

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

**BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE WORKING GROUP**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 19 May 2016

**Present:**

Councillor Michael Tickner (Chairman)  
Councillor Sarah Phillips  
Councillor Stephen Wells

Marsha Berg, (Beckenham Business Association)  
Gail Low, (Guide Dogs for the Blind)  
Alan Old, Beckenham Resident  
Dr John Parker, (Beckenham Society)  
Marie Pender, (West Beckenham Residents Association)  
Janice Pilgrim, Kent Association for the Blind  
David Wood, (Beckenham Civic Society)  
Lorraine McQuillan, LBB Environment & Community Services  
Kevin Munnely, (LBB Regeneration & Transformation Service)  
Stephen Oliver, (Regeneration & Transformation Service)  
Stephen Wood, (Chief Executive's Department)  
Melanie Corfield (Post Office Ltd)  
Jackie Groundsell (Beckenham Business Association)

**Also present:**

John Cassey (Beckenham Resident)  
Gloria Cassey (Beckenham Resident)  
Nick Goy (Beckenham Resident)  
Sue Woodward (Beckenham Resident)  
John Crozier (Beckenham Resident)  
Colin Hughes (Langley Park Residents' Association)

<b>48</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>
	Apologies were received from Councillors Ian Dunn, Alan Collins and Diane Smith.  Apologies were also received from Chloe Jane Ross and Jean Appleton.
<b>49</b>	<b>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING</b>
	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed subject to a minor

	amendment suggested by Mr Nick Goy.
<b>50</b>	<b>MAJOR SCHEME UPDATE</b>
	<p>The Major Scheme update was provided by Kevin Munnelly and Stephen Oliver.</p> <p>The Group heard that the business plan had been submitted, and that a response from TfL was awaited. Agreement was required concerning the percentage of contingency. LBB were hoping to agree a figure of 25%, TfL were favouring 15%. Originally, the contingency was 40%. Mr Munnelly pointed out that given the high total value of the scheme, the difference in the percentage values equated to a significant amount of money. It was hoped that the matter would soon be agreed. The materials could then be ordered; it was hoped that implementation could proceed in September 2016. A detailed implementation plan would be sought from FM Conway once TfL had agreed funding. It was anticipated that everything would be signed off by the end of June. Mr Munnelly stated that the design was robust, lessons had been learnt from previous projects, and so it was hoped that there would not be problems with the implementation of the major scheme project.</p> <p>Dr Parker felt that engagement in the public consultation was limited, and that large numbers of the public were still not aware of what was going on. He wanted to see a greater dissemination of information to the general public. Mr Munnelly stated that general arrangement drawings would be displayed. Councillor Stephen Wells suggested that drawings be displayed in a three day exhibition at the Beckenham Public Halls.</p> <p>The Group heard that when works were being undertaken on a project in Orpington, information had been placed in an empty shop. The process for doing this in Beckenham had not yet been decided. Lorraine McQuillan (Town Centre Manager) suggested that LBB use a shop on Beckenham High Street. The Chairman felt that perhaps a media release was also appropriate.</p> <p>The Chairman read an update to the Group concerning the Albemarle Road/Southend Road Junction; this had been drafted by Mr Chris Cole:</p> <p>Virgin Media had now agreed to move their cable with LBB providing Civils assistance. Once the cable had been moved, LBB would then immediately start on the rest of the junction works. This was likely to occur in July 2016. LBB were liaising with TfL's Signals Team to ensure that all works were co-ordinated. In order to minimise disruption, LBB would prefer the start date to be in late July once the school holidays commenced, as traffic was significantly less in the morning peak.</p>

Provided the decision had been made on materials, the junction could then be completed. If no decision had been made, the footway would be temporarily made good with tarmac, and the permanent materials would be installed as part of the major scheme.

Mr Oliver informed the Group that the construction drawings were now almost complete. However, they were not final. The Group looked at a planning drawing that focused on the Albemarle Road Junction. The drawing was in colour and so the Group was able to easily identify the varying types of paving and surfaces. The Group was in agreement that the Albemarle Road parking bays (where the road heads West), should be removed. It was noted that the Albemarle Road Junction design had been formulated after a traffic modelling exercise had been undertaken; indeed this was the case for all of the road junctions. The Group discussed the traffic bells/bollards and Marsha Berg commented that they were a trip hazard. Dr Parker wondered if the colour could be changed to make them more visible; he felt that if they were simply removed, it would be dangerous for pedestrians. Dr Parker requested that in future, road names be added to the plans to aid identification. Mr Oliver stated that the kerbs on the road junctions would be 6cm high. Crossing points would be wider and would slope down to be flush with the carriageway. There would be pink granite paving at the road junctions, and tactile paving would be red.

