

Minutes: Meeting July 10 2017**DRAFT**

Ref MinJul017

1. Present:, Martin Case, Richard Linnell, David Farmery, Denis Browne, Derek Collett, Stephen Browne, Innes Garden, Sue Garden, Mary Drake, Kath Richardson, Chris Dakers, Chris Mukasa, Andrew Mills, Diane Page.

2. Apologies: Hugh Mortimer, Christopher Richards, Vitas Puig, Nigel Moore, Marilyn Batek, John Todd.

3. Minutes of Last Meeting: Approved as correct record (see MinJun017, attached) save that 9 (a) has the sentence added, '£60 was contributed in subscriptions after the meeting.' Also in the first line of item 9(f), the words 'close to' are substituted for 'in'.

4. Matters arising (numbering from June minutes)

4a. Kew Bridge Station application: BCC's report was submitted to LBH.

4b. Ealing Road/A4/Alfa Laval Site C – BCC's report was submitted to LBH. This is dealt with as part of the agenda for this meeting.

4c. Master plan for Great West Road – this item is on the current agenda.

6. Other major applications:

6b. Fountains Leisure Centre – on agenda

6c. Chiswick Curve – permission was refused

6d. B&Q Site/Hudson Square – on agenda

7. Proforma for responses when a planning application is considered by BCC: the proforma is now ready for use.

9b. Extension of St Paul's Rec. Conservation Area: we should have heard the decision by now. Martin Case will pursue in liaison with Vitas Puig.

5. Police Station Building replacement/Waterman's Centre update.

It is clear from the exhibition that the 'new' scheme will have about the same footprint as the previously proposed scheme but with two blocks slightly reduced in height. The proposed scheme would remain higher than the adjacent Albany House. The site is opposite Kew Palace, a Grade I Listed Building, and this creates a significant visual amenity problem for the setting of Kew Palace. It was agreed that there should be an approach to Historic England asking that they require a call-in of the proposal by the Secretary of State. DB said that the scheme should be 4-5 storeys in height rather than the proposed 8-9 storeys. The proposal is an enabling development, although the proposed arts centre is now no bigger than the existing Waterman's Arts Centre, but with no dedicated car parking, and with the loss of the riverside site and the public amenity that the current site provides. The new centre will be in competition with other arts centres, such as the new Hammersmith Riverside Studios, which does have a riverside site and much better access to public transport. It was understood that this package may not happen, and it was agreed that BCC should press for the matter to be reconsidered *in toto*. There is a Waterman's Board meeting this week, and Waterman's may withdraw from the proposal.

The exhibition showing the new arts centre was disappointing with only vague answers from those presenting. It is understood from Waterman's that the auditorium has been reduced in size from 500 to 250 seats, and the cinemas reduced in number

from three to two. Mary Drake commented that an auditorium of less than 300 seats was considered to be commercially unviable. There has been a discussion with Steve Curran to the effect that Waterman's had approached Guy Lambert. LBH are keen to save money and to be relieved of ongoing support obligations. Derek Collett suggested that this might be regarded as a conflict of interest for LBH. No business plan has been seen.

DB has drafted a letter which will be circulated expressing the continued concerns of BCC.

6. Citroen Site:

DC and DB attended the exhibition on 8th July. John Goldstone of L & Q, the developers, was not aware of BCC. There were no visuals available at the exhibition. The developer wishes to work together with neighbouring owners to create 400 homes including up to 40% affordable and local facilities including a play area and gym. The application may come forward by 14th August.

In conjunction with the site, there has been correspondence between Steve Curran and Guy Lambert considering a new Fountains Leisure Centre north of its current with the current Fountains Centre to be released for redevelopment. BCC will monitor any further comment or resulting proposal.

7. Hudson Square (B&Q site):

David Farmery attended a workshop meeting on the scheme. Diagrams had been received showing the coverage of the site with high-rise buildings, with the highest block at the western corner of the site. The proposed uses were for lower income housing, student housing and office use. The store is to be re-provided. The development of the proposal is at an early stage. Proposed BCC Letter 795 sets out the issues clearly. There are issues about the connection of pedestrians and vehicle access to the site. It was agreed that in the letter, after 'unsuitable for family life' the words 'and also for retail and other uses' should be added. DF said that the next stage was still not clear. He has suggested at the meeting that there should be full liaison with the owners of the Chiswick Curve site.

