



THE LONDON BOROUGH  
www.bromley.gov.uk

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

**BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE WORKING GROUP**

Meeting to be held at **7.30 pm** on **Thursday 15 September 2016** at  
**Beckenham Library, Beckenham, BR3 4PE\***

**\*PLEASE NOTE STARTING TIME**

**AGENDA**

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 30TH JUNE 2016 (Pages 1 - 10)**
- 3 MATTERS ARISING (Pages 11 - 16)**
- 4 MAJOR SCHEME UPDATE**
  - a POTENTIAL TREES FOR MAJOR SCHEME (Pages 17 - 20)**
- 5 PARKING BAY UPDATE**
- 6 BID UPDATE**
- 7 BECKENHAM SOCIETY REVIEW REPORT BASED ON DRAWINGS PROVIDED BY THE CONTRACTOR (Pages 21 - 26)**
- 8 TOWN TEAM UPDATE**
- 9 DAVID BOWIE MEMORIAL UPDATE**
- 10 TERMS OF REFERENCE (Pages 27 - 28)**
- 11 OTHER BUSINESS**
- 12 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The date of the next meeting is to be confirmed.

Contact Officer:

Stephen Wood  
LBB Democratic Services Manager  
8 September 2016  
020 8313 4316  
*stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk*

## RENEWAL AND RECREATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

### BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 30 June 2016

#### Present:

Councillor Michael Tickner (Chairman)  
Councillor Ian Dunn  
Councillor Sarah Phillips

Marsha Berg, (Beckenham Business Association)  
Jackie Groundsell, (Beckenham Business Association)  
Colin Hughes, (Langley Park Residents' Association)  
Gail Low, (Guide Dogs for the Blind)  
Marie Pender, (West Beckenham Residents' Association)  
Janice Pilgrim, (Kent Association for the Blind)  
Chloe-Jane Ross, (Copers Cope Area Residents' Association)

Cliff Watkins, (West Beckenham Residents' Association)  
David Wood, (Beckenham Civic Society)

Lorraine McQuillan, (Town Centre Manager)  
Stephen Oliver, (LBB Regeneration and Transformation Service)  
Stephen Wood, (LBB Committee Services)

#### Also present:

Roger Bahari, (Beckenham Resident)  
Louise Fuente, (Beckenham Resident)  
Nick Goy, (Beckenham Resident)  
Mark Lees, (Beckenham Resident)

Yvonne Mason, (Beckenham Resident)

Carole Smith, (Beckenham Resident)  
Terry Stanley, (Beckenham Resident)  
Sue Woodward, (Beckenham Resident)

<b>58</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>
	Apologies were received from the following Councillors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cllr Diane Smith</li><li>• Cllr Russell Mellor</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Stephen Wells</li> <li>• Cllr Vanessa Allen</li> <li>• Cllr Michael Rutherford</li> <li>• Cllr Alan Collins</li> </ul> <p>Apologies were also received from Alan Old, Kevin Munnelly, Angus Culverwell and Richard Comaish.</p>
<b>59</b>	<b>MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19TH MAY 2016</b>
	<p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2016 were agreed, subject to the amendment that Mr Terence Stanley had sent apologies.</p>
<b>60</b>	<b>ACTION POINTS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b>
	<p>The Group looked at the Action Points from the previous meeting.</p> <p>It had been noted that the general plan drawings would be put on display when available. The Group heard that this would be actioned when the final budget had been agreed by TfL. Lorraine McQuillan (Town Centre Manager) had been investigating empty properties where the drawings could be displayed in due course.</p> <p>It had also been noted that a detailed implementation plan would be sought from FM Conway, but this was also dependent on the agreement of funding from TfL.</p> <p>The third action point from the previous meeting was that the Albemarle Road parking bays (where the road heads west) should be removed. It was noted that this matter was outside the scope of the project. The appropriate officer needed to be identified and invited to the next meeting.</p> <p>Stephen Oliver had been asked to investigate if the colour of the bell bollards on the corner of Rectory Road by the locksmiths could be changed to improve visibility for partially sighted pedestrians. It was confirmed that this was possible, and the colour would be confirmed in due course.</p> <p>Concerning the matter of yellow lines in the Conservation Area being half width, the Group was reassured that any roads in the Conservation area where the road was being resurfaced would have the yellow lines half width.</p> <p>The Group were due an update as to why there were no advanced 'stop cycle' markings on the Albemarle Road junction. Mr Oliver responded that this was something that had been designed by the traffic engineers to reduce delays, and would be subject to a safety</p>

