# DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 2 November 2021

**Present:**

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Yvonne Bear (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Julian Benington, Katy Boughey, Peter Dean, Simon Fawthrop, Christine Harris, Colin Hitchins, Samaris Huntington-Thresher, William Huntington-Thresher, Charles Joel, Josh King, Tony Owen, Richard Scoates and Kieran Terry

**Also Present:**

Councillors Michael Tickner and Stephen Wells

## 59 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Cllr Michael Turner. Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Terry.

## 60 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no additional declarations of interest.

## 61 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions were received.

## 62 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 31 AUGUST 2021

The minutes of the Developmental Control Committee held on 31 August 2021, were agreed and signed as a correct record.

## 63 DESIGNATION OF THE COVERT CONSERVATION AREA, THE THRIFTS CONSERVATION AREA AND THE EXTENSION OF THE CHISLEHURST ROAD CONSERVATION AREA
**Report HPR2021/055**

The report recommended the designation of the Covert Conservation Area, the Thrifts Conservation Area and the extension of the Chislehurst Road Conservation Area. The proposed boundaries were informed by an independent assessment and were subject to public consultation between October and December 2020. Details of the representations received and how these representations had been addressed were set out in the report.

Cllr Fawthrop opened the debate as local Ward Member and proposed an additional recommendation that the Article 4 Direction be progressed in accordance with the 'BEAMS' report.

The motion was seconded by Cllr Owen, put to the vote and CARRIED.

Cllr Fawthrop asked about the status of existing Article 4 Directions if the proposed Conservation Areas come into force. The Head of Planning Policy and Strategy confirmed that existing Article 4 Directions would remain in force.

Cllr Fawthrop highlighted that the purpose of the proposal was to preserve one of the few remaining garden suburbs in London. In the last few years, it had become apparent that there was a lack of consistency with the decisions of Planning Inspectors. At a meeting with the then Minister for Housing attended by Petts Wood Ward Councillors and the Chairman of the Development Control Committee, a recommendation was made by the then Minister for Housing that a Conservation Area should be pursued so that appeal decisions might be more consistent in future.

Cllr Fawthrop requested that the Article 4 Directions across the Conservation Areas and ASRCs be looked at to ensure they were consistent.

Cllr Fawthrop proposed that in order to enhance the Conservation Area in the future and protect against inappropriate development, the four houses in The Covert with no architectural merit that were currently excluded from the proposals be included. Cllr Fawthrop asked whether this would require further consultation. The Head of Planning Policy and Strategy considered that re-consultation would not be required but noted that any proposed areas to be added to the proposed Conservation Area must be justified in line with legislation.

The motion was seconded by Cllr Michael from the Chair, put to the vote and CARRIED.

**RESOLVED: That**

1. **The designation of the Covert Conservation Area (shown at Appendix 1 of the report), the Thrifts Conservation Area (shown at Appendix 2 of the report) and the extension of the Chislehurst Road Conservation Area (shown at Appendix 3 of the report) be endorsed.**
2. **The Article 4 Direction be progressed in accordance with the 'BEAMS' report.**
3. **In order to enhance the Conservation Area in the future and protect against inappropriate development, the four houses in The Covert with no architectural merit that were currently excluded from the proposals be included.**

## 64 BROMLEY HOUSING TRAJECTORY 2021
## Report HPR2021/056

National planning policy requires Local Planning Authorities to identify a supply of housing to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing target. Bromley's current five-year housing land supply (FYHLS) position was agreed by the Development Control Committee in September 2020. The report set out an updated housing trajectory, split into projections for years 1-5 (the FYHLS, covering 01/04/2021-31/03/2026), years 6-10 and years 11-15. The report concluded that the Council could not demonstrate a FYHLS, although the supply position had improved since publication of the last FYHLS position. Where a minimum of five years housing supply could not be demonstrated, the presumption in favour of sustainable development (set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF) was triggered.

In opening the discussion, the Chairman confirmed that the Council was now able to demonstrate 3.99 years and the figure was heading in the right direction but still fell short of the 5-year supply. Until such time as this figure was reached there would remain a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Members expressed concern that the current position left the Council vulnerable in terms of fighting appeals relating to large inappropriate developments.