8. Local Plan development scenario:

Following a meeting at the UWL building, there had been a conversation with Guy Lambert who has seen another version of the A4 corridor Local Review Area, but there appears to have been no action on this. The BCC 's concern is that planning applications are being brought forward without a contextual plan, although the large Capital Interchange Way proposal is on hold for the time being. It was agreed that LBH must ask questions about air quality in the context of the Government's Capital programme, as this will have a significant impact on the approach set out in the Local Plan. DB will draft a letter to reflect BCC's view and will circulate this prior to the next BCC meeting.

9. Presentation on Block D of development site on High Street (includes NatWest Bank building):

Under the aegis of Diane Page of LBH, the presentation was given by Steve Downey of architect BDP, supported by Andrew Mills of BPTW and Chris Mukasa, the Housing Development and Supply Manager for Brentford Waterfront.

The scheme is part of the Ballymore site masterplan prepared by AHMM. The proposal for Block D is purely for social housing, and LB Hounslow Housing Department have taken on the site. Block C immediately to the west of this block has detailed planning permission. The timetable for the planning application for Block D is very tight, and the application is to be made by 11th August. This will facilitate the CPO enquiry for the whole of the Ballymore schemes to be held from 3rd to 13th October 2017. There is therefore insufficient time for a public consultation but there will be an exhibition in St Paul's Church from 3.00 pm to 8.00 pm tomorrow 11th July. Of Block D, only the electrical shop at the north-east corner of the site remains subject to CPO confirmation, no purchase from that owner having been agreed. The CPO has been confirmed on the remainder of the Block D site.

The proposal is intended to maximize the number of social housing units, providing 96 units in three blocks, North, East and West. The mix will be approximately 15% 1-bed, 40% 2-bed, 30% 3-bed, and 10% 4-bed, including four duplexes on the top levels of each block. The outline planning permission set out the content and general configuration in three blocks. This application is similar but the three blocks have been increased in height from the permitted scheme by a storey in each case, although these additional storeys do not cover the whole floorplate but are set back for visual amenity. The blocks will therefore comprise ground floor retail with 7 storeys of residential accommodation over that. Residential entrances are to each side of the overall scheme.

The blocks are to be set back from the existing building line by about 3 metres to achieve a wider pavement on the High Street. The scheme will create retail to the ground floor of each block, to the whole of the north block on the High Street, to most of the West block on Bradbury Yard, which will be pedestrianized, and to the northern end of the East Block on Catherine Wheel Yard. Servicing of the retail units of the North Block is by means of a trolley-way to the rear of the block. The original scheme retained the NatWest frontage and the retention of this may be considered as an A3 unit.

Parking and servicing are by road from the south of the scheme and will provide access to a common yard including 20 car spaces, of which 10 will be for disabled users. There will be 132 bicycle racks. Above this yard will be a podium garden for common use. There are balconies on a number of units generally facing west. There are some small private gardens providing screening for privacy from the communal area. Duplexes on the top floors of each block will have private terraces. The East and West blocks will be 17m apart. The external material has not been settled but is likely to be brick with some use of precast stone on the north elevation of the North Block.

The s106 and CIL have not yet been agreed for this application, which is stand-alone. This will cover any usual transport, health, education and other contributions. The services for the scheme have not been finalized but it should be possible for the blocks to become part of a wider CHP scheme, to be provided on Block K, if that becomes available in time. The provision of solar panels will also be possible.

The timeline is to start on site in the next four years. After the exhibition tomorrow (11th July), a second pre-app. meeting will take place with Nick Smith the case officer at LBH, with a planning application to be made by 11th August so that

permission can be granted in time for the CPO Inquiry commencement on 3rd October.

BCC expressed considerable concern that there was no proper public consultation process for this significant scheme. The presenter said that public feedback from the exhibition and any responses would be considered, but BCC remained very concerned that this did not constitute a proper consultation process, with any time for public viewing of material and response being far too short. BCC considered that this set a very bad example and a very poor precedent, when BCC wishes LBH to be conducting full public consultation in an exemplary manner. This falls very far short of that standard, whatever the reason for the haste may be.

The presentation concluded, and the presenters left the meeting. BCC discussed the presentation immediately as the timetable for response is so truncated as to require reaching an immediate conclusion. It was agreed that BCC would not object to the scheme, as the provision of social rented housing is important to the area. There was concern, however, about the additional storey on each block, which would result in a loss of visual amenity and the loss of daylight to the High Street and neighbouring blocks. There was also concern about the provision of a significant amount of retail space in secondary locations on the side streets, and that this could result in unlet units or low-grade use which would detract from the amenity of the blocks and the area. With no car parking available, the retail could only be for convenience or A3 use.