	<p>audit. At the previous meeting, it was the general consensus that seating should be wooden, including backs and arms. Mr Oliver stated that in most areas this would be the case. However the informal seats forming part of the planters would not have backs as it would compromise the design.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p><b>(1) that the appropriate officer who had responsibility for parking bays would be invited to the next meeting to report on town centre parking provision and answer questions.</b></p> <p><b>(2) that the revised colour of the bell bollards at the corner of Rectory Road be confirmed.</b></p>
<b>61</b>	<b>TOWN TEAM UPDATE</b>
	<p>Chloe Jane Ross, Chairman of the Town Team, attended to provide the Town Team update.</p> <p>The Town Team had recently held an AGM, where the work of the last two years had been reviewed.</p> <p>Ms Ross went through a checklist of issues and requirements for the Major Scheme. She raised the issue of decluttering, and stated that this had been delayed so that the matter could be incorporated into the funding for the Major Scheme. She pointed out that extra loading bays had been promised, without loss of parking space, and was seeking assurances that this would still be provided. She was also seeking assurances that the current parking signs would be simplified.</p> <p>Ms Ross referenced the Major Scheme proposals for bike stands, and asked if it would be possible to provide rain covers and locks. She asked if sensor-activated lights for perception of security for after-dark use could be incorporated. She also asked if a Town Centre bike audit had been considered. It was noted that, as much as possible, the Town Centre Team would like to see step free access to shops.</p> <p>Ms Ross referenced bus stops and asked if the proposed move of the bus stop from outside Em &amp; Lou's to outside M&amp;S was still going ahead. The Group heard that the Town Team would like to have 'No Smoking' signs at bus stops to reduce littering.</p> <p>Ms Ross highlighted the various issues around 'communication'. She asked what had been the response to the paving choices. She asked if East had adequately defined why each improvement was being made and facilitated feedback from the group(s) affected. The Town Team expressed the view that it would be a good idea for</p>

prototypes or models to be displayed with the plans, including a comment wall. Ms Ross queried who would be handling the public relations for the scheme.

Mr Oliver responded that FM Conway would be providing a PR person to advise local businesses and residents. There would be a weekly reporting exercise that would provide all round updates. The Chairman asked if this would be the same person that carried out this function for the Bromley Project, and the response was that this would be investigated, but other options may provide a more appropriate solution. Ms Ross referenced Thornton's Corner/Kelsey Park, and requested clear plans to be shown (not just ideations) for Thornton's Corner, including flower beds.

Ms Ross asked if there was a way to encourage cars to take wider turns by Rectory Road, and Mr Oliver responded that this would happen automatically once the junction was widened. Ms Ross asked what would happen to the proposed illumination of the water pump at Kelsey Square. Mr Oliver responded that coloured lighting would be provided at this location. The Group heard that, at the Sainsbury's forecourt, the principle of the works had been agreed for the installation of new paving, benches, cycle racks and bin enclosures. It was also noted that agreement had been reached to move the telephone kiosk outside the entrance.

Stephen Oliver stated that Lidl appeared unwilling to communicate or participate in the scheme. Dialogue had been with the owner's managing agent not the supermarket itself. It was suggested that Lidl's be lobbied, and perhaps a meeting could be arranged between Lidl's and local residents. The Chairman stated that it was good news concerning Sainsbury's, but bad news as far as Lidl's was concerned.

Ms Ross asked if the roundabout wall was being removed and the answer to this was no. Many people in the Group wanted the wall removed. Mr Goy expressed the opposite view, and felt that the wall protected the memorial. The Chairman asked the Group to indicate with a show of hands if they would prefer the wall to remain or to be removed. Six people indicated that they would like the wall to remain, and nine indicated that they would like it removed. Stephen Oliver advised that the removal of the wall had not formed part of the scheme since it was decided to leave the shape of this junction as it is. The issue seemed to be the planting height and its appropriateness.

