

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

BECKENHAM TOWN CENTRE WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30pm on 21 September 2017

Present:

Councillor Michael Tickner (Chairman)
Councillor Vanessa Allen

Marsha Berg, (Beckenham Business Association)
Jackie Groundsell, (Beckenham Business Association)
Colin Hughes, (Langley Park Residents' Association)
Marie Pender, (West Beckenham Residents' Association)
Janice Pilgrim, (Kent Association for the Blind)
Chloe-Jane Ross, (Copers Cope Area Residents' Association)
Sue Woodward, (West Beckenham Residents' Association)
David Wood, (The Beckenham Society)
Lorraine McQuillan, (LBB Town Centres and BID Development Manager)
Kevin Munnely, (LBB Head of Renewal and Recreation)
Stephen Oliver, (LBB Senior Planning Officer)
Sylvia Ramos, (LBB Project Planning Officer)
Garry Warner, (LBB Head of Highways and Traffic Management)
Derek Sampson (FM Conway)
Stephen Wood, (LBB Committee Secretary)

Also present:

Nick Goy, (Beckenham Resident)
Gillian Morphy, (Beckenham Resident)
Terry Stanley, Beckenham Resident
Sarah Niblock, (Beckenham Resident)

149	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
	<p>Apologies for absence were received from Gail Low, Dr John Parker, and Councillor Russell Mellor.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Ian Dunn, and Councillor Vanessa Allen attended as substitute.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Helen O'Connell (FM Conway) Susan Ryall and Alan Old.</p>

150	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22ND JUNE 2017
	The minutes of the meeting held on 22 nd June 2017 were agreed and signed as a correct record.
151	MATTERS ARISING REPORT
	<p>CSD 17113</p> <p>The Group noted progress on matters arising from previous meetings. The update concerning the matter of Network Rail and the bench outside of Beckenham Junction Train Station would be discussed in the Major Scheme update.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the Matters Arising Report be noted.</p>
152	MAJOR SCHEME UPDATE
	<p>Mr Munnelly assured that the major scheme work was making good progress and was on schedule. There had been minor delays completing works in the Beckenham Green area. There was a gap in the brickwork near the planters. This was because the contractors were waiting for delivery of the green bricks that would spell out the name, 'Beckenham Green'. It was anticipated that this work would be completed during the next five weeks. Some of the lamp columns had been dug up and re-instated. Some electrical work was still required to be completed by UK Power Networks.</p> <p>Mr Munnelly informed the Group that the phase 3 work at Thornton's Corner was well advanced, and that a good space had been created for pedestrians. Orders had been placed for the phase 4 work around Village Way.</p> <p>The contractors would be pulling off site at the end of November, and traffic would revert to two way; work would re-commence in the second week of January. Mr Munnelly felt that work was generally going well, with minimum disruption. Communication had been good, and the Beckenham Business Association had been regularly updated.</p> <p>The Chairman asked about the re-order of the granite. It was confirmed that the new granite had arrived, and that it was pink. Mr Goy asked if it was the correct granite as he felt that the pink colouration was very hard to see. The Chairman asked if the granite was porous, and it was clarified that granite was not a porous material. It would require jet washing to be cleaned properly. Mr Munnelly assured that a budget was available for jet washing, and that enhanced cleaning would be incorporated into any future contracts. The granite areas were likely to be jet-washed quarterly.</p>

Jackie Groundsell was concerned that the cost of jet-washing may be borne by the BID. It was clarified that this was not the case and that LBB would be bearing the cost.

Chloe-Jane Ross remarked that a more stringent cleaning regime may be required for outside of the Kebab Shop, and that jet washing quarterly was not sufficient.

The Group discussed matters relating to bus stops. It was noted that when the work paused for the Christmas break, all of the bus routes would return to their pre-scheme operations; this included Rectory Road. The Group heard that some bus stops had been removed during the course of the major scheme work. It was anticipated that these bus stops would be re-instated over the Christmas break, but it was likely that liaison with TfL would be required for clarification.

Sarah Niblock stated that there were many kerbs in the front of the High Street that were chipped. Assurance was provided to the Group that any damage to the kerbs would be made good.

