

**MINUTES OF THE BCC MEETING 3<sup>RD</sup> MARCH 2011 AT 7:15**

**Present: Stephen Browne, Derek Collett, Jon Hardy (Chairing) Anthony Flynn, Matthew Rockel, Keith Garner, Mr Jinhyeon Lee**

**Apologies received: Nigel Moore, Denis Browne**

**The Minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true record.**

**1. Thameside/Kew Campus Site** – Dominic Chapman was not present and so this item was only discussed cursorily, the main thrust of feeling was that JTA's next step would be to a formal planning application rather than further consultation

**2. Kew Bridge Junction Improvements** – no-one thought that the proposed improvements to the junction amounted to much improvement. Concerns were that the imposition of a bus-stop cage on the east bound carriageway of Kew bridge Road would cause a pinch-point, that the positioning of a speed table at the mouth of Strand on the Green may render that junction more dangerous particularly to two wheeled traffic.

It was thought that the proposals had been formulated in isolation from the Scottish Widows development and that TfL had missed an opportunity to engage with the developers and develop a set of proposals that would actually improve the junction. JH agreed to see if JTA had been approached by TfL. It was agreed that following this a letter should be sent to TfL reflecting our disappointment and that a more imaginative solution might be found by engaging with the developers. KG promised to send a letter reflecting similar thoughts from the Kew perspective.

**3. Scottish Widows Show House** – no-one was happy about the lack of consultation by the planning officer with regards to this. However, it was noted that consultation was normally quite good between LBH and BCC so the discussion concluded that any letter should not dwell on a sense of affront but seek explanation of the error, what would be done to prevent a re-occurrence and what the implications of this particular planning permission would mean: no-one was clear as to how long the building could stay up for instance. JH would be having lunch with Cathy Gallagher and would seek informal clarification of these matters before drafting a letter.

**4. Commerce Road** – there was some discussion around MR's letter to the developers which was considered to be very much on the money as regards the remaining concerns of the BCC. It was thought that ISIS would either be soon to submit a planning application or had just done so: MR would investigate this and report back at the next BCC. In the interim a response to MR's letter has been received which can only be described as disappointing.

**6. Brentford Survey** – JH ran through the methodology of the data collection and representation of the survey thus far. He emphasised that the returns thus far should be considered as Phase 1 with Phase 2 collection of more hard-to-reach

areas. However, even at this stage there were some startling and indisputable trends emerging.

The data had been logged as individual items rather than homogenized into monolithic slabs of data: the intention was to show that the data comprised of 'individual voices' that often echoed each other (and were thus more compelling for that). JH explained that the approach was to present Members with a tool that they could use to judge the community's needs and aspirations rather than to present them with pre-digested conclusions that they may not agree with. MR observed that this would in no way preclude the BCC making their own comments on the data once it was published in the same way as it does planning applications.

The intention was to have the Survey put on the next IBAC M agenda on the 23<sup>rd</sup> March: however, Cllr Harmer feels that the agenda is too full and it would be better to present in May.

**7. 17 Market Place** – discussion on this matter was somewhat truncated since no-one who has the inside track on this matter was present. Representatives from the EBCC were invited and pressed to attend when they demurred but to no further response. AF, a local resident whose property is near to 17 Market Place, was present and was given assurances by MR that his concerns would be fairly presented to Cllr Bath at the meeting that had been proposed between BCC representatives and Members. MR repeated his proposal that the matter should be dealt with in the same manner as a Planning Application whether or nor planning permission was required to be assured that everything was transparent and that there was the opportunity of objections to be taken into account just as at a planning meeting. JH suggested that an alternative to this would be that the matter be given to Scrutiny to conduct a time-limited scrutiny since the issue was also about the manner in which the Council were taking this decision.

The meeting with the Members did not take place owing to a confusion on confirming the proposed date.

**8. Neighborhood Watch** was not discussed owing to lack of interested parties.

**9. Minor applications** – MR reported that there were two but neither were of much consequence though he would report further at the next meeting.