The Chairman suggested that new planting on the island be investigated.

Stephen Oliver agreed to answer all of Ms Ross's questions in writing as he had only received a written copy that evening.

	<p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p><b>(1) that new planting at a more visible height on the war memorial island be investigated</b></p> <p><b>(2) that Mr Oliver responds in writing to the questions submitted by Ms Ross on the evening.</b></p>
62	<p><b>DAVID BOWIE MEMORIAL UPDATE</b></p>
	<p>It had been agreed that the Town Team would lead on matters concerning the David Bowie Memorial.</p> <p>A meeting had been held with the artist Dan Pearce, and the currently white painted side wall of Patrick’s Bar had been identified as a suitable location for a David Bowie mural. The property owner had confirmed its support for this. The issue that needed to be resolved was that of funding. The funding for this was not part of the Major Scheme and so needed to be sourced separately. The Chairman was hopeful that the Council may match any funding raised by the Town Team and from David Bowie fans.</p> <p>Roger Bahari stated that it was estimated that the Beatles had brought in £82m in revenue to Liverpool, and there was no reason why Beckenham could not benefit economically from commemorating David Bowie. He felt that there was a lack of landmarks and plaques in Beckenham, and this could be rectified by Beckenham recognising David Bowie effectively. Mr Bahari was confident that he could raise funding for a statue using his Facebook page which had an extensive network of contacts. This idea was supported by Chloe Jane Ross. Mr Oliver commented that the intention to install the Bowie ‘bolt of lightning’ outside of Zizzi’s in Beckenham was still going ahead as part of the Major Scheme. It was noted that planning permission was not required for the mural.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED that the update be noted, and that the matter be retained on the agenda for the next meeting.</b></p>
63	<p><b>BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) STRATEGY FOR TOWN CENTRES</b></p>
	<p>Lorraine McQuillan (LBB Town Centre Manager) attended to provide the BID update.</p> <p>Ms McQuillan explained the concept and ethos behind BIDS, and informed the Group that BIDs had been set up in Orpington in 2013, and Bromley in 2016. A Business Improvement District (BID) was a tried and tested model to deliver sustainable investment in a defined area, through a small levy on rateable business properties - based</p>

	<p>on typically 1-2% of rateable values. Legislation which became law in 2004 provided the regulatory underpinning for BIDs. They can only be established or renewed after a majority of business ratepayers vote in favour in an official postal ballot (operated under conditions similar to a political election). Once a BID was established or renewed, the occupiers of any eligible property must by law pay the levy annually for the term of the BID (usually 5 years) – providing a level of financial sustainability and certainty not usually present with less formal partnership arrangements. BIDs could deliver any projects or services in their area that were agreed by the relevant businesses. These would be in addition to services the Public Sector already provided.</p> <p>A report outlining the case for BIDS in Beckenham and Penge would be scrutinised by the Renewal and Recreation PDS Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> July, and would then be looked at by the Executive on 20<sup>th</sup> July. It was recommended that the Executive grant approval for both BIDs to proceed. It was hoped that the BID ballot would be undertaken in 2017, and that the BIDs would be operative in 2018.</p> <p>The Chairman asked if there were any ‘gaps’ in the BID boundaries, and it was confirmed that this was currently the case, but this was being looked at. The R&amp;R PDS Committee had suggested that the boundaries be joined up.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED that the BID information be noted and that the Group be updated in due course concerning action taken to resolve the issue of the gap that currently existed between the Beckenham and Penge BID boundaries.</b></p>
64	<b>MAJOR SCHEME UPDATE</b>
	<p>Stephen Oliver (LBB Planner) attended to provide the Major Scheme update. There had already been some discussion concerning the development of the Major Scheme outlined in the minutes pertaining to the Town Team update.</p> <p>Mr Oliver informed the Group that negotiations concerning receipt of final funding were ongoing with TfL. The negotiations centred around the Major Scheme costs and the amount of contingency funding required. He informed the Group that LBB had submitted a 70 page business case to TfL, and that he had been in dialogue with TfL regularly. The Business Case had been revised several times. TfL’s finance team had been going through everything, but had still not confirmed final funding. LBB had originally suggested contingency funding of 25%; this had now been reduced to 15% with an estimated saving of £250k. Mr Oliver stated that he had been in a positive call with TfL on the day of the meeting, and it was hoped that all of the funding issues would be resolved by the end of July.</p>

The Chairman was concerned that if the delay continued, FM Conway may decide to send their resources to an alternative contract. Mr Oliver noted that it would take 16 weeks to get all the materials on site, so the project work would not commence in September as had been previously hoped. FM Conway was aware of the situation.

