

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

BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 20 April 2017

Present:

Councillor Michael Tickner (Chairman)

Marsha Berg, (Beckenham Business Association)
Jackie Groundsell, (Beckenham Business Association)
Alan Old, (Copers Cope Residents Association)
Janice Pilgrim, (Kent Association for the Blind)
David Wood, (The Beckenham Society)
Kevin Munnely, (LBB Head of Renewal and Recreation)
Stephen Oliver, (LBB Senior Planning Officer)
Tina Slater, (Environment & Community Services)
Garry Warner, (LBB Head of Traffic Management)
Stephen Wood, (LBB Committee Secretary)
Helen McConnell (FM Conway)

Also present:

Terence Stanley (Beckenham Resident)
Nick Goy (Beckenham Resident)
Susan Ryle (Beckenham Resident)
Alice Marsh (Beckenham Forum Website)
Gillian Morphy (Beckenham Resident)

122	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
	<p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ian Dunn, Marie Pender, Cliff Watkins, Gail Low. Councillor Russell Mellor, Councillor Wells, Councillor Collins and Chloe-Jane Ross.</p> <p>Apologies were also received from Martin Pinell-Head of Town Centre Management & Business Support.</p>
123	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9TH MARCH 2017
	<p>Amendments to the previously published minutes had been submitted by Mr Nick Goy. The minutes had been revised and republished accordingly.</p> <p>With the incorporation of these adjustments, the minutes were agreed as a correct record.</p>

124	MATTERS ARISING
	<p>CSD 17066</p> <p>The Matters Arising report noted that pollution readings could be taken from the diffusion tube at Beckenham Road, but that this would not provide an accurate reading with respect to Rectory Road.</p> <p>The Chairman requested that pollution readings be taken from the diffusion tube at Beckenham Road. The readings requested were historical, current, and subsequent to the cessation of the Major Scheme works.</p> <p>Mr Warner assured that this was possible, and that he would ensure that the data was provided.</p> <p>RESOLVED that pollution level data be provided to the Working Group in due course.</p>
125	MAJOR SCHEME UPDATE
	<p>It was noted that the Major Scheme was now in the implementation stage, and Mr Warner provided a verbal update regarding the phasing plan.</p> <p>The Group was informed that Mr Warner attended on site most days, and that he also met with Mr Oliver once a week. Phase 1 was running according to schedule. The area around Beckenham Junction was due for re-surfacing next week, and the previous box junction would no longer be present. Mr Warner was waiting for details of the planters from FM Conway.</p> <p>It was noted that at the junction where Albemarle Road met the High Street and Southend Road, there were issues with traffic turning right out of Albemarle Road, causing delays. Mr Warner stated that at the junction it was not intended to use right turn boxes or filter arrows as there should be enough capacity for vehicles to turn right.</p> <p>Marsha Berg enquired what was happening with the proposed seat that was due to be located outside of the taxi office at Beckenham Junction. Mr Oliver clarified that this had not yet been installed as negotiations were ongoing with Network Rail.</p> <p>Mr Wood had brought in some colour photographs of the new granite paving that had been laid. The paving looked dirty and in need of cleaning. Mr Warner explained that there would be remnants of cement on the paving, and that the area was still really a 'building site'. The paving was due to be jet washed the following week. There was a brief discussion concerning whether or not the jet</p>

washing would incorporate the use of detergent. Marsha Berg suggested that perhaps businesses could be incentivised to clean the pavements outside of their premises. One way to incentivise could be by way of a small reduction in business rates.

One of the premises highlighted was the kebab shop near the Bridge Bar. The Bridge Bar owner (who owned several shops in the vicinity-including the kebab shop) had been approached concerning the dirty pavement outside of the kebab shop. He stated that the staff working at the kebab shop cleaned up every night.

Mr Goy commented that the additional cleaning budget for Bromley North light yellow paving was in the region of £40-£70k and enquired if the rest of the paving in Beckenham could be laid as dark red brindle bricks as opposed to light grey granite slabs, to reduce cleaning costs and because he felt it would look better. Mr Munnelly stated that this would not be possible as the paving for the scheme had been designated as grey granite. A budget had been incorporated into the scheme for cleaning costs. He was confident that when the work had been completed, and everything had been washed and bedded in, that the quality of the final design would be manifest.

There was some discussion amongst Group members concerning the colour of the granite paving. The paving was supposed to have an element of pink mixed with grey; some Group members expressed the view that there was no sign of the pink colouration. Mr Goy was disappointed with the grey granite paving and expressed the view that the paving was not of a high quality, just looking like common concrete slabs but showing dirt and stains more quickly. Mr Munnelly stated that he would seek confirmation from the contractors that the paving was the correct specification.

The Chairman said that Mr Goy's suggestion was fair, but the newly-laid granite paving at Beckenham Junction should be assessed after jet-washing on the weekend.

Helen McConnell (FM Conway) advised that the bus stop by the Coppers restaurant needed to be moved to the kerb line, and that TfL would be dealing with this. In the next few weeks, work would be undertaken by the Public Hall, where burnt ochre paving would be laid. Stephen Oliver confirmed the brick colour as 'burnt ochre' not 'brindle'.

