of these options are taken forward from a traffic perspective. This does not, however, preclude aesthetic improvements being made to the roundabout/public realm in the vicinity of the roundabout.

Junction Improvement: Beckenham High Street / Rectory Road / Albemarle Road.

All of the diversion works for both BT and UK Power were completed last month. Detailed design for the new road and signal layout is now complete.

All the necessary documentation has now been submitted to Transport for London as regards to the Network Assurance approval. As this part of the road network is strategic, this specific process is mandatory for LBB.

Documents submitted being –

- Existing and proposed layout drawings
- Accident data
- Traffic surveys/data
- Traffic/transport modelling
- Traffic Signal Supplementary Report (TSSR) which is required for all proposals involving traffic signals (see Section 7)
- Traffic Impact Assessment or summary
- Road Safety Audit
- Supporting information including a summary of stakeholder comments, relevant correspondence and reports

Due to the current work being undertaken for improvements area wide for the High Street there are various options as regards the next steps for this junction.

1. Implement all the works now: Then when all the materials have been decided for the High Street along with the nature of the new design - clear the site again and re-build in line with the rest of the High Street. There are serious cost and PR consequences to this of course, along with repeat disruption to road users and nearby retail units.

2. Seek agreement with TfL to implement part of the works now and use temporary footway materials in order to achieve most of the junction improvements.

- Being a wider carriageway in the High Street (Southend Road side)
- Improved left turning space for larger vehicles from Rectory Road.

3. Do nothing now, upgrade the junction as phase one of the new High Street plan with all the new agreed materials.

Malcom Harris
Team Leader : Traffic Engineering

This page is left intentionally blank

BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE

Summary of findings from consultation on concept designs

Section 1 – Introduction

This note highlights the main findings from the recent consultation exercise run by Bromley Council in order to seek views on the concept designs for the Beckenham town centre public realm scheme. The consultation was held over the four week period from 2 to 27 March 2015. The consultation focused on the RIBA Stage 2 concept designs prepared by East Architects.

The remainder of the note is structured as follows:

- **Section 2** – summarises the **main objectives and key audiences** for the consultation exercise;
- **Section 3** – outlines the **consultation activities and events** that took place during the consultation period;
- **Section 4** – explains **how the Council has recorded feedback** from residents and key stakeholders during the consultation exercise;
- **Section 5** – highlights the **key findings** from the consultation exercise;
- **Section 6** – identifies the **main implications for the concept designs**; and
- **Section 7** – makes recommendations for the **dissemination of the key findings**.

The note includes the following appendices:

- **Appendix A** – Concept plans used for the public exhibition boards; and
- **Appendix B** – Consultation feedback form.

Section 2 – Consultation objectives and key audiences

The main objectives for this consultation exercise were as follows:

1. To remind people of the overall scheme objectives and reinforce the shared ambition to deliver something very special in Beckenham town centre;
2. To explain the key elements of the concept design for the Beckenham town centre public realm scheme, including the provisional traffic modelling results;
3. To show what can be delivered given the funding that we currently have available for the scheme;
4. To show what could be achieved if we were able to secure additional funding for Beckenham;
5. To gather views and priorities from the local communities which will enable us to finalise the concept designs before moving to the next stage of design development; and
6. To explain what happens next and the overall timetable for delivering the improvements to the public realm in Beckenham town centre.

Key audiences

The consultation exercise was aimed at the following key audiences:

- Ward Councillors and other key elected Members;
- Businesses in Beckenham, especially those with a frontage on the High Street;
- Beckenham Town Team;
- Resident associations;
- Members of the public; and
- Transport for London as the key funding partner.

Promotion of the consultation exercise

The consultation exercise was promoted in the following ways:

- Bromley Council news releases issued in advance of and during the consultation exercise;
- Bromley Council website;
- Updates on social media;
- Letter circulated by e-mail to Beckenham businesses and other stakeholders;
- Leaflets which were hand delivered to all businesses on Beckenham High Street; and
- Leaflets which were hand delivered to all residential streets adjoining the High Street.

Although the consultation exercise was widely promoted in advance of the main activities taking place, we did receive some comments from residents who felt that they had not been given sufficient notice of the public exhibition in particular.