Janice Pilgrim referred to perceived issues with the tactile paving by the crossing near to Beckenham Junction Station. The Chairman asked Ms Pilgrim to make a basic plan for the engineers so that they could investigate further.

Post Meeting Note 1:

Janice Pilgrim supplied the following information for clarification:

The issue: Tactile paving at controlled crossings

The location: The controlled crossings at the corner of Albemarle Road and Southend Road, on the O'Neill's side of Southend Road, by the estate agent.

The problem: Tactile paving has been laid at each crossing, but the guidelines for this state that the 'tail' that crosses the main pavement (approximately perpendicular to the kerb) should extend back either to the building line or a distance of five metres from the kerb.

The tactile paving at the other controlled crossings laid so far do meet the national guidelines, however the tails on the aforementioned locations do not extend far enough. As a result, people with very low or no vision, which is a surprisingly large number particularly on a bright day when the sunlight is dazzling, will walk right past the crossing and will not be able to locate it if the tactile 'tail' stops too close to the crossing itself.

While the dimensions of the tactile paving at other newly laid controlled crossings in the High Street do meet the national

guidelines, the colour contrast is not as great as had been hoped as the brindled paving is more “red” than the “earth” coloured sample at the chicken shop appeared to be. Hopefully the colour contrast will be sufficient to distinguish the crossing from the surrounding paving.

Post Meeting Note 2:

Sarah Niblock has sent in photos of damaged paving, and these will be emailed out with the minutes.

Nick Goy expressed the view that the tactile paving near to ‘Snappy Snacks’ and elsewhere was too short and it was at an unusual angle to the crossings by the former public toilets. Mr Munnelly assured that the relevant guidance pertaining to conservation areas was being adhered to, and that the original plans showed the tactile paving.

Mr Goy expressed the view that the tree roots from the planters at Beckenham Green had been exposed for too long. Mr Oliver responded that no problems had been reported by the Tree Officer.

Mr Goy complained about ‘random protrusions’ on kerb and parking bays paving bricks, and expressed the view that they were a trip hazard. Mr Munnelly responded that parking bays needed to show textual and visual changes, and that the bays corresponded to the relevant design parameters and took into account mobility issues. The kerbs were high, but they corresponded to the crop top design that had been specified from the onset.

Mr Goy further complained that the wider pavements were being used by cafes for al fresco dining. He expressed the view that this made it difficult for pedestrians to navigate the footways. Also, the public could not determine whether the cafés were exceeding the area allowed. The Chairman responded that he was pleased that al fresco style dining was taking place. He added that eating establishments providing al fresco dining had to apply for a licence, and that the licence would impose certain restrictions. The licences would normally be displayed in shop windows.

Chloe-Jane Ross felt that the work around Beckenham Green was taking too long. She also felt that the Green and the surrounding area were messy and untidy. Garry Warner asked if FM Conway could undertake a litter pick up as soon as possible. The Chairman was hopeful that this could be done the next day (22nd September) as there was going to be a market held on the Saturday (23rd September).

Marie Pender drew attention to a gas monitoring valve outside Lloyds Bank that needed either to be moved or camouflaged. She felt that something should be done with it to stop people falling over

it.

David Wood stated that the paving around St George's Church had not been finished on one side. He asked if this could be rectified so there was not a change in paving material halfway down a property frontage. (Post-meeting note from David Wood: the adjoining attractive listed St Georges' alms houses ought also to have the new brick paving).

Gillian Morphy highlighted a lip on a dropped kerb in Church Avenue (on the opposite side to the bank), and asked if this could be checked. She felt that the kerb and the road were not as flush as those at the junction cross roads. There was still a lip which caused jolting in wheelchairs and Ms Morphy had seen a lady trip there. She understood that there had to be a significant difference in height for it to be considered a trip hazard and was unsure if it would meet the criteria. She hoped that FM Conway would be able to lay the rest of the dropped kerbs to the excellent standard they had displayed at Beckenham Junction. Garry Warner said the tolerance was 6mm.