Cliff Watkins was not present at the meeting but had written in with the observation that on the drawings there did not appear to be any indication of the edge of the present pavements.

He felt that the pavements on the drawings looked wider than they were at present and may interfere with the current traffic flows and thus make Beckenham a less attractive place to visit after £5m had been spent.

Nick Goy stated that he was concerned that in the High Street, the carriageways were getting narrower, and that this was a problem. His concern was that although this provided more room for the pavement, the width of roadways had been reduced. This problem would be exacerbated if there were issues like vehicle breakdowns and accidents. Mr Oliver stated that, in Beckenham High Street the aim was to discourage traffic. Mr Goy pointed out that plenty of room was still required for passing trade and deliveries.

The issue of paving was discussed, and Mr Oliver stated that generally speaking, it was intended that the 'earthy brown' paving be used. Gail Low stated that there was an issue with consultation, and that Rectory Road residents needed to be informed of what was planned. Mr Goy commented that at three of the main gateways into the town, it was planned to use grey granite and pale pink paving. He referred to this as 'schizophrenic'. He wondered why granite had to be used when it was expensive and had to be imported from China.

It was agreed that the Beckenham Society would lead on pavement plaques, and design suitable wording. Chloe Jane Ross asked if the Working Group should approve plaques in the pavements. It was agreed that this was a matter that should come back to the next meeting. Cllr Dunn pointed out that Rectory Road was often blocked, and so asked if there would be less traffic going into the High Street. Mr Oliver responded that this had been subject to traffic modelling, and that the Traffic Team would again be consulted.

**RESOLVED:**

**(1) that the Major Scheme update be noted and that the Group be updated in due course concerning the agreement of funding from TfL**

	<b>(2) that the matter of Plaques be discussed at the next meeting.</b>
<b>65</b>	<b>UPDATE ON THE THREE DAY PUBLIC INFORMATION EVENT</b>
	<p>The Group heard that two options existed concerning the three day public information event that the Chairman was seeking. One option was to use an empty shop, the other may be to use the Public Hall.</p> <p>With regard to finding an empty shop which could be used for this purpose – it was noted that this could be problematical – as most empty shops on Beckenham High Street were owned by difficult to reach landlords. If a landlord could be found that was willing to provide the space rent free, funding would still be required to cover things like insurance and space preparation/ clean up.</p> <p>A Resident’s Evening meeting would need to be set up. It was noted that the running of the consultation and the exhibition would be the responsibility of the LBB Town Centre Development Team. The Chairman expressed a desire for a three day exhibition early in the process, and suggested that this should be funded from the consultation budget. He suggested using a closed shop in the High Street.</p> <p>Mr Goy stated that the three day exhibition should not just randomly appear, but should be properly marketed.</p>
<b>66</b>	<b>CONSERVATION AREA UPDATE</b>
	<p>The Chairman asked David Wood if the Conservation Area Panel was being consulted on new planning applications. Mr Wood responded that they did receive some information but it was often delayed. Sometimes they received information about work that had already been completed. The Chairman expressed dissatisfaction with LBB planning enforcement. Chloe Jane Ross expressed the view that there should be a review of planning policy and process as the current system was broken.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that in general, planning laws were weak, and that individuals could apply for planning permission retrospectively without penalty.</p>
<b>67</b>	<b>LOCATION OF THE PURPLE FLAG</b>
	<p>Lorraine McQuillan gave the Purple Flag update. There was still no flag pole, and the location of the pole had to be determined. Six possible locations had been identified, and photographs of the possible sites were tabled for discussion. The Chairman stated that the document presented to the Group concerning the possible site locations was well researched and well presented. It was felt that the</p>

