

**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)

Alan Old, Beckenham Resident

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 MBE. Beckenham Resident

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 36 | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE |
| | 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 | MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10TH DECEMBER 2015. |
| | The minutes of the meeting held on the 10 th December 2015 were agreed. |
| 38 | SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS FROM THE MEETING ON 10TH DECEMBER 2015 |
| | <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>beckenhamimprovements@bromley.gov.uk</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 http://beckenhamhighstreet.co.uk/. Chloe Jane Ross stated that the information could also be uploaded to the website of the Copers Cope Area Residents' Association--http://www.coperscope.org.uk/ .</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</p> |

raised as a question at the next Full Council meeting. 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. Chloe-Jane Ross referred to Article 4 Directions that had recently been obtained by Richmond Council, and mentioned that Article 4’s could be retrospective. In Richmond, the Secretary of State intervened to prevent Richmond’s Article 4 being retrospective, therefore LBB would need to lobby the Secretary of State not to make this intervention for Beckenham. Kevin Munnelly (Head of Renewal) stated that an Article 4 Direction may not be justified.

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 would be enforced rigorously

Mr Munnelly reminded the Group that an Article 4 Directive would take a year to come into force. He stated that this was a

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | <p>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>RESOLVED that an Article 4 update for Beckenham be provided to the Working Group with the minutes.</p> |
| <p>39</p> | <p>TRAFFIC UPDATE</p> |
| | <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 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</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>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>RESOLVED that the Traffic Update and the Modelling Report from Arcadis be noted and a line drawn under the proposals.</p> |
| 40 | DAVID BOWIE MEMORIAL |
| | <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 sculpture, illustration and design, 3D modelling and printing and computer graphics. His website is:</p> |

<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 19th. 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 Munnelly 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 David Bowie had kept his illness private, 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 and that other deceased celebrity place associations attracted tributes of cellophane bouquets of dying flowers, cards, memorabilia, candles/wax, graffiti and 'souvenir' theft

and damage. 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 Jean Appleton, MBE, 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> |
| 41 | MAJOR SCHEME UPDATE |
| | <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 awaited, but it was not anticipated that there would be any problems.</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>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</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>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.</p> <p>Mr Munnelly stated that the feedback on the lanterns was noted, and that revised ideas would be circulated in due course.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the feedback provided by the Group concerning street lighting be noted, and that revised ideas be presented at the next meeting.</p> |
| 42 | TOWN TEAM UPDATE AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISIONS GOING FORWARD |
| | No update was provided at the meeting as there was insufficient time. |
| 43 | PURPLE FLAG AWARD |
| | 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. |
| 44 | BECKENHAM JUNCTION STATION UPDATE |
| | The Beckenham Junction Station update was deferred to the next meeting due to lack of time. |
| 45 | ARTICLE 4 UPDATE |
| | <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</p> |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | <p>the meeting, but it had been agreed that an update be circulated with the minutes.</p> <p>RESOLVED that an Article 4 update be circulated with the minutes.</p> |
| 46 | ANY OTHER BUSINESS-PREVIOUSLY NOTIFIED |
| | No other business was discussed. |
| 47 | DATE OF NEXT MEETING |
| | The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday 19 th May 2016 at 7.30pm. |

The Meeting ended at 9.40 pm