Section 3 – Consultation activities and events

The consultation exercise included the following activities and events:

- **Public exhibition** – we held a public exhibition of the concept designs at Citygate Church from 11:30 am to 8 pm on Thursday, 12 March 2015. The exhibition was manned by staff from East Architects and from Bromley Council. There were a total of 128 visitors throughout the day, with many people staying for considerable periods of time to scrutinise the plans in detail and to discuss their views with staff;
- **Copers Cope Area Residents' Association AGM** – East Architects and Bromley Council attended the Copers Cope Area Residents' Association AGM on 18 March 2015. The audience of 75 people heard a presentation on the concept designs followed by a lively question and answer session; and
- **Beckenham Business Association** – East Architects and Bromley Council presented the concept plans to Beckenham Business Association meeting on 25 March 2015. The attendance was relatively light with only nine local businesses at the meeting. Even so, the discussion which followed the presentation generated some very valuable feedback.

Section 4 – Recording feedback

The consultation exercise generated a rich range of valuable feedback on the concept plans for Beckenham High Street. We have recorded feedback received in the following ways:

- **Conversations at consultation events** – we have reflected the views expressed during conversations and the formal question and answer sessions at the main consultation events;
- **Feedback forms** – we have captured the views expressed in a total of 32 feedback forms submitted by hand, by post and online; and
- **E-mail feedback** – we have also reflected the views expressed in 51 e-mails sent to the beckenhamimprovements@bromley.gov.uk mailbox that was created for the consultation exercise.

Section 5 – Key findings

What people like most about the plans

The overriding view emerging from the consultation exercise was that there is clearly a very strong groundswell of opinion which welcomes the concept plans for Beckenham High Street. Consultees welcomed the aspiration to create something very special for Beckenham, recognising that the time has now come for significant investment in the town centre.

The consultation feedback form asked respondents “what do you like most about the concept plans for Beckenham town centre?” The following aspects of the proposals were identified by respondents as being the things which they like most about the concept plans:

- The proposals for the **Albemarle Road/High Street junction and the related plans for Beckenham Green**. Many people like the idea of opening up Beckenham Green to the High Street, although some respondents noted that this would remove an effective screen to traffic noise and make the boundary of the Green less secure for young children;
- The prospect of **fewer heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) using the High Street** as a result of the Albemarle Road/High Street junction improvements. However, some residents of Rectory Road raised concerns about the extra HGV movements that would affect their homes if HGV traffic were diverted away from the High Street;
- **Feature lighting** – the proposals for enhanced lighting throughout the High Street and feature lighting in special places were strongly welcomed;
- **Enhanced pedestrian experience** – many people felt that the concept plans would enhance the experience of pedestrians and shoppers using Beckenham High Street;
- The proposals for **wider pavements** where possible without snarling up traffic were seen as being a key factor in enhancing the pedestrian experience on the High Street;
- The aspirations to **de-clutter the High Street** and to provide **a coherent, high quality public realm** with well-chosen and carefully positioned street furniture were both very well-liked by respondents. There was a clear feeling that the plans would make the High Street more “user friendly” than at present;
- **Safer crossings** – many people recognised the benefits of enhanced crossing points for the High Street, both on the southern side of the Bromley Road junction and elsewhere along the High Street; and

- **War Memorial junction** – there was a clear feeling that investment is needed at the War Memorial junction which is generally seen to be a rundown gateway to Beckenham High Street. Most people welcomed the working assumption in the concept plans that the War Memorial will not be moved from its current location.

What people do not like about the plans

The consultation feedback form asked respondents “is there anything that you do not like about the concept plans?” The following aspects of the proposals were identified by respondents as being the things which they do not like about the concept plans:

- **Pedestrian access to the War Memorial roundabout** – there was widespread scepticism about the aspiration to provide a surface treatment which would encourage pedestrians to access the War Memorial roundabout. There were concerns in equal measure about the danger to pedestrians and the likely congestion for traffic if people were crossing the carriageway onto the roundabout. There was also a strong feeling that any attempt to widen the footway in front of the Odeon Cinema would not leave sufficient room for two lanes of traffic on that side of the roundabout;
- **Lighting in Beckenham Green** – there was a strong feeling that the existing traditional street lanterns in Beckenham Green should not be replaced with a more contemporary design as they currently contribute to the historic character of this part of the town centre;
- **Beckenham Green boundary with the High Street** – there were some concerns about safety for young children and increased traffic noise for users if the western edge of Beckenham Green were to be made more permeable with the High Street;
- **Cycling provision** – some people felt that the concept plans are “too car-centric” and a number of respondents expressed disappointment that the proposals do not include more dedicated provision for cyclists, including dedicated cycle lanes and enhanced cycle parking; and
- **Shared space pedestrian areas** – there were concerns expressed about the potential for conflict between pedestrians and motorists in shared space areas such as the proposed loading bays at selected points on the High Street footway.