	<p>Purple Flag needed to be visible at night.</p> <p>Mr Goy asked what benefit a purple flag would add to the High Street. Members of the Group responded that the Purple Flag was a visible demonstration of the accreditation that Beckenham had received over a variety of areas, and particularly the night time economy. The Flag was a way of raising awareness of what had been achieved.</p> <p>The favoured location of the Purple Flag was location number 2, which was at Beckenham Junction Train Station.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED that the Purple Flag be displayed at Beckenham Junction Train Station.</b></p>
<b>68</b>	<b>OTHER BUSINESS</b>
	<p>It was noted that a 'Business Day' run by Beckenham Business Association was scheduled for 7<sup>th</sup> September in the Public Halls. There would be talks, workshops and exhibition stands. Details would be available on the Beckenham Business Association Website. The Chairman wondered if the Council could book a stand to publicise the Major Scheme. It was noted that this was an annual event, and sponsors were welcome.</p> <p>It was noted that no updates had been received from the Post Office concerning the possible relocation of the Post Office into the High Street at WH Smiths.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED that the issue of Street Lamps be discussed at the next meeting.</b></p>
<b>69</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>
	<p>The date of the next meeting was confirmed as 15<sup>th</sup> September 2016.</p>

The Meeting ended at 9.25 pm

This page is left intentionally blank

# Agenda Item 3

Report No.  
CSD16117

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

---

**Decision Maker:** Beckenham Town Centre Working Group

**Date:** 15<sup>th</sup> September 2016

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

**Title:** **MATTERS ARISING**

**Contact Officer:** Steve Wood, Democratic Services Officer  
Tel: 020 8313 4316 E-mail: stephen.wood@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:** Mark Bowen, Director of Corporate Services

**Ward:** N/A

---

1. Reason for report

1.1 **Appendix A** updates Members on matters arising from previous meetings.

---

**2. RECOMMENDATION**

2.1 The Group is asked to review progress on matters arising from previous meetings.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Policy/Financial/Legal/Personnel
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Minutes and Action Points from the previous meeting

## Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
  2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council/Quality Environment, Thriving Town Centres,
- 

## Financial

1. Cost of proposal: No Cost to Democratic Services
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Democratic Services
  4. Total current budget for this head: £335,590
  5. Source of funding: 2016/17 revenue budget
- 

## Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 8 posts (7.27fte)
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: Completion of "Matters Arising" Reports for PP&S PDS meetings (and their sub groups) can take up to a few hours per meeting.
- 

## Legal

1. Legal Requirement: None
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable
- 

## Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): This report is intended primarily for Members of the Beckenham Town Centre Working Group
- 

## Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Not Applicable
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

<u>Minute Number/Title</u>	<u>Matters Arising</u>	<u>Update</u>
<p><b>Minute 54</b> <b>19<sup>th</sup> May 2016</b></p> <p><b>Future of Post Offices Counter Services</b></p>	<p>It was agreed that Ms Corfield from the Post Office Ltd would email copy of the floor plans (for the new Post Office in WH Smiths) to Dr John Parker.</p> <p>It was agreed that Ms Corfield would update the Group in due course with clarification of the 10 year franchise term.</p> <p>It was also agreed that Ms Corfield would update the Group concerning how mail would be collected from the new location on the High Street.</p>	<p>Ms Corfield supplied a disc to Mr Parker with the details on.</p> <p>Post Office Ltd reached a new ten-year commercial agreement earlier this year which provided for up to a further 61 Crown Post Office branches to move to WH Smith stores this year, either as franchises or 'concession arrangements' whereby the Post Office rents space from WH Smith.</p> <p>The agreement gives stability for Post Office branches because it provides a commercially sustainable model for some of the Crown Branches for the future.</p> <p>WH Smith is modernising stores, which brings benefits to Post Office branches where these are integrated and the benefits of working together with WH Smith have been proven over the past ten years</p> <p>The agreement does not 'guarantee' individual branches in that there is always the possibility of local changes (for example there could be redevelopment which leads to a store closure). In managing its network of 11,600 branches, the Post Office has vast experience of changing local circumstances and replacing branches where the need arises. This can happen whether a branch is franchised or directly-managed. The Post Office is committed to maintaining the overall size of its network as a key priority.</p> <p>Royal Mail collects from the branch by using the main road outside. As discussed at the meeting in May, collection visits to branches are relatively short.</p>