The Vice-Chairman suggested that the Committee should receive an update every six months until a five-year housing land supply could be demonstrated. The Head of Planning Policy and Strategy confirmed that six-monthly updates would be possible, although completions were derived from an annual survey so any mid-year update would not provide the full picture.

In response to a question concerning practical measures that could be taken to improve the trajectory, the Head of Planning Policy and Strategy confirmed that there were a number of sites in the pipeline that could come forward to bridge the gap. However, the trajectory was based on sites with planning permission. There was a need to meet the definition of 'deliverable' and that essentially meant planning permission was required to include a site in the five year housing land supply.

In response to a question about using past over-supply of housing to compensate for future under-supply, the Head of Planning Policy and Strategy noted that there was no provision in national planning policy to factor in over-supply in previous years. Some Boroughs had unsuccessfully attempted to put forward that argument.

A Member read out the definition of Sustainable Development which was: "Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." It was noted that future generations with families were likely to want houses with gardens and space

to grow. Without offering this provision, the definition of sustainable development would not be met. It was suggested that the housing targets were arbitrary and unless there was some lobbying of Central Government, the resources available to future generations would be greatly diminished. It was recognised that the issue was not necessarily one of planning and that it was likely that political lobbying would be required. However, the report before the Committee highlighted the need for urgent action to be taken.

Cllr Fawthrop suggested that Crystal Palace Park ought to be available for housing development and urged fellow Committee Members to agree that this should be formally investigated, in particular, whether this could occur within the existing Crystal Palace Act.

Cllr Bear proposed that the Committee receive an update on the Bromley Housing Trajectory every six months. The motion was seconded by Cllr Terry, put to the vote and CARRIED.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

1. **The Bromley Housing Trajectory 2021 provided at Appendix 1 of the report, including the updated five-year housing land supply position for the period 01/04/2021-31/03/2026, be agreed.**
2. **The Committee receive an update on the Bromley Housing Trajectory every six months.**

## 65 INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING STATEMENT

The report sought the Committee's agreement to publish the second annual 'Infrastructure Funding Statement' for the 2020/21 financial year as required under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) by 31 December 2021. Under the Regulations the Council was designated as a 'contribution receiving authority' and was required to publish certain information in respect of S106 and CIL amounts collected.

The Infrastructure Delivery Team Leader briefly introduced the report, explaining that the London Borough of Bromley adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 15 June 2021. Consequently, CIL was not included in the report before the Committee, which covered the period up to April 2021.

Members noted that Section 106 funding was generally spent in accordance with legal agreements which specified how funds were spent. The CIL was more fluid and could be applied to current need.

In response to a question, the Infrastructure Delivery Team Leader confirmed that he had developed a good working relationship with the Clinical Commissioning Group and had engaged with the CCG to regarding use of S106 funding.

Cllr Joel requested that following the meeting further information concerning Farnborough Primary School be provided to him by email.

Cllr Bennington asked whether councillors could put forward individual projects to be funded by CIL. The Infrastructure Delivery Team Leader noted that it was up to the Council how CIL was spent and work was underway to establish a process for this. He noted that 15% of CIL was encouraged to be used for spending in neighbourhoods (usually aligned with priorities for Wards), with the remaining 85% focused on strategic infrastructure.

The Committee discussed the issue of carbon offsetting, noting that more funds had been received since the end of April 2021. It was suggested that some funds should be directed toward carbon management projects such as better insultation and heating systems. The Council's Energy Team were actively looking at spending Carbon Offsetting funds and a detailed breakdown of the current measures would be provided to Members following the meeting. The Committee noted that carbon offset was an established policy in the London Plan, although there was an increasing move towards onsite emission reduction. Investigations could be made into establishing a Council Policy through the Local Plan, which would require local evidence.

In response to a question, the Infrastructure Delivery Team Leader explained that Officers did not anticipate significant amounts of CIL coming through until 2023. However, where Members were able to identify specific projects associated with developments, these should be raised with the relevant service department.

