

Minutes: Meeting October 9 2017**DRAFT**

Ref MinOct017

1a. Present: Denis Browne, Richard Linnell, David Farmery, Derek Collett, Chris Dakers, Vitas Puig, Stephen Browne, Martin Case, Linda Prince, Hugh Mortimer, Diana Oppe, Andrew Dakers, John Todd, Patricia Kennedy, Mark Kehoe

1b. Apologies: Mary Drake, Marilyn Baker, Brian Burgess

2a. Minutes of Last Meeting: Approved as correct record (see MinSep017, attached).

2b. Matters arising (numbering from September minutes):

Item 5: Citroen Site: DB said that the letter to the applicant was on the website. The previous presentation at the September meeting had made a mockery of the consultation process. MC had suggested guidelines on the consultation process to be issued to applicants and it was agreed that this would be considered in due course.

Item 6: Air Quality: MC said that he was awaiting the promised presentation. JT said that LBH were behind the curve on this generally and were the only London borough not participating in King's College 'London Air' programme.

Item 7: Chiswick Curve scheme: DB reported that BCC and other amenity societies were being asked to work with LBH and their barrister in preparation for the Public Inquiry next June. DB is looking for volunteers and DC agreed to be involved.

3. Consultation on Cycle Superhighway from Olympia to Brentford:

The agenda pointed out the need to appoint an 'editor' to lead and collate the BCC response with other members to contribute. There are consultation events on Saturday 14th October from 11 am to 3.00 pm at Waterman's and at Brentford Market on Sunday 15th October from 10.00 am to 2.00 pm.

SB had circulated an e-mail to TfL. The consultation finishes at the end of October so there is a need for rapid response. DB suggested that he prepare a response based on his comments on the questions from TfL and this was agreed. SB asked if his previous question had been answered about the traffic cameras around Kew Bridge being preparatory to this exercise. If not, where does TfL obtain its data? JT answered that TfL obtains its data from an external source, namely a Government Department. JT commented that there had been monitoring work in Chiswick High Road and this was claimed to be very busy in terms of bicycle use. The destination was not clear but it was claimed that the majority of bicycle traffic goes to Brentford and not the A4. DB suggested that the A4 reconstruction should allow for cyclists, and this would link to the shuttle (shown as 'Skyline' or the revived 'Freightline') from the A4 to the Crossrail connection to the north. PTAL would rise considerably by this means. It was a general principle that all modes of transport should link to Crossrail. It was agreed that BCC supports cycle movement in the right place, and this should not go through Waterman's Park.

DF stated that he had attended a consultation on 2nd October and thought that the proposals looked reasonably balanced. DB commented that the proposals would result in additional delay times for other users of Brentford High Street. The cycle 'Superhighways' were intended in principle to connect Central London with major outlying centres, but Brentford was not one of these. DC commented that the

proposals took cyclists to the junction with Half Acre and left them there, which was not satisfactory. AD commented that there had been proposals to create a raised cycle lane or to build a lane at the edge of Waterman's Park in the past but these had not been executed probably on account of cost. CD pointed out that although there were no frontages requiring access on the south side of the High Street in that section, there were bus stops and pedestrian access to them would be difficult across the 'superhighway'. AD said that demand would follow when the flats were built with no parking. MK said that the cycle 'superhighway' near his office in Lower Thames Street in the City was dangerous and extremely confusing for pedestrians and other users with various serious casualties over time. He also commented that the A4 cycle path was barely used.

DB said that he was in favour of cycling but unhappy about the way it was put forward in this case. AD said he did not agree but thought the proposals were generally acceptable. DB said that he would prepare a statement to attempt to reflect the discussion at the meeting as far as possible.

4. Waterman's Issues:

DB stated that he had spoken to Keith Garner of Historic England who oppose the Waterman's site scheme and have written a strong letter of objection. He suggested that because the applicant is the development partner of LBH, the application may be determined by the LBH Planning Committee. He was not sure if the scale of the scheme, at 206 apartments, would require the endorsement of the Mayor of London after planning permission had been given. DB noted that Royal Palaces and others are trying to stop the scheme on the Waterman's site on the grounds of visual intrusion. LBH are keen to pursue the overall scheme to reduce or obviate the subsidy currently required by the Waterman's Centre from LBH.

JT confirmed that the objection process might also take the form of an application for Judicial Review. DB said that he had spoken to Paul Velluet, an ex officer of English Heritage, who said that the call-in power is now used only sporadically by the Secretary of State. DB confirmed that he had communicated with the Kew Society, and that any reference to LBRuT would be undertaken by LBH and was not a matter for BCC, but that they should have been consulted. AD said that he was aware of the Waterman's campaign for additional funds. DB said that he and others had met the Waterman's management who confirmed that they had taken legal advice and had the right to move the centre; that they wished to move; and in their view they did not need a car park. They were not willing to share their 'projections' or their business case. BCC rightly had concerns, however, that the new centre would be a 'white elephant' and in the process of creating it the enabling development was significantly overproviding residential accommodation for commercial gain without any other normal benefit to the Local Authority or the community. DB noted that on the application for the Police Station site, full detail was given of the proposed residential accommodation but the arts centre was shown only in schematic form.