<p><b>Minute 60</b> <b>30<sup>th</sup> June 2016</b></p> <p><b>Previous Action Points</b></p>	<p>It was noted that the general plan drawings would be put on display when the final budget had been agreed by TfL.</p> <p>It was agreed that a detailed implementation plan would be sought from FM Conway when funding had been agreed by TfL.</p> <p>It had been agreed that the colour of the bell bollards on the corner of Rectory Road be changed, and that the colour would be confirmed in due course</p> <p>It had been agreed that parking bays in Albemarle Road, (where the road heads west) should be removed, and that the appropriate officer be invited to the next meeting.</p>	<p>This will be discussed in due course after the Major Scheme report is scrutinised by the PDS Committee, and subsequently ratified by the Executive.</p> <p>FM Conway has been requested to provide an update.</p> <p>The new colour will be discussed by the Working Group at the September meeting.</p> <p>The appropriate officer has been identified and invited.</p>
<p><b>Minute 61</b> <b>30<sup>th</sup> June 2016</b></p> <p><b>Town Team Update</b></p>	<p>It was resolved that new planting at a more visible height on the war memorial island be investigated.</p> <p>It was agreed that Mr Oliver would respond in writing to the various questions raised by Chloe Jane Ross on the evening.</p>	<p>This will be discussed further at the meeting. To aid discussion, an item on Potential Trees has been added to the agenda.</p> <p>Mr Oliver responded in full the day after the June meeting.</p>
<p><b>Minute 63</b> <b>30<sup>th</sup> June 2016</b></p> <p><b>BID Strategy for Town Centres</b></p>	<p>Resolved that the Group be updated in due course concerning action taken to resolve the issue of the gap that existed between the Beckenham and Penge BID boundaries.</p>	<p>A BID update will be provided at the meeting. A separate Member briefing meeting is being arranged for late Aug/ early Sept to which all Beckenham Councillors will be invited which will provide an update on BIDs. The issue of boundaries and the potential 'gap' between the two BIDs will be dealt with in more detail on that occasion. Suffice it to say at this stage, the boundary included in the report on the potential BIDs which was presented to Councillors in July was <u>indicative</u> only – and definitely not final. The actual boundaries will be decided at a time nearer to the ballot by the group of local businesses who will be proposing the BIDs. This is not a decision which can be 'second guessed' at this early stage in the development of the BIDs.</p>
<p><b>Minute 64</b> <b>30<sup>th</sup> June 2016</b></p> <p><b>Major Scheme Update</b></p>	<p>Resolved that the Group be updated in due course concerning the agreed funding from TfL.</p>	<p>Funding has now been informally agreed. Waiting for written confirmation.</p>

<p><b>Minute 67</b> <b>30<sup>th</sup> June 2016</b></p> <p><b>Location of the Purple Flag</b></p>	<p>It was agreed that the Purple Flag should be displayed at Beckenham Junction Train Station.</p>	<p>The Purple Flag is awaiting the installation of a flag pole. After some consultation with local Ward Councillors and the R&amp;R and Environment Portfolio Holders, the location has been decided as Thornton's Corner (adjacent to the flower bed). A planning application needs to be submitted which will take a minimum of 8 weeks to determine. Therefore, assuming the planning decision is positive, it is expected that the flag pole would be installed in late October, and LBB will be working with the Town Centre Team to arrange a special flag raising event around that time.</p>
--	--	--

This page is left intentionally blank

## POTENTIAL TREES – BECKENHAM HIGH STREET

<b>Beckenham Green</b>	
Tulip Tree – <i>Linodendron Tulipifera</i>	
	 <p><small>© Barcham Trees Plc</small> <small>The stunning flower of <i>Linodendron tulipifera</i> in detail</small></p>
<b>Beckenham High Street north of Thorntons Corner</b>	
Elm - <i>Ulmus New Horizon</i>	
	