**RESOLVED: That the Infrastructure Funding Statement at Appendix 1 of the report be approved, noting that it will be published on the Council's website by 31 December 2021 to comply with the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).**

## 66 SHOPFRONT DESIGN GUIDANCE IN BROMLEY

The Beckenham High Street Shop Fronts Design Guide had been submitted to the Council with a view to it being used to assess relevant planning applications in Beckenham Town Centre. The report considered this guide and recommended that it be used to inform the production of the Boroughwide shopfront design guidance in the Council's forthcoming Bromley Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

A report from the Beckenham Town Centre Team outlining the following amended recommendations from the Copers Cope Ward Members was tabled:

### 2. AMENDED RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED BY COPERS COPE WARD COUNCILORS

**2.1 That the Beckenham High Street Shop Fronts Design Guide be adopted forthwith to assess relevant planning applications in Beckenham Town Centre and be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, providing strong support for planning decisions where needed.**

**2.2 That the Beckenham High Street Shop Fronts Design Guide be used by the Council to inform the future production of borough-wide shopfront design guidance in the forthcoming Bromley Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.**

The report is attached at Appendix A to the minutes.

The Head of Planning Policy and Strategy introduced the report and recognised the time and effort that had gone into producing the guidance. He confirmed that whilst it was agreed that some guidance was useful, Boroughwide guidance was being developed and consequently the view of Officers was that there was not a specific need for location specific guidance. He also noted that the guidance itself was not specific to Beckenham. The Head of Planning Policy and Strategy recognised that in 2014, the Development Control Committee had noted the Chislehurst Design Guide with the intention of using this guide to inform the production of Boroughwide guidance. The intention was to now use the Beckenham Shop Fronts Design Guide and the Chislehurst Design Guide to inform the Boroughwide Design Guide which would be brought forward in early 2022. The Head of Planning Policy and Strategy set out the statutory process and Council committee process that adopted planning guidance must follow and noted that it would not be possible for the Committee to formally adopt a document without going through this process, which included six weeks' public consultation. The Head of Planning Policy and Strategy also noted that the Planning Policy and Strategy team are working on a number of other planning documents and that any request to progress a Beckenham-specific guide would not be prioritised above these other documents whose production has been approved by DCC and Executive in the Local Development Scheme which was approved in 2020. The Head of Planning Policy and Strategy considered that once a Bromley Design Guide incorporating shopfront guidance was published, there would be no need for additional documents covering shopfronts in specific areas.

Councillor Michael Tickner addressed the Committee as local Ward Member making the following points:

- The Committee had previously endorsed two Shop Front Design Guides: one for Bromley North and one for Chislehurst.
- If endorsed, the Shop Front Design Guidance would become a supplementary planning document supporting planning policy.
- The Design Guidance before the Committee had been produced by the Beckenham Town Team at the request of a previous Planning

Conservation Officer and reflected that Beckenham was a Conservation Area.

- The Beckenham Shop Front Design Guidance could be used to inform the production of Boroughwide guidance which had been in the developmental stages since 2014.
- There had been at least four instances where shop fronts in Beckenham had been radically altered without consent and this issue needed to be addressed along with other long standing planning issues.
- In Beckenham there was a strong Town Centre Team and the Beckenham Society. The professionals involved in these groups had worked together to produce guidance which could be heavily relied upon to inform the Boroughwide guidance. After three years' work, the guidance had been finalised and was before the Committee.
- The local Ward Councillors were asking the Committee to vote in favour of the alternative recommendation which incorporated the Officer recommendation.

In opening the discussion, the Chairman asked for confirmation of the timescales to transition the guidance before the Committee into working document were the Committee minded to approve. In response, the Head of Planning Policy and Strategy explained that his service was delivering a number of other workstreams, including the Boroughwide guidance, and the draft guidance would therefore come forward after those. Officers were unable to commit to reprioritising other work at this time.

In response to a question about an exact date when the borough wide guidance would come forward, the Head of Planning Policy and Strategy noted that the intention was to present the draft Boroughwide Design Guide to the Development Control Committee in March 2022. It would then need to go through the Renewal, Recreation and Housing PDS Committee and on to the Executive, ahead of public consultation

Members welcomed the excellent Beckenham High Street Shop Fronts Design Guide which they considered had been compiled by representatives of Beckenham and clearly set out expectations in terms of shop front design. Concerns were expressed that the Boroughwide Design guide had been in development for seven years. It was agreed that it was now time to progress the Boroughwide Design Guide and that the Beckenham Design Guide should be heavily relied upon in its production. In the meantime, it was suggested that the Beckenham Shop Front Design Guide should be adopted at the earliest opportunity.

