

BCC.000

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 SECTION 78
PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) 1990
SECTION 20.**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY (PLANNING APPEALS INQUIRY PROCEEDURE)
(ENGLAND) RULES 2000.**

**SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE
OF
THE BRENTFORD COMMUNITY COUNCIL
(Summary of BCC 1)**

Appellant:	Barratt, West London
Proposed Development	Demolition of Existing Buildings and Erection of two six storey buildings Comprising 69 flats, 187 sq m of Commercial Floor Space and 55 basement level parking spaces.
Site:	Albany House, 41 High Street, Brentford.
Planning Inspectorate Reference	APP/F5540/07/2061824/NWF
LPA Reference:	00607/41/p26
BCC Reference:	ALB/010/dmb

Denis Browne
Chairman, Planning Consultative Committee,
Brentford Community Council.

Chatham House,
15 The Butts,
Brentford,
Middlesex TW8 8BJ.

May 2008.

1. Introduction and Background:

Paras Ref To BCC 1:

1.01. My Name is Denis Browne. Together with my colleagues, I represented the Brentford Community Council. I have been Vice Chairman, then Chairman, of the BCC,s Planning Consultative Committee since 1989. 1.01

I have spent 38 years in local authorities including 8 years as Director of Development for the London Borough of Hammer-smith and Fulham and 7 years as the Borough Planning Officer in Islington.

I have lived in Brentford for 19 years.

1.02.. This is a summary of my proof, BCC 1, which should be taken together Appendices A and B and with the BCC proofs: BCC 2 (Policy Issues) by Mr Peter Eversden), BCC 3 (Blue Ribbon Issues) by Mr Nigel Moore and (BCC 4) Views of Local Residents by Mr Stephen Browne. 1.02
3.01/4

The evidence of the BCC and the appendices have been bound together for easy access.

1.03. The Brentford Community Council, originally set up by the London Borough of Hounslow in 1989, is now an independent association of local groups and individuals regularly presenting views on development in Brentford to Hounslow officers and members. 1.04
1.05

1.04. The BCC is a founder member of the Thames Land-scape Strategy (Hampton to Kew). I have served as chair-man and now vice chairman of its Community Advisory Group since it was set up in 1995. 1.06

1.05. The BCC believes that this site should be developed, but opposes this application and requests that it be refused on the grounds listed in proof BCC 1 para 2.05. 2.01

1.06. The application should be seen in the context of the massive development which is taking place in Brentford which provides more new accommodation than is sought in current housing targets for the whole borough and which has over-stretched the local infra structure. 2.02
3
4
6
7

2. This Application.

We submit that this application fails on a number of grounds: 2.05

2.01. Ealing Road/ Brentford High Street Junction. The site is at the important junction of Ealing Road and the High Street where traffic lights separate west bound traffic from traffic by-passing Brentford. It is not a suitable frontage for access, servicing or parking. Access should be through the adjacent Thames Side House site. 6.01
2
3
4
5

2.03. PTAL is 3. The local facilities are at present poor. Access To central London involves making a change from bus to Train. The development includes "luxury" riverside apartments. Car ownership is likely to be high. Parking on site caters for a part of the demand, but would need a CPZ in evening hours. 6.06
7
8
6.12/16

2.04 . Thames Side Footpath. The buildings should be set back to provide a landscaped foot path along the river as proposed in UDP. See also TLS views. 6.10/11
7.12
Appdx A+ B

2.05. Height Density and Design. The proposed density is too high resulting in blocks A and B being too high, too close together and too close to the High Street and the river. 7.01
Appdx A
7.07

2.06. Families: The scheme has neither the proportion of family accommodation nor the amenity space required. What it has inadequate sunlight, daylight and privacy. 7.02/6

2.07 Precedent. Sites either side of Albany House may be redeveloped. The precedent set by this decision could effect the "hope value" and possible design precedents for a long and important river frontage. 7.09
Appdx A
Appdx B

2.08. Impact on views from the Thames and Kew. The application is a clearly visible further intrusion into the views from Kew Gardens World Heritage site. This would be exacerbated if the adjacent sites are re-developed. 7.10
Appdx A
Kew Gdns
evidence

2.09. Lots Ait is about 45 m from the river frontage of this site. The boat sheds are to be restored for boat building and repairs. The application scheme should be designed so that residents suffer no noise pollution. A reduced scheme should be designed without any balconies or windows opening onto the river. 7.11

2.10. Permeability. The Thames is invisible from the High Street and should be opened up. 7.13

2.11 The external impact of the design is unacceptable because it is too high, lacks modelling (apart from the unacceptable balconies (see above), has only flat roofs (contrary to TLS policy, lacks diversity, repeats idioms from adjacent Holland Gardens scheme. Additionally it is out of scale with Osier Court adversely affecting views from Ealing Road and along the High Street. 7.14
15
16
17
18

2.12. The quality of the design within the site has been compromised by the excessive density (see above). In particular the flying galleries to block A with their multi level internal courts remind one of the worst features of pre-war Council flats. These features and much of the central court would be often in shadow. Privacy and noise could be additional problems which could be if children used these spaces as their playground. 7.19
20
21
22
7.02

3.0. Conclusions and Recommendation.

3.01 The application is an over-development of excessive height and density, with an unworkable access. It is so tightly planned that it fails to meet appropriate standards of amenity, privacy, sunlight and daylight. The design is incompatible with boat building on Lots Ait, the scale of Brentford High Street and with views from Kew Gardens, World Heritage site. 8.01/5

3.02. The application does not set a suitable precedent for river-side development on adjacent sites. 8.06

3.03. We ask that the application be refused. We also ask that a new brief for development of the Thames Side House, Albany house and Waterman's Arts Centre Should be prepared before further applications are lodged. 8.07