The Chairman hoped that licensees would apply for the relevant licences required to provide tables and chairs outside. He hoped that a continental café style culture could be promoted in Beckenham. Mr Munnelly pointed out that such arrangements would need to ensure that they did not infringe on wheelchair mobility and did not adversely affect individuals with visual impairments- a case by case

	<p>approach was required.</p> <p>No negative comments had been received concerning the contractors, and several positive comments had been received by the Beckenham Business Association, and passed to Helen McConnell.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the Major Scheme update be noted.</p>
126	<p>AREA CPZ AND OFF STREET PARKING REVIEW</p>
	<p>Mr Warner briefed the Group concerning the Burnhill Road site meeting. The meeting had been well attended and Lidl's delivery contractor (DHL) had been present. New road markings and yellow lines had been laid and new parking restrictions had been implemented. Gillian Morphy stated that in the residential parking area by Lidl's, there was not enough room for the delivery lorry to turn from Fairfield Road into Burnhill Road without mounting the pavement. Mr Wood highlighted that as Burnhill Road was in a Conservation Area, the yellow lines that had been laid were too thick, and they would need to be removed and re-painted.</p> <p>The area around 5-7 Kelsey Square was mentioned. In this area there were no parking restrictions. It was noted that parking restrictions were going to be implemented to prevent individuals from parking there all day. This was an issue that would be dealt with outside of the project.</p> <p>The Chairman requested that outside of the traffic exit from the Odeon Cinema car park, either signage or an arrow be painted on to the road to show that exiting traffic could turn left only.</p> <p>There was a discussion concerning parking and loading bays and it was felt that Beckenham needed a comprehensive parking review. Marsha Berg expressed the view that CPZ (Controlled Parking Zone) signs should not be displayed on long poles. Mr Warner commented that the signage had to be visible. The Chairman suggested that as CPZ signs were hard to understand, perhaps LBB should use explanatory signs in addition to standard signage.</p> <p>Members felt that there had been a lack of communication and information disseminated by TfL. They felt that more information should be disseminated concerning construction phase changes, bus diversions, and new temporary locations of bus stops.</p> <p>RESOLVED that a comprehensive CPZ review of Beckenham be undertaken and a report be presented to the Group in due course.</p>
127	<p>UPDATE ON BUS DIVERSIONS</p>

	<p>David Wood stated that the public were not aware of where the buses were now stopping during the current phase of the project. He expressed concern that not enough information and explanation was being provided by TfL.</p> <p>Tina Slater responded that TfL were conscious that there had been communication issues, and that they were taking steps to remedy this. The Chairman commented that the matter of communication should have been thought through.</p> <p>RESOLVED that TfL be invited to the next meeting.</p>
<p>128</p>	<p>TOWN TEAM UPDATE</p>
	<p>Mr Old raised the issue of the Christmas tree lights on the Green. He asked if the lights would be able to extend around the corner to Albemarle Road. Mr Munnelly responded that this had only been raised recently and was being looked into. It was suggested that this should be a matter to be incorporated onto the next agenda.</p> <p>The Group heard that the Town Team had met recently and had discussed the Heritage Trail, the Beckenham Green canopy and issues concerning TfL.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the matter of Christmas tree lights be added as an agenda item for the next meeting.</p>
<p>129</p>	<p>FLAG RAISING CEREMONY FOR THE PURPLE FLAG</p>
	<p>Cllr Wells had emailed the Chairman prior to the meeting, expressing concern at the size of the flagpole. He felt it was not long enough. He also noted that there was no sign of illumination. Mr Oliver responded that the pole length was as specified in the Major Scheme plans and that six metres in length was a standard specification that had been used in other boroughs.</p> <p>Mr Goy echoed Cllr Wells' concerns on the 'dwarf' pole; with a 1.5m wide flag, hanging down further, it could be a grabbing challenge for a person standing on another's shoulders.</p> <p>Tina Slater informed the Group that no date had yet been received from LBB Planning Department to hear the planning application for the flagpole. This was delaying the siting of the Purple Flag. Permission was not required for the associated plaque.</p> <p>The Chairman remarked that perhaps the flagpole could be erected and a retrospective planning application be submitted. The Chairman asked to be informed if the application for the flagpole was</p>

not presented to Plans Sub Committee 3 on 11th May.

Post meeting note:

The date of the Plans Sub Committee 3 has been moved from 11th May to 9th May. The flagpole is on the agenda.

The web link to the planning application is:

<http://cde.bromley.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=126&MId=5796&Ver=4>

Marsha Berg expressed the view that many residents did not understand the meaning of the Purple Flag, and that more publicity was required to remedy this. The Chairman suggested a target date for the raising of the Purple Flag of 19th May at 8.00pm.

The Purple Flag plaque was made of stainless steel. The wording on the plaque was, *"This Purple Flag is in recognition of Beckenham's safe, diverse and vibrant night-time economy."*

Illumination could be achieved via the lamp column adjacent to the pole. There would be a cost for this, which would be advised by Street Lighting and would depend on what kind of additional equipment was needed.