BCC would therefore propose that the additional storeys should be removed from each block to revert to the scheme envelope in the scheme which had been granted outline permission. BCC would request the retention of the NatWest unit, to retain an important part of the history of this part of the High Street, relocated 3 metres to the south to permit the widening of the High Street pavement, or at least the retention of the façade of the building in a sensitive way. BCC would also put forward its concern about the amount of retail space in secondary positions being provided, particularly on Catherine Wheel Yard on the east side of the scheme, and request that LBH has full regard to the report being prepared by GL Hearn advising on viability. It was also agreed that BCC would object in the strongest terms to the lack of proper public consultation in this case and seek LBH's full reassurance that this improper haste and the denial of any due process is not repeated and is not regarded as a precedent for any application of any kind in future.

In view of the extreme haste with which this application is being pushed through, BCC needs to respond quickly. It was agreed that these minutes, and in particular the paragraph above, would form the basis of the response of BCC. Those who wish to comment should respond to Stephen Browne, Denis Brown or Richard Linnell by the close of business on 14th July. RL will then prepare a draft letter by 17th July for circulation with any further comments by close on Friday 21st July with a view to the letter being submitted as soon as practicable after that.

10. Green School for Boys site:

This was discussed and the main concerns were:

1. that the proposal would create a traffic problem as many parents take their children to and from school by car, and it is diagonally opposite the girls' school,

exacerbating an existing problem without providing any proposals for traffic amelioration; and

2. that the proposal is for a new 4-storey building that sits immediately adjacent to the Capability Brown landscape at Syon Park without sufficient screening from the park, so that this new building will be very visible and intrusive when seen from the Park. Suitable screening by trees should be provided within the application site.

The general conservation work on Bride House appeared to be good and was welcomed.

The planning application was expected in about a month's time.

11. Housing on Syon Park allotments:

The Isleworth Society requested BCC's support which was duly provided. There was a long debate at the meeting but the application was refused. It is not known if there will be an appeal.

12. Air quality:

Martin Case set out his concerns. DB said that this was a much wider issue related to national changes. The Mayor's proposed Tax charge regime threatened to put additional environmental strain on the North Circular for those not wishing to proceed beyond it and incur a further charge. This, together with the continuing environmental challenges of the A4 corridor, would require a reconsideration of various matters including LBH's housing policy and guidelines with regard to land use planning in the Local Area Plan. DB will prepare and circulate a draft letter to the Council Leader covering these matters.

13. Leftover s106/CIL sums:

There is a meeting on 13th July at 6.00 pm at the Holiday Inn to discuss £300,000 that LBH wishes to spend from s106/CIL contributions from various schemes. This can only be used in accordance with planning permissions granted, but the Local Authority can write to original applicants requesting permission to reallocate such funds. There is a large total pot, and LBH provides for 15% of CIL sums to be allocated to schemes led by the local community. All who wish to apply with appropriate schemes should attend the meeting.

14. Bridge replacement:

No further progress on the replacement bridge on the Brent Way to Dock Estates footbridge.

15. Local list update:

No further progress

16. AoB

a. DC stated that there is a Stop Heathrow Expansion meeting on 18th July at St John's Community Centre where Ruth Cadbury, Caroline Russell of GLA and John Steward of HACAN will be speaking.

b. DC also requested that any members who had not paid their subscriptions should do so as soon as possible.

c. SB asked if anyone knew why there were temporary traffic monitoring cameras on Kew Bridge and if they were associated with a scheme. SB said he would investigate.

d. Innes and Sue Garden gave a summary on the Brentford/Kew footbridge. Crowdfunding was running to the end of September and £5,000 had been pledged already. They requested that anyone interested should register on the website and pledge if possible. The Mayor of London can grant up to £50,000 for any one project and the result of an application to him will be known in the next three weeks. £150k is required to design the bridge and submit a planning application. The estimated total cost is £10m, and of this £2.5m had been set aside for future maintenance and £2.5m for contingency. The bridge is in a very sensitive location and a cheaper bridge might exacerbate issues with English Heritage with regard to Royal Botanic Gardens Kew's status as a World Heritage Site. RBG are interested in the project and are working on their own masterplan. They are supportive and looking at further educational facilities on their site, possibly to upgrade to a college or university, and the increased access that the bridge would provide to Brentford is attractive to them. There is also a public transport benefit as 10% of visitors enter by the Brentford Gate and the proposed bridge would give an alternative route to that access without the use of public transport. The sponsors are also looking at rights from the old ferry service on the same route across the Thames which may ease the process of allowing a landing for goods and people on the Brentford bank of the river.

10. The meeting closed at 9.52 pm

11. Dates of Next Meetings August 14 and September 11.