The Group looked at a drawing that showed the design for the new planters, with associated seating and paving. The brickwork for the planters was an earthy colour, and the words "Beckenham Green" were imbedded into the brickwork of the planters using green bricks. There were slats to sit on next to the planters, these had no backs. Mr Goy commented that he did not approve of the green brickwork which broke up the name of the green around a corner, so from other viewpoints it read either 'ENHAM GREEN' or just 'BECK'. He preferred to see the seating fitted with backs and arms. Mr Oliver clarified that other seating would be introduced that would have backs and arms. Mr Oliver brought along a new brick sample in an earthier brown colour in response to criticism of the colour of the bricks at the previous meeting.

The paving next to the planters was a very similar colour to the brickwork used for the planters, and Gail Low requested that this be changed to allow for a visual contrast. It was noted that although the seating by the planters was white in the drawing, white would not necessarily be used. The Chairman requested that the seating be wooden.

Marsha Berg asked if the electrical power supply for the market had been sorted. The answer to this was yes, and it was noted that the lighting in the trees ran off a separate lighting system. A new

electrical plan had been formulated. A member of the group stated that the Christmas tree lights should run off a separate circuit. It was noted that the Bromley Market milestone was not moving.

The Chairman expressed disappointment that there was now no pedestrian crossing on the southern side of the Bromley Road-High Street junction drawing. Mr Oliver informed the Group that a crossing was not on the plan as the design team had deemed it not to be cost effective. He explained that the crossing would not meet disabled access requirements. This was because the required steps on one side would not be accessible to disabled people. If a long ramp was introduced, then this would require the removal of trees and substantial loss of landscaping. It was noted that there were no railings in the drawing as they had all been removed. Dr Parker questioned what the orange lines were in the drawing, and it was confirmed that these were yellow lines. The Working Group was unanimous in their request that all yellow lines in the Conservation Area be half width.

Mr Goy was concerned that no right turns had been built into the drawing, he felt that this was a problem. He expressed the view that pavement widening meant reducing the carriageway width and the number of lanes forming at some traffic light junctions from two to just one lane. Mr Munnelly responded that the traffic modelling that had been carried out had not revealed any significant traffic delays caused by the absence of right turns. Mr Old asked how people would park their cars in the bays by the bank, as there did not appear to be enough room. Mr Munnelly stated that a larger scale drawing would show that this was not the case. Mr Goy expressed concern over what at first appeared to be a lack of cycle racks; Mr Oliver clarified that cycle racks would be placed in various locations, as this was an important part of the business case.

The Group examined the drawing that was marked as "Thornton's Corner". The Group expressed concern regarding the pavement widening on the north east corner of Thornton's Corner, and the impact on traffic flow. Mr Oliver outlined the improvement works planned around the bus stop waiting space, and would give the potential for restaurants to adopt alfresco dining. The Group noted the different types and colours of tactile paving. The Group expressed the view that Kelsey Park Road should remain with two lanes instead of one, having been resurfaced in the last few days.

Mr Goy expressed concern regarding the loss of traffic lanes, and potential holdups that could be caused by vehicles attempting to turn right. Currently there were two lanes, a straight-on-or-left-lane and the right-filter lane for cars turning from the High St into Kelsey Park Road. Mr Goy's concern was that at present, right turning cars can be held up by oncoming traffic from Manor Road, but because there is another lane at present, cars can continue straight on or turn left.

He stated that it would just take one right turning car, waiting for oncoming traffic to clear, to cause a jam all down the High St - and buses and emergency vehicles would be caught in that jam. Similarly, he also expressed concern regarding the proposed pavement extension outside of the Odeon Cinema, and felt that this may also cause problems for emergency vehicles.

The Group referred to the drawing pertaining to the Fairfield Road Junction, and noted the free parking bays and the bus stops. The Group heard that to deal with long standing flood issues, the bus stop would be on a raised platform. The Group looked at the seating plan for the new bus stops and noted that the seats were devoid of arms. The Group expressed a preference for seats with arms. Mr Oliver reported that the bus waiting space would be greatly improved, and that the bus stop would be raised to accommodate disabled access requirements. He presented a drawing of the bus stop to explain the proposals.

Mr John Crozier raised the issue of streetlamps, and stated that the streetlamps being proposed as part of the major scheme were not in keeping with the buildings in the area, and that the scheme should seek to retain heritage lighting where possible. However, the Group noted that the main road going through Beckenham is an "A" road, and as such, proper illumination was required. Cllr Wells requested that wherever possible, lighting should be attached to buildings. Mr Oliver explained to the Group that the heritage lamps as used on Beckenham Green would not on their own give sufficient illumination of the "A" road. Alternative lanterns might require an additional 27 columns, therefore the lanterns presented had been recommended as the best option.