The matter of the proposed long bench outside of Beckenham Junction was discussed. Mr Oliver explained that Network Rail were asking for £10k to engage, with another £5k for legal costs. The Group had to make a decision based on this information, as to whether or not the matter of the bench was really a priority. The minicab firm reportedly considered it would reintroduce congregating nuisance--removed when the low car park wall was removed. Mr Wood and Mr Goy considered the long bench would be an obstacle to commuters leaving the station in large numbers normally or in an emergency. The Group decided that the bench was not a priority, and should be abandoned. A 'legible London' street map here was still proposed.

The Group discussed telephone boxes that had become an eyesore. Many of these had received planning permission in the 1990's and were principally lucrative advertising surfaces for the owning companies, eg. 'New World'. New planning permission had been refused. Mr Munnelly estimated that the cost of removal of the boxes would be in the region of £10k to £15k. The Chairman requested a report on telephone boxes in Beckenham to assess the best way forward.

Marsha Berg also requested any action possible to deal with untidy unsecured cables on building frontages.

RESOLVED that:

(1) A cleaning test on the granite slabs be undertaken before the next meeting

	<p>(2) Liaison is undertaken with TfL to clarify if removed bus stops would be re-instated during the period of the Christmas Break</p> <p>(3) Damaged or chipped kerbs in the High Street would be repaired or replaced</p> <p>(4) Janice Pilgrim to submit a diagram to the engineers to highlight the location of the tactile paving which she felt was problematic, with a note to explain what the issue was</p> <p>(5) FM Conway to carry out a litter pick up exercise in the Beckenham Green area as soon as possible</p> <p>(6) The plan to locate a long bench outside of Beckenham Junction Station be abandoned</p> <p>(7) A report on telephone boxes in Beckenham be drafted for the next meeting</p>
<p>153</p>	<p>UPDATE ON RECTORY ROAD-PEDESTRIAN REFUGE AND NEW MINI ROUNDABOUT</p>
	<p>A design had been put forward for a new pedestrian refuge. It had to be decided if this would be a temporary or permanent solution. Mr Warner explained that the cost of a temporary or permanent solution would be the same. The Chairman felt that the refuge was required immediately. Mr Warner stated that this matter had been looked at previously. Sarah Niblock stated that there were already two refuges in Rectory Road (by the tram stop and at the traffic lights), and so there was no requirement for a third. She felt that this would cause extra problems with traffic congestion. She suggested that the Group go and have a look for themselves at the existing crossing and refuge. A possibility was that the existing refuge be removed, and an alternate be located at Stop G.</p> <p>Mr Munnelly asked if this could be reviewed in six months.</p> <p>Mr Warner stated that the matter of a roundabout at the junction with Blakeney Road had been looked at three or four years ago, and no evidence had been forthcoming to justify a roundabout going in. The safety engineers had looked into the matter previously. The Chairman expressed the view that the roundabout was a good idea as it would slow traffic and prevent accidents. Mr Goy said that as a cyclist he found the existing configuration with the 'right turn pocket lane' provided a safe place to wait out of the main traffic flow on the bending road.</p> <p>RESOLVED that the issue of pedestrian refuges in Rectory Road be reviewed in 6 months time.</p>

154	REPORT ON PUBLIC/ DIGITAL DISPLAY BOARDS
	<p>Lorraine McQuillan explained that digital display boards were very expensive, and that a high end model would be required to be effective. She felt that it was not value for money to progress any further with the idea.</p> <p>The display boards had the facility to generate income from advertising-- however the general view was that they should primarily be for community notices.</p> <p>Mr Goy opined that what the public required was just to be able to insert a piece of paper into a board, and not to have to use USBs and cloud technology.</p> <p>RESOLVED that</p> <p>(1) The three existing notice boards be replaced and upgraded by cleaning, illumination and lowering as required. Kevin Munnely confirmed that a budget was available for this.</p> <p>(2) One of the notice boards should be disabled friendly.</p>
155	UPDATE ON PROGRESS BEING MADE WITH THE PARKING REVIEW
	<p>It had been resolved at the previous meeting that an independent report concerning parking in Beckenham be drafted by the Beckenham Town Team. This report was presented to the Group for consideration.</p> <p>The report suggested eight objectives that would improve the parking provision in Beckenham. The review reported on consistency of parking, a review of the charging structure, the creation of new parking provision and that parking information should be made easier to understand. It was suggested in the report that planned CPZ changes should be re-considered.</p> <p>The report outlined a way forward and made three recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Working Group to endorse the objectives of the report • That detailed maps and revenue/usage data be provide to the Town Centre Team • The TCT to prepare a proposal to change parking provision-- to be endorsed by the Working Group.