DC said that today he had received a letter from Waterman's management saying that all matters had been approved and checked. DB confirmed that it is London Green who will obtain consent and they have made it clear that if no money for the arts centre is available, they will build a smaller centre. DC said that the letter from Waterman's states, 'but [we] have not agreed yet to move.' DF commented that

the scheme for the Police Station site was not up to the design standard to be expected of the architect in question.

JT suggested that BCC send a letter supporting Historic England's excellent letter. It was agreed that BCC should do so.

DF suggested that a daylighting/sunlight study should be carried out for the Police Station site scheme in respect of its effect on St Paul's School. MC said that he would take this up.

5. Hounslow Consultation Papers:

These comprise the Great West Corridor ("GWC") Review and the Brentford East SPD; also included are the Boston Manor and Grand Union Conservation Area and the St Paul's Conservation Area Appraisals. DB pointed out that the first two papers in particular will set the pattern for development in the area up to 2030.

GWC Review: DB pointed out that a review had previously been carried out by BCC and an Issues Paper produced in February 2016. This was tabled (BCC 820). He suggested that the exercise now should form an updating of that paper. The adviser, Urban Initiatives, have developed land use plans but the policies have not changed much, so it will be sufficient to re-state, with amendments as necessary, the comments of 18 months ago. This needs to be completed by the end of November.

Brentford East SPD covered the piece formerly known as 'Kew Gate', and included major schemes at Capital Interchange Way, Chiswick Curve, Hudson Square, Brentford Fountains Centre renewal etc. This consultation also has to be completed by the end of November. Under AoB, JT said that there was to be a pre-meeting of LBH to discuss Brentford East SPD and he would let BCC know the date of that.

SB proposed that each item should be run by an 'editor' with a team of people contributing as the documents progressed. DB said that he had not commenced drafting but had considered what needed to be done. HM said that he found the documents repetitive and unclear, with conclusions not following the principles set out at the start, and with the Brentford East SPD seeming to spread into the GWC Review area.

DB suggested that as the issues were similar to those set out in the previous response (BCC 757, 758) in February 2016, all that would be necessary was to revise those in response the documents as rewritten and now reissued by LBH. This approach was agreed. DB agreed to be 'editor' and HM, MC, DF, SB, VP and RL agreed to assist as the 'team'. DB expressed concern that the 'Growth Area' in concept should be centred on nodes not bypasses, and as the A4 functions entirely as a bypass, the idea of the GWC as a growth area was fundamentally misconceived.

Conservation Area Appraisals: Boston Manor and Grand Union Conservation Area (BMGUCA) and the St Paul's Conservation Area (SPCA) are the CAs being appraised. For BMGUCA, Heritage England had proposed to extend the CA from the High Street to the river. LBH didn't agree with this. The proposal is to extend the CA to include The Ham. VP said he has been told that LBH were not going to implement the various proposals made by the previous officer, Rowena Scrimshaw. VP said that if the BMGUCA could be extended, he did not see why SPCA could not be extended to Ealing Road, which made perfect sense in view of the similarity of the built form of that area to that within the CA. Guy Lambert seemed positive about that idea. MK set out the benefits that had been seen in the Ealing CAs as a

result of a long-term and constructive approach. VP agreed to prepare a note for the next meeting setting out the proposals for BCC to make. MK agreed to send a note to VP with his views and comments as expressed at the meeting from his knowledge of the Ealing CAs. MC suggested that in due course it might be beneficial for Conservation Officer to be invited to a BCC meeting.

6. AoB:

a. Former Acton Lodge site. A housing scheme is proposed for this. There is a public exhibition on 17th October from 4pm to 9pm at the Holiday Inn, Brentford Lock, Commercial Road. The scheme is to be undertaken by Lampton Investments, a company set up by LBH with a borrowing facility of up to £200m, and a target to build residential accommodation.

b. Brentford High Street – Block D. CD commented that this was now described as Affordable Housing whereas the presentation made to BCC was on the basis of the provision of Social Housing only for the whole project. JT said that he would investigate this and would contact Diane Page at LBH. DC said that with regard to the CPO Inquiry, he had been informed that in LBH's view there was no reason why the application for Block D should not be given planning permission.

c. Sarah Trimmer House. CD noted that an application had been made for two dwellings on the site.

d. Brentford Monument. CD stated that this had now been renovated.

e. Green Belt. JT said that a proposal to allow LBH to acquire parcels of 'pink' land within the Green Belt for development was being considered.

10. The meeting closed at 9.08 pm

11. Dates of Next Meetings: November 13th and December 11th