In response to a question, the Head of Planning Policy and Strategy confirmed that neither the Chislehurst Design Guide nor the Bromley North Design Guide carried any weight in planning decisions as they were not formally adopted documents. In order for the Beckenham Design Guide to have more weight in term of defending planning appeals, a more formal statutory process would need to be followed involving public consultation.

Councillor Bear proposed acceptance of the Officer proposal that the Beckenham Design Guide be incorporated into the Boroughwide Design Guide for March 2022. In the interim, the Design Guide for Shop Fronts in Beckenham be informally approved and published on the Council website immediately.

The motion was seconded by Cllr William Huntington-Thresher, put to the vote and CARRIED unanimously.

In response to a question, the Head of Planning Policy and Strategy confirmed that neither the Design Guide for Chislehurst nor the Design Guide for Bromley North were formal documents and were therefore not published on the Council's website, although the Chislehurst Design Guide was available within the Development Control Committee papers in 2014.

Members expressed dismay that the Guides were not available on the website as they were frequently used by local Ward Councillors and local groups to inform planning applications. The Committee instructed Officers that the status of the Chislehurst and Bromley North Design Guides be established and that Officers develop a form of words to enable all the informal guides to be published on the Council's website as soon as possible to make the guides readily available to local residents. There would need to be a caveat that these documents were not formal policy but were there for assistance and guidance.

Cllr Samaris Huntington-Thresher proposed that Officers be instructed to investigate the status of the Chislehurst and Bromley North Design Guides and report back to the next ordinary meeting of the Committee.

The motion was seconded by Cllr Terry, put to the vote and CARRIED.

**RESOLVED THAT:**

1. **The Officer proposal that the Beckenham Design Guide be incorporated into the Boroughwide Design Guide for March 2022 be accepted. In the interim, the Design Guide for Shop Fronts in Beckenham be informally approved and published on the Council website immediately.**

2. **Officers be instructed to investigate the status of the Chislehurst and Bromley North Design Guides and report back to the next ordinary meeting of the Committee. The Bromley North and Chislehurst design guides are also published on the Council website as informal documents pending their incorporation into the design guide as well.**

## 67 LOCAL LIST OF VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS

National Government Guidance required Local Planning Authorities to undertake a regular review of their validation requirements for planning applications. It was necessary to ensure that the list remained fit for purpose in the context of changes to National Legislation and Development Plan Policies.

The document set out the level of information required by the local planning authority to support a planning application and was intended to explain clearly what plans and documents were required as part of a planning application to ensure that the Council could make transparent, well informed and robust decisions on planning applications in the public interest.

The intention was to clearly define the minimum amount of information required for proper assessment of an application. Requirements were not intended to be onerous and information would only be requested when it was necessary to enable full and proper assessment of a proposal.

The document was divided into two sections:

1. National and standard requirements for all application types (including householder applications)

2. Technical supporting statements/documents required for more complex applications (could be requested for householder applications if required, this will be determined on a case-by-case basis)

National requirements were set by Central Government and were consistent across all local planning authorities in England. These were set out on the Planning Portal. The local requirements must be prepared by each local planning authority and should be tailored to reflect the material planning considerations that were relevant for that area.

Planning legislation required that the local planning authority must review its local list every two years. As part of that process, the Council was required to consult on a draft local list and then formally publish the document, having taken any representations into consideration. A copy of the final local list must be made available on the Council's website and the list must be subsequently reviewed every two years.

A formal six week consultation period had been undertaken which ended on 24th September 2021. This comprised a consultation page on the Council's website. An email was sent to regular agents to advise them of the consultation, a notice was published in the local

press and notification text added to the planning application validation letter during that time.

The report set out the updated requirements and sought Members' agreement to the updated document.

In response to a question, the Head of Development Management confirmed that there was a requirement to update the document every two years, although there were no barriers to updating more frequently if necessary.

Members noted that the purpose of the document was to set out the information required when planning applications were submitted. Requirements around photographs had been strengthened.