Mr Goy sought assurances that the illumination would not shine into flats above shops in Rectory Road. He was informed that the beam would be vertically upward.

Ms Slater updated the Group concerning plans to apply for a renewal of the Purple Flag. The renewal bid had to be finalised by the end of June 2017. A draft of the bid would be circulated to the Group by the end of May for comments. In preparation for this, various data streams were being collated. This would include data about crime, health, alcohol, and public perceptions of Beckenham.

A perceptions survey was currently being circulated; this could be found at the following web link: <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/7CN3D5J>. The link had been disseminated to Copers Cope Area Residents Association and West Beckenham Residents' Association, as well as Councillors.

RESOLVED that

(1) The Chairman be informed if the application for the flagpole was not presented to Plans Sub Committee 3 on 11th May.

(2) Subject to planning permission, the target date for the raising of the Purple Flag would be Friday 19th May at 8.00pm.

	<p>(3) A draft of the bid for the renewal of the Purple Flag accreditation would be circulated to the Group by the end of May for comment.</p>
<p>130</p>	<p>BECKENHAM GREEN CANOPY</p>
	<p>Chloe-Jane Ross had emailed details of a possible new canopy design to Mr Oliver, and the pictures were circulated to the Group. A positive aspect regarding the proposed canopy design, was that it only had one leg. This was helpful because of the extensive tree roots beneath the current structure. It was stated the canopy was made of a composite material.</p> <p>Mr Goy queried the ability to add temporary sides for rain and wind protection of electrical equipment and performers. He was informed the manufacturer did not include this feature but the canopy might be capable of modification.</p> <p>Mr Old stated that he still favoured a design competition for a new canopy.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the Group continue with the original idea of a design competition for a new canopy on Beckenham Green, and that Mr Old would help in formulating the design brief.</p>
<p>131</p>	<p>BID DEVELOPMENT</p>
	<p>Ms Slater provided the BID update:</p> <p>Talks with businesses indicated that the improvement works were currently having a negative effect concerning the BID concept. Therefore the Ballot Day for the BID had been re-scheduled to 28 Feb 2018. This would be twelve months into the improvements, with some positive visuals on what the finished work would look like. The revised timescale would hopefully increase the possibility of a successful outcome in the Bid Ballot.</p> <p>LBB had completed the feasibility study and were now progressing the planning stage, which would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-depth consultation with businesses and marketing campaigns to raise awareness with local traders. • Core businesses had been identified to form the shadow Steering Group for the BID. The initial meeting would be arranged for mid-May 2017 where CMS would present their consultation questionnaire for approval by the group. (CMS were Central Management Solutions and were LBB's BID consultants).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CMS would attempt to consult with every rate paying business included in the BID area, aiming at a 45% minimum response rate – the exact BID area was still to be determined and LBB would be guided by CMS and the responses to the questionnaire. • CMS would then draft a business plan for discussion with the group during the summer, with the final draft to be approved by the Steering Group by the beginning of August 2017. <p>The campaign stage to encourage businesses to vote positively for a BID would commence in November, but would not be vigorously campaigned over the Christmas period. It would re-commence in mid-January 2018, building up to the ballot on 28 February 2018, with results due on 1 March 2018.</p> <p>Susan Ryall made the point that that there may be a conflict of interest between businesses and rate payers. In response, assurances were made that the Town Centre Team would be working closely with local residents to get their views and keep them informed.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the BID update be noted.</p>
132	HERITAGE PLAQUES UPDATE
	<p>The Group heard that the suggested wordings for the plaques would be published when consultations were complete. The plaques would be sited in the pavement. All of the plaques would be laid at the same time at the end of the project in August 2018.</p> <p>Mr Wood stated that the ‘Walk around Beckenham’ publication would be republished with a link online.</p>
133	ANY OTHER BUSINESS-- PREVIOUSLY NOTIFIED
	<p>It was noted that Beckenham Business Association and LBB had been working together on a leaflet for delivery to residents, retailers and businesses. The leaflet would provide details of parking and bus routes during the High Street Improvement works.</p> <p>The Chairman asked those present how many leaflets they would like for delivery to their various organisations and where the leaflets should be delivered to. Anyone requiring leaflets was advised to contact Jackie Groundsell for further information.</p> <p>Helen McConnell advised that the yellow information signs were now ready and would be fixed to lampposts during the next two weeks.</p> <p>Mr Wood commented that nobody knew what was happening with</p>

	<p>respect to the lighting for the project. The Chairman responded that this was a matter that had been discussed at previous meetings. Mr Warner reported that the new lighting was being installed the following week. Lighting would be fixed on buildings where possible. Mr Goy asked if the lighting would be able to give out a warm orange glow. Mr Warner answered that the lighting would be a white LED light.</p>
134	DATE OF NEXT MEETING
	<p>The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Thursday 22nd June at 7.30pm.</p> <p>A prior walking inspection of the High Street works was agreed, for those interested, commencing at 7pm at Beckenham Junction Station forecourt, continuing on to the Beckenham Library meeting.</p>

The Meeting ended at 9.30 pm

This page is left intentionally blank