Mr Munnely reminded the Group that 6-7 lamp profiles had been previously debated by the Group at some length. Mr Oliver stated that lighting would be fixed to buildings where practicable. It was noted that it was not straightforward to put lamps on buildings. In many cases, there were various technical and practical issues that needed consideration such as buildings not being high enough, or too far away from the road. Mr Munnely stated that existing lighting on buildings would be retained. It was felt that the matter of lighting should be further discussed at the next meeting.

**RESOLVED:**

**(1) that the general plan drawings be displayed to the public in due course**

**(2) that a detailed implementation plan would be sought from FM Conway once TfL had agreed funding.**

	<p><b>(3) that the Albemarle Road parking bays (where the road heads West), should be removed.</b></p> <p><b>(4) that the Group would be updated concerning why there were no advanced stop cycle markings at all traffic lights on the plan drawings</b></p> <p><b>(5) that Mr Oliver investigate if the colour of the bell bollards could be changed</b></p> <p><b>(6) that all yellow lines in the Conservation Area be half width.</b></p> <p><b>(7) that seats should be wooden, and wherever possible should have backs and arms</b></p> <p><b>(8) that lighting be discussed further at the next meeting</b></p>
<p><b>51</b></p>	<p><b>PURPLE FLAG UPDATE</b></p>
	<p>The Purple Flag update was provided by Lorraine McQuillan, the newly appointed Town Centre Manager for Beckenham and Penge. She informed the Group that she had been appointed from April 1<sup>st</sup> 2016. She advised that the Purple Flag assessment had taken place in December 2015, and had been subsequently awarded. She stated that Beckenham had received its flag, and the Chairman enquired where it was going to be placed. Ms McQuillan suggested that the flag be located on the Green. The Chairman asked if Beckenham could have more than one flag, and it was agreed that the matter of location should be discussed at the next meeting. An issue had been raised concerning whether or not planning permission was required to display the flag, this was ongoing.</p> <p>Ms McQuillan was hopeful that the Town Team would be allocated funding to promote the Purple Flag status. The unveiling of the flag was yet to come, and a report was due back to the assessors. A follow up assessment was due later in the year. The Group noted that no other town in the Borough had been awarded the Purple Flag.</p> <p>Ms McQuillan informed the Group that she would be going on maternity leave for about 9 months in August, and that cover would be arranged. It had not been confirmed yet if the maternity cover would be full time or part time-the details would be confirmed to the Group when available.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED that the matter of the location of the Purple Flag be brought to the next meeting.</b></p>

<b>52</b>	<b>TOWN TEAM UPDATE</b>
	Chloe Jane Ross was not available to give the Town Team update, but Marie Pender advised that the alleyway signposting was well underway.
<b>53</b>	<b>BECKENHAM JUNCTION STATION UPDATE</b>
	Mr Oliver informed the Group that he had been in contact with Network Rail, and it had been confirmed that no further developments at Beckenham Junction Station were planned before 2020.
<b>54</b>	<b>FUTURE OF POST OFFICES COUNTER SERVICES IN BECKENHAM</b>
	<p>Melanie Corfield from the Post Office Ltd Communications Team attended to provide the update on Post Office Counter Services in Beckenham. She informed the Group that Post Office Ltd, which owns and runs the Crown Post Office Network, was separated from the Royal Mail Group Ltd on 1 April 2012. In return for a package of Government funding for transformation and modernisation, the Post Office was committed to investing in the network, and maintaining a network of around 11,500 branches with no further substantive reductions and continued accessibility for all at the national level.</p> <p>It was noted that the Government had moved many services online, and as a result usage was now different. There are now 300 Crown Post Offices including Beckenham. Ms Corfield stated that many Post Offices were not able to remain in high streets in their current form for economic reasons.</p> <p>Some of the economic reasons were outlined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High fixed costs</li> <li>• High staff costs</li> <li>• Reduction in customer numbers</li> </ul> <p>Ms Corfield explained to the Working Group that W H Smith had been partnering with the Post Office for 10 years, and so a good working relationship had been established. The partnership was symbiotic in that it provided the Post Office with suitable high street locations, whilst providing an expanded customer base for WH Smith. It was the case that savings were now required to release money for investment, and that the government subsidy to the Post Office was decreasing.</p>

The plan was that the Post Office in Beckenham would move into WH Smith in the High Street, and would take over roughly a third of the floor space. The business would be run by WH Smith as a franchise; there would be longer opening hours, with the addition of Sunday trading. The consultation process was ongoing.