It was further noted that details of the consultation process were set out in the report. In addition, the Head of Development Management confirmed that the majority of planning applications were submitted electronically. Where applicants indicated that they would struggle with electronic submission, Officers worked to assist the applicant. Electronic submission was not compulsory but encouraged as far as possible. Members noted that there was a requirement that drawings were to scale but dimensions were also accepted.

In relation to telecommunications infrastructure and the rollout of the 5G network, the Committee noted that the Local List of Validation Requirements would only apply to those masts requiring planning permission. All applications usually included a supporting statement which would provide the context of the provision of telecommunications masts. The Vice Chairman highlighted that the Council's Digital Strategy would focus on the positioning of telecommunications masts across the Borough and that dialogue between the Council and various providers was ongoing.

Officers agreed to review the ways in which planning site notices could be made more prominent. It was also agreed that future revisions to policy documents would be presented to the Committee with tracked changes clearly visible.

In response to a question from the Chairman concerning requirements for neighbour notifications, the Head of Development Management confirmed that there were different requirements for different applications. As a bare minimum, there was a requirement to display site notices or send a letter to any adjoining neighbour. It was noted that non-statutory notices had been reinstated as an additional layer of publicity.

**RESOLVED: That the revised Local List of Validation Requirements be formally adopted.**

p
The Meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chairman

**London Borough of Bromley DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held at Bromley Civic Centre on TUESDAY 2 NOVEMBER 2021 AT 7.00 PM**

**Agenda item 9 - SHOPFRONT DESIGN GUIDANCE**

**Report of the Beckenham Town Centre Team**

**2. AMENDED RECOMMENDATIONS PROPOSED BY COPERS COPE WARD COUNCILORS**

**2.1 That the Beckenham High Street Shop Fronts Design Guide be adopted forthwith to assess relevant planning applications in Beckenham Town Centre and be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, providing strong support for planning decisions where needed.**

**2.2 That the Beckenham High Street Shop Fronts Design Guide be used by the Council to inform the future production of borough-wide shopfront design guidance in the forthcoming Bromley Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.**

Issue

1. Beckenham TCT has worked since 2017 to produce a shop front guide for the Beckenham Conservation Area, at the request of the then Conservation Officer, Rob Buckley. In February this year, when it was almost complete, we were informed that it could not be used as a Bromley guide because it had not been written by Council officers and that it would therefore have no status. This was a shock and a blow to the eminent professionals who had produced the guide. There had been three years wasted effort. In collaboration with Copers Cope Ward Councilors, we ask that the Committee agree to adopt the Guide at least until such time as a Bromley wide Conservation Guide is produced, so that the TCT can actively promote its good practice.

Consideration

2. Beckenham Conservation Area was approved by the Development Control Committee on 24 March 2015. The proposal for a conservation area to cover all of Beckenham's High Street and parts of some immediate surrounding streets had been promoted by the Beckenham Town Centre Working Group chaired by Cllr Tickner, a formally constituted working group under Renewal and Recreation Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee. The Working Group was serviced by Council officers.

3. Beckenham TCT is comprised of three Residents' Associations, The Beckenham Society, Beckenham Business Association, Beckenham Together (the BID), Safer Neighbourhood Panels, Churches Together, Beckenham Rotary and a freeholder of a parade along Beckenham High Street. It was set up on the recommendation of Cllr Tickner and formed a consultative body for residual issues of the Beckenham Town Centre Public Realm Improvement Project. The initial aim of the TCT, set up in 2013, was to consider how best to invest the remainder of the £200K capital improvement funds for Beckenham and report back to the Council Working Group – the minutes of the working group will reflect the TCTs role. The TCT's formal inauguration was attended by Ward Councilors and Council Officers, and until the Beckenham BID was formed, Bromley Council Town Centre Management Officers sat on the TCT. Further the TCT was for many years a member of the ATCM a recognised body for Town Management, and Town Teams are a recognised type of community group by Council's across the country. At no time were we told we needed to get some other official accreditation as a "relevant neighbourhood forum", nor that our Town Team is not recognised in this capacity.

4. On 8 August 2017, the then Conservation Officer, Rob Buckley, attended a TCT meeting and asked TCT to draft a shop front guide to be incorporated into a Bromley CA guide. He cited the Chislehurst precedent.