Key priorities for investment

The consultation materials made it clear that there may not be sufficient funding available to deliver the full design intent for Beckenham High Street. With this constraint in mind, the consultation feedback form asked respondents “what are your key priorities for Beckenham town centre?” Table 1 below summarises the main findings.

Table 1 – Priorities for Beckenham town centre

Scheme area	Top priority	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority
Beckenham Junction and Green	59.3%	25.9%	11.1%	3.7%
Bromley Road junction	15.4%	30.8%	38.5%	15.4%
Thornton's Corner	11.1%	18.5%	44.4%	25.9%
Kelsey Square	3.7%	22.2%	51.9%	22.2%
War Memorial junction	38.5%	42.3%	0%	19.2%
Lighting	33.3%	29.6%	14.8%	22.2%
Street furniture and signage	11.1%	25.9%	44.4%	18.5%
Parking and loading bays	22.2%	22.2%	25.9%	29.6%

The results shown in Table 1 are based on a total sample size of 27 people who completed this question in the consultation feedback form. Given the relatively small sample size, some caution is necessary when interpreting these results.

Notwithstanding this caveat, Table 1 reveals that the two areas given the highest priority for investment are as follows:

- **Beckenham Junction and Beckenham Green** – 85.2% of respondents see this area as being either a top priority or a high priority for the town centre; and
- **War Memorial Junction** – 80.8% of respondents see this area as being either a top priority or a high priority for the town centre.

Of the thematic elements of the scheme identified by the consultation materials, the proposed lighting improvements were seen as the most important, with 62.9% of respondents identifying lighting as either a top priority or a high priority for the town centre.

The proposed treatment of parking and loading bays on the High Street provoked the most divided opinion of all the potential priorities for investment. For this element of the concept plans there was an even distribution of responses from top priority through to low priority.

Other comments and observations

The consultation exercise also generated the following comments, observations and questions on the concept plans for Beckenham High Street:

- How will the aspiration to reduce HGV movements on the High Street be realised in practice? Many people found it difficult to make the link between the Albemarle Road/High Street junction improvements and HGV movements along the High Street;
- What about an additional diagonal pedestrian crossing from Beckenham Junction station to Beckenham Green?
- There is a need to maintain the space for six parking bays at the train station outside Regency Cars. The representatives from Regency Cars who attended the public exhibition were not at all convinced about the proposals for a shared space approach to the new parking bays;
- There is also a need to tackle the poor quality of the shop fascia signage along the High Street. This concern was raised by a number of respondents;
- The War Memorial should be left where it currently resides in the roundabout;
- There is a need to ensure the correct phasing of traffic lights on the High Street to facilitate optimum traffic flows and maintain safety for pedestrians;
- There was a strong feeling that more trees should be planted along the High Street and at the War Memorial junction;
- What will the Council do to ensure that the disruption to local businesses is kept to a minimum during the construction of the scheme;
- How will independent, local businesses survive if the improvements drive up rents; and
- For new paving, careful thought should be given to the choice of material to ensure that the new surface opens up the look and feel of the High Street as much as possible.

Section 6 – Implications for the concept designs

The key implications arising from the consultation exercise for the concept designs for Beckenham High Street are as follows:

- How do we balance the aspiration to open up views of (and access to) the War Memorial with the strong concerns about safety for pedestrians?
- How do we balance the aspiration to increase the permeability between Beckenham Green and the High Street whilst maintaining a recognisable boundary edge to the western side of the Green?
- Do the benefits of opening Beckenham Green to the High Street outweigh the disadvantages of doing so?
- Do the proposals for the High Street maximise the potential to include provisions which will promote more and safer cycling?

I have asked Julian Lewis from East Architects to give some thought to these questions during the process of finalising the concept plans for the High Street. There may also be other design-related questions which occur to Julian on reviewing this note.

Section 7 – Dissemination of the consultation findings

Charlie Parish from TfL has already expressed an interest in the findings from the consultation exercise. We can include Section 5 of this note on key findings in the forthcoming paper to TfL on the revised Major Scheme bid for Beckenham town centre. In the meantime, it would be worth sharing the complete note with Charlie Parish and colleagues from TfL.

Once the purdah period has expired, the consultation findings should be shared with the following key audiences:

- Beckenham Town Centre Working Party;
- Beckenham Town Team;
- Beckenham Business Association; and
- Copers Cope Residents Association.

It would also make sense for the Council to issue a press release highlighting the key findings from the consultation exercise. This paper could be supplied as a note to editors to support the press release and also be made available to the general public via the Council website.

**Mark Teasdale
Consultant
Renewal Team
29 April 2015**