Jackie Groundsell enquired about the ten year franchise with W H Smith and asked if the 10 year term began from the time that the generic franchise contract with W H Smith was originated, or whether it began with the new franchise contract at Beckenham. Ms Corfield promised to get back to the Group concerning this.

Alan Old enquired what the specific reasons were for closing the Post Office at its current location in Beckenham, as it was always very busy. Ms Corfield reiterated the economic reasons outlined previously, as well as the fact that the lease was expiring, and this would be expensive to renew. It was also the case that the Post Office was hopeful that it had sourced a suitable partnership opportunity with WH Smith in Beckenham High Street.

A member enquired what would happen if the franchise went ahead, and then WH Smith pulled out at a later date. Ms Corfield responded that if this occurred, then the Post Office would have to source an alternative partner.

Dr John Parker enquired if there were any floor plans that could be looked at. Ms Corfield replied that a floor plan could be supplied as long as it was not published. Dr Parker asked how mail would be picked up as there was no space at the rear of WH Smith. Ms Corfield replied that this was an ongoing matter of discussion with Royal Mail, and that she would update the Group in due course. Dr Parker would supply his email address to Ms Corfield for receipt of the floor plans.

Marie Pender commented that the floor plans had been shown at a meeting the previous week. She expressed grave concern over what appeared to be a lack of internal space. She envisioned problems with a lack of standing and queuing space, and this was without the additional problems that would be caused by buggies.

Ms Corfield stated that there had to be proper doors and plenty of floor space, these were non-negotiable. She stated that the Post Office would work with WH Smith and disability groups to try and resolve any problems. David Wood expressed the view that the proposals were hopeless. He was concerned about the lack of space, less staff, and the fact that there was only one exit at the back. He also reminded the Group that although it was the case that the Post Office had relocated to WH Smiths in Bromley, the Bromley site operated over two floors.



	<p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p><b>(1) that Ms Corfield email details of the floor plans to Dr John Parker</b></p> <p><b>(2) that Ms Corfield update the Group in due course concerning clarification of the 10 year franchise term</b></p> <p><b>(3) that Ms Corfield update the Group in due course concerning proposed arrangements for the collection of mail from the new location in the High Street</b></p>
55	<p><b>DAVID BOWIE MEMORIAL UPDATE</b></p>
	<p>The Group was informed that Chloe Jane Ross (Chairman of Copers Cope Area Resident's Association) had met with Dan Pearce, and that a suitable location for a wall mural had been identified. They felt that a side wall of Patrick's Bar in the High Street would be a suitable location for the mural, and it was noted that Patrick's were supportive of the project. The Group were informed that additionally, Ms Ross would be meeting with Andre Masters (sculptor) in the next two weeks. Mr Goy asked if it was appropriate to have Mr Bowie's image looking down at everyone.</p> <p>The Chairman stated that it was now time to get costings, and to ascertain where funding would come from.</p> <p>Concerning the Bandstand in Croydon Road Recreation Ground, it was noted that supporters of the project to restore the bandstand could buy a personalised brick around the bandstand, which could carry any message, whether it was remembering the music legend, or commemorating a loved one.</p> <p>The bricks would form a circular pathway around the structure and expand the performing space. Each brick would cost £100, with the proceeds going towards the restoration and enjoyment of the bandstand. Councillor Phillips advised that fifty bricks had been sold so far.</p> <p><b>Resolved that the matter of the David Bowie Memorial be referred to the Renewal and Recreation PDS Committee.</b></p>
56	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p>
	<p>The Chairman read out a written update from Mr Chris Cole concerning the publication of traffic related information on the web, as follows:</p> <p><i>"The traffic team is in the process of significantly improving the</i></p>

	<p><i>information that was on the LBB website. Previously the information was difficult to find or non-existent.</i></p> <p><i>The web site is still a work in progress, but there is now some information available at <a href="http://www.bromley.gov.uk">www.bromley.gov.uk</a> Additional information on parking design was being added today for example.</i></p> <p><i>The link to the accident data is not yet on the site, but it is planned to be so shortly.”</i></p> <p>It was agreed that the plans and drawings would be published when general agreement on the drawings had been established.</p> <p>It was noted that sample paving was still in place outside of Zizzi’s, and that new sample paving had also been laid outside the former fried chicken shop near the cinema, with explanatory posters on the shop window.</p>
<b>57</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>
	<p>The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 30<sup>th</sup> June 2016. It was agreed that a copy of the next agenda be sent to Cllr Rutherford, the newly appointed Chairman of the Council’s Renewal and Recreation PDS Committee</p>

The Meeting ended at 9.30 pm