5. Therefore, the statement in para 3.2 of the committee paper that *"nor was its production specifically encouraged by any Council decision*" is not wholly accurate. It is true that no committee specifically asked us to produce the guide, but we were specifically asked to produce it by a senior officer and encouraged to do so by the official working group. We had no reason to question that this was a legitimate and fully supported project.

6. Eminent local professionals and well regarded experienced local resident and business association members worked to produce the guide. Dr John Parker, Member of the RIBA, Fellow of the RTPI and Fellow of RSA, was in the lead. David Wood, the chair of the Council's own Advisory Panel on Conservation Areas also played a substantial role and Colin Hughes provided technical and practical expertise from his work on IT and shop design. Jackie Groundsell (recent former Chair, Beckenham Business Association), Chloe-Jane Ross (Chair, Copers Cope Area Residents Association), Marsha Berg (West Beckenham Residents Association) Marie Pender (Chair, West Beckenham Residents Association) made a significant contribution to the Beckenham Public Realm improvements project and continued that work in support of this guide. The previous Conservation Officer, Robert Buckley was consulted in the scope and development of the guide. The

current Conservation Officer, Simon Went, has been consulted throughout on the drafting of the guide and kept informed of progress right up the production of a near final version in February this year. We understand that the quality of the document is not questioned.

7. As far as the comment in papa 3.4 is concerned, that the guide "*does not reflect the most up to date planning policy*", we were in the process of updating the planning policy context when we were told, quite abruptly, via the conservation officer, that the document could not be used in any shape or form. We have had no direct communication from the planning officers. We consider it would have been courteous to have explained the situation direct to Beckenham TCT rather than have a two line email message delivered by the conservation officer. Nevertheless we would like to work with the planning officers to update the policy content.

8. Also, referring to para 3.5, any guide will of course, "*not <u>prevent</u> those who are ignorant or intent on breaching planning regulations*". It can however help to prevent ignorance. There continue to be illicit shop front renewals in Beckenham on a monthly basis. One aim in producing the guide is to circulate it among agents and consultants to help owners to avoid expensive alterations which subsequently have to be corrected at unnecessary additional expense. Early adoption of the Guide will also help to protect valuable historical features – it is too late to take enforcement action when the features are already in a skip. We cannot see why the guide cannot be adopted by the Council and circulated in Beckenham as a precursor to the Bromley wide CA. The fact that it uses specific Beckenham illustrations is surely a good thing.

9. A considerable amount of work has gone into this document, produced on the suggestion of a Council officer and with the support of the properly constituted working group. We want to work co-operatively with our planning officers on any local issues. We are available to provide local knowledge to help develop policy and its local application, for example on Article 4 Directions. If local groups can help the Council's finances by volunteering for physical work such as Tree Friends, Snow Friends, Friends of parks and open spaces, why cannot we provide intellectual input in written form to save the Council money?

10. We note the recommendation that the Guide be "*used by the Council to inform the production of borough wide shop front design guidance in the forthcoming Bromley Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document*." However we also note that this Document has been "forthcoming" since 2014, when the same was said of the Chislehurst Guide.

Conclusions

11. If the Committee endorses the Guide, the Beckenham Town Team aims to be proactive in taking a forward leaning role in engaging with lessors and agents when shops are being changed to promote the Conservation Area and signpost them to Council planning information – we can provide on the ground information as works occur to minimise unauthorised changes and encourage enhancements that improve the Conservation Area. We look forward to working with Council Officers in this aim.

12. We therefore ask that the Council endorse our Document, and we hope that the proposed amended recommendation by Copers Cope Councilors can be accepted by the Committee.

Signatories

Chloe Jane Ross, Chair Beckenham TCT and Chair Copers Cope Area Residents' Association
Marie Pender Secretary Beckenham TCT and Chair West Beckenham Residents' Association
John Parker and David Wood, The Beckenham Society
Colin Hughes, Beckenham Business Association
Tony Powers Beckenham Rotary
Joan Conway, Beckenham Churches Together
Marsha Berg, Safer Neighbourhood Panels
Jackie Groundsell, 1230 The Women's Company Ltd