

Shane Baker,
Development Control,
London Borough of Hounslow

Ref:BCC779
Dec 17 2016

Dear Shane.

Chiswick Curve.

The Brentford Community Council has considered the revised application for the Chiswick Curve development and they have asked me to write to you:

1. The Previous Application.

On February 9th 2016 we wrote to you (BCC759 and BCC760, copies attached) and we asked you to refuse the application (at para 21) having given reasons paras 1/20.

The BCC considers that the objections raised then apply to the revised application. We ask you to refuse the revised application

Before the application was put to the Planning Committee four local Amenity Societies convened a public meeting in April 2016, which was attended by the Leader of the Council and our MP. It was also widely reported in the press and on TV.

At the meeting Cllr Curran agreed that the application should be withdrawn for further consideration and our MP, Ruth Cadbury, expressed her opposition to the proposal.

2. Subsequent Events: Access and Servicing.

2.01. In November 2016 Chris Grayling, Secretary of State for Transport replied to a parliamentary question by our MP, Ruth Cadbury, asking about improvements to the M4 associated with a third runway at Heathrow. He said "*.....improvements are needed to local roads in West London, and the M4 is one of those where plans are afoot to deliver improvements way before we have a new runway in place (at Heathrow).*"

Clearly these improvements could have a major effect on the area around the site of the proposed Chiswick Curve.

2.02. When the Council granted planning consent for the new Brentford Community Stadium the officer report referred to the Management Plan to help fans cross Chiswick Roundabout at the end of the match, halting, for a time, traffic on the North and South Circular Roads and on the A4.

2.03. The current proposal to allow London Irish and BFC to play in the stadium would reduce traffic flows on 42 occasions each year.

2.04 The revised proposals do not take account of these uncertainties which would complicate the measures proposed to link the island Chiswick Curve site at grade across heavily trafficked roads.

2.05. The Mayor is now consulting on plans to exclude diesel vehicles from roads inside the North and South Circular roads, which meet at the Chiswick roundabout. His proposals could lead to increased traffic using these roads and the A4/M4 corridor to Heathrow. Increased air pollution could result making the site even more unsuitable for residential development.

2.06. It is more than ever apparent that the recommendation we made in February 2016 (see para 1) "that the site requires a multi-level solution to provide easy access for pedestrians, services and parking which does not impede traffic flows" is now imperative.

3. Urban Framework.

3.01. Para 2 of BCC759 noted that this application was then being put forward in advance of any contextual plan. Since then progress on the Great West Road Plan Review has fallen behind programme and completion is not expected before 2019. No update appears to have been carried out on the Golden Mile Site Capacity Study.

3.02 Instead it is understood that other sites close to the Chiswick Curve are being put forward for development. These include:

Capital Interchange Way.	Bus facility and 550 flats: application submitted,
Telephone Building	Land assembly with petrol station.
Fountains Centre	Cabinet decision to promote re-placement with enabling development after preparation of a Master Plan.
B&Q	Development anticipated.

3.03. The cumulative effect of these developments could produce a massive restructuring of East Brentford. The Master Plan proposed for the Fountains Leisure site will not be prepared before much of this development has been

submitted for planning consents. most of these schemes could, like the Chiswick Curve, have been designed without a contextual Master Plan or a considered Planning brief.

3.04. In this situation the application for the Chiswick Curve is premature which is an additional reason to ask that it be refused

4. Summary:

4.01. The site is a small traffic island in the middle of one of the busiest junctions in the country, with all the associated problems of access, air quality, lack of accessible open space and infrastructure. It is fundamentally unsuited to residential development, This is before the further increase in traffic flows that could follow from the Secretary of State's plans for short term road improvements and the Mayor plans for Air quality or expansion at Heathrow.

4.02. The proposal presents a gross over development making a nonsense of planning policy at national, regional and local level. Its impact on surrounding areas would cause substantial harm and there is no justification for such an impact.

4.03. The practical results of such over development can be seen in the complex and questionable solutions for car parking, cycle and refuse storage and amenity space.

4.04. Such intense developments can only be appropriate for city centre locations with maximum public transport accessibility levels. The public transport in this area was designed for a suburban level of development. It is already at capacity, and the amount of development being proposed in the area threatens to overwhelm all the transport systems.

4.06. Since we wrote to you in February 2016 the original application has been withdrawn and re-submitted. We note that none of the recommendations made to you then has resulted in significant improvements to the proposal. The only changes made have resulted in a slight reduction to the number of family units and to the number of affordable units.

4.07 These changes do nothing to alter the fundamental concerns which we have to the proposal. For the above reasons and those which have been previously stated in response to the previous application this application should be refused.

Yours sincerely

Denis Browne
Chairman, Planning Consultative Committee
Brentford Community Council

copies to: The applicant
Ruth Cadbury MP
The Mayor
The Leader of the Council
Members of the Planning Committee
IBAF members
G15+ members.