Fastigiate hornbeam	
	

Ginkgo	
	
<b>Thorntons Corner to Village Way</b>	
Birch – Betula Ermani	
	
Betchula Pendula	
	
<b>Kelsey Square</b>	
Olive tree	
	

**Sainsbury's Planters**

Amelanchier



**Odeon Cinema**

Magnolia Grandiflora



*The flower bud of Magnolia grandiflora in detail*

Paulownia tomentosa



Paulownia tomentosa



The stunning purple flowers of Paulownia tomentosa

Catalpa – Bignonioides Aurea



The stunning bright yellow foliage of Catalpa Bignonioides Aurea



# Agenda Item 7



## **THE BECKENHAM SOCIETY**

Your Local Civic Society

[www.thebeckenhamsociety.com](http://www.thebeckenhamsociety.com)

25 August 2016

**London Borough of Bromley,  
Stockwell Close,  
BROMLEY  
BR1 3UH**

### **Review of Beckenham High Street Improvement Proposals Based on the Contractor's (Conway) Drawings.**

#### **1. Preamble**

In principle the Society approves of the environmental traffic calming objective of the proposals that provides for a better balance of highway space (carriage and footways), between vehicles and pedestrians. Also the intention to divert as many vehicles as possible away from the High Street and into Rectory Road should eventually be beneficial. There is however a large number of detail issues that need to be reassessed.

Three members of the Society's Executive Committee recently visited improvement schemes in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. These schemes have features that might be beneficial to Beckenham High Street (examples are contained herewith). Members of the Working Group, and the Council's contractors, might benefit from a similar visit.

## **2. Carriageways and traffic flows**

(a) The loss of filter lanes at key junctions is of particular concern. Perhaps some of the footway widening at these locations can be reduced. Unless vehicles can filter they may cause congestion and traffic queues, when running engines could cause an increase in environmental pollution. This would harm pedestrians, shopping and restaurant conditions, (including al fresco facilities) and the living conditions of frontage residents.

(b) Would these traffic flows benefit if Church Avenue was re-opened to two-way traffic?

(c) The future of traffic refuges (islands) is very unclear, although they are still shown near current locations. The islands at the Beckenham Junction and War Memorial intersections are clearly shown paved and in colour, whereas at all other locations they are in pale grey, and often “floating away” from the crossing point. Refuges have safety benefits even at minor crossing points.

## **3. Footways**

(a) Is there some clear functional, aesthetic or urban design purpose for changing footway paving to granite paving at three of the junctions ( Albemarle Road /Rectory Road /High Street; Thornton’s Corner; and War Memorial). Are the changes clearly related to the façade details of the adjoining frontage building?

(b) There seems to be an excessive amount of new footway on the western side of Thornton’s Corner. Perhaps some of it could be used for a left traffic filter lane.

(c) At the War Memorial junction why does new paving (albeit in a different material) not continue along both of the Croydon Road frontages up to Shaftsbury and Westfield Roads?

#### **4. Pedestrian Safety**

- (a) On road safety grounds the side road junctions of Village Way and The Drive with the High Street have very excessive throats (radii of curvature) making it easy for vehicles to turn at high speed thus making it difficult for pedestrians to judge when to cross. Can all such side road junctions have tighter radii?
- (b) Is a fourth pedestrian crossing feasible at the Bromley Road /High Street junction (Lloyds Bank /NatWest Bank)? One often sees younger pedestrians dashing to cross here (including diagonally), a real safety hazard.
- (c ) In the spirit of pedestrian improvements why are there not some more formal pedestrian crossing points provided on the natural lines of pedestrian movement, at such locations as:
  - i) Between Christ Church /Fairfield Road and Lions Alley.
  - (ii) Between Sainsbury's and Halifax Building Society
  - (iii) The existing light controlled crossing near HSBC and Burnhill Road needs to remain.
- (d) Pedestrians might benefit if all side road junctions with the High Street, had slightly raised pedestrian priority crossings. The visit mentioned to Kensington High Street and Sloane Square by members of the Society demonstrated these crossings in action, (See illustrations).

There were earlier plans for overhead catenary lighting in the walkway between High Street and Sainsbury's store.

#### **5. Highway Lighting**

Will highways have white LED illumination? The benefit of double lighting units should be considered, i.e. a high level bracket over the carriageway and a lower bracket over the footway (See illustration of example from Kensington High Street). Perhaps these might emphasise the spirit of the scheme?