	<p>RESOLVED that:</p> <p>(1) The Working Group endorse the objectives of the Parking Review document that had been written by the Beckenham Town Team</p> <p>(2) The Town Centre Team prepare a proposal to change parking provision to be endorsed by the Working Group</p> <p>(3) Once the proposal has been endorsed, it should be submitted to the Environment Portfolio Holder for consideration.</p> <p>(4) More information on revenues and usage be provided to the Town Centre Team.</p>
156	TOWN CENTRE TEAM UPDATE
	<p>It was noted that no funding would be forthcoming from the London Mayor for the David Bowie memorial project. The TCT (Town Centre Team) were looking at alternate funding streams. The Group heard that the amount of funding required was £30k. Mr Munnely asked if a temporary mural may be possible. Chloe-Jane Ross responded that the TCT did not want a graffiti image, but an image of better quality. It was possible that crowd funding could still be used. It was the general consensus that a graffiti type image was not suitable for Beckenham.</p>
157	UPDATE ON THE CHRISTMAS LIGHTS
	<p>The Group heard that LBB had provided the Town Centre Team (TCT) with £6.5k towards the cost of the Christmas lights. The work would be undertaken by John Packmore. The TCT were hoping for a Christmas event on the Green. The impressive artificial Christmas tree frame at Shortlands was noted. It was hoped that Beckenham could have a similar type of tree on the Green, but extra funding would be required for this. The tree (if acquired) could be located opposite Gallery 17 in the tree pit. It was possible that either the BID or Regency Cars may contribute towards the cost of ongoing storage.</p>
158	UPDATE ON BECKENHAM GREEN CANOPY
	<p>The update on the Beckenham Green canopy was provided by Sylvia Ramos (LBB Regeneration Project Planner).</p> <p>Beckenham Green's stone paved stage would form part of an open architectural student competition for the concept design of a canopy. The canopy would sit over the existing stage and would</p>

	<p>enable the venue to be used for a variety of events. Several constraints would form part of the design: conservation area status; adjacent trees; vandalism prevention; minimal maintenance; and a set budget. The chosen design from the competition would inform a brief for the design and manufacture of the canopy.</p> <p>The canopy would need sides, and would need to be rain proof. The sides may need to be removable. It would also need an electricity supply. Ideally it should also blend in well with the surrounding trees and general ethos of the conservation area.</p> <p>Chloe-Jane Ross was not in favour of removable sides; she suggested that the design should incorporate elements that would make it unattractive for use by rough sleepers. The Chairman mentioned that the matter of clearing away leaves should also be considered. He also referred to other considerations such as the use of lighting, fixings, spotlights and sap dripping off trees.</p> <p>An informal brief would be distributed for feedback to three members of the working party – Chloe-Jane Ross, Alan Old, and Doctor John Parker. Once an agreement on the canopy’s informal brief had been established, Ms Ramos would distribute it to London wide architectural universities. Competition judges would include the Renewal Team, and members of the working party. Members of the Working Group were invited to feed back to Ms Ramos with ideas for the brief.</p> <p>The budget for the canopy was £35k, and there would be a £500.00 prize for the winning design.</p>
159	UPDATE ON APPLICATION TO MAINTAIN PURPLE FLAG STATUS
	<p>It was noted that a new floodlight had been sited on the purple flag. This worked with a timer.</p> <p>The Group was informed that the renewal application for the Purple Flag had been submitted in June, and that a decision was due imminently.</p>
160	ANY OTHER BUSINESS (PREVIOUSLY NOTIFIED)
	<p>Mr Goy raised the matter of the safety audit report and stated that he was not satisfied with the response to his queries so far. He asked if he could be provided with a copy of the safety audit report. Garry Warner undertook to send him the safety audit which was done in different phases.</p>
161	DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Beckenham Town Centre Working Group
21 September 2017

	The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Thursday 16 th November at 7.30pm.
--	---

The Meeting ended at 9.30 pm