## **6. On - Street Parking**

- (a) Are sufficient loading bays shown in the street parking areas? Might an unloading bay outside W H Smith's be needed for Royal Mail collections and deliveries now the Post Office has been relocated there?
- (b) Perhaps the nearby footway Post Box may also need re-siting to outside Smith's (possibly a double unit will be needed).
- (c) Are sufficient disabled parking bays indicated?
- (d) Parking provision in the Pavilion Parade area of the High Street needs to take better note of the bus stop outside Wimpy. Frequent jams occur in this location which needs addressing due to parking opposite and in front of the bus stop causing problems for the buses and holding up other traffic.

## **7. Tree Planting etc.**

- (a) The only new tree planting and benches shown are in the Odeon's disabled parking area. Are there not several other places that would benefit, especially where footways have been widened? For example at: Beckenham Junction Station forecourt; outside Lloyds Bank at Church Avenue; Thornton's Corner and possibly Kelsey Square.?

- (b) Can more seating be provided? If lower pedestrian footway lighting brackets are provided (para. 5) on lighting columns these could be designed to incorporate flower brackets. Councillor Tickner is very keen on this.
- (c) Why is there no design proposal indicated for incorporating the former public toilets garden into the street scene? This opportunity might be missed.
- (d) Are there any landscape improvements proposed for the War Memorial garden? Perhaps the “palm tree” might be replaced by a group of slender elegant trees. (The LBB Tree Officer’s advice could be beneficial).

## **8. Kelsey Square**

- (a) This is an important heritage location of statutorily listed buildings that need some renovation at least at street level. Currently the no entry sign to Burnhill Road eastbound has been turned round whilst the proposed exit into the High Street seems much over done with a variety of surfaces. Has there been provision for the HGVs leaving the Lidl store?
- (b ) Does the footway crossing to Cooper’s Mews need to be delineated? Is there to be a Bowie memorial feature included in the footway outside Zizzi’s

## **9. Key Symbols**

Some of the symbols shown and their correlation to the drawings are inconsistent and confusing and need to be clarified.

- (a) For example, several items that are shown in the key do not seem to be indicated on the drawings, e.g. cycle stands and any planned remaining guardrails.

(b) What are the blue oblong boxes shown on the kerb sides indicating?

A symbol is not shown on the key? Do they indicate highway drains?

## **10. Other Thoughts**

Will there be signs at the two junctions, on the approaches to Rectory Road, advising vehicles (especially heavy goods) to by-pass the High Street and proceed via Rectory Road?

- 11.** We are pleased to hear that TfL has approved the latest proposals thus allowing the purchase of the necessary materials needed for the overall scheme to begin in the relatively short term.

Cc: Councillors Tickner, Mellor and Wells.  
Stephen Oliver,

## **Beckenham Town Centre Working Group--Terms of Reference.**

### **Note from the Chairman**

It is some time since we reviewed the Working Group's objectives.

Some regular members of the Working Group have dropped out since we were set up by R&R and several new attendees come regularly. As Chairman I want the Working Group to stay focused on its objectives and suggest amendments where this has become appropriate in the passage of time.

### **The Terms of Reference**

The ToR of the original working group started in 2009 were:

*“To identify and scrutinise factors which particularly affect the economic sustainability of Beckenham and West Wickham Town Centres and suggest costed action proposals.”*

When the working group was re-convened by R&R PDS in 2012, the ToR were:

*“To review the OLF Round 2 proposals for Beckenham Town Centre and to recommend new proposals for the Town Centre to form the basis of an area based bid to TfL in 2012.”*

In early 2014 the ToR agreed by R&R PDS were as follows (and this has not been altered):

*“To provide design oversight and strategic guidance during the initial scheme design stage of Beckenham Town Centre.”*

Because this refers just to the initial design phase, it may need updating to something like:

*“To provide oversight and strategic guidance on the design and implementation of the improvement scheme for Beckenham town centre.”*

### **Recommendation**

Members are invited to make suggestions contributing to the formulation of a revised Terms of Reference.

This page is left intentionally blank