

**Employment Development Plan Document,
Sustainability Appraisal,
Preferred Options,
Brentford Community Council response.**

BCC312

Views adopted by the Planning Consultative Committee of the Brentford Community Council on March 2nd 2006.

6.2.1 Preferred Option 1: The Council in planning the future of employment land will work to providing for sustainable employment growth including a range of job opportunities for the Borough's residents.

We support this aim but note that it is not compatible with Option 3

6.2.6 Preferred Option 2: The Council will facilitate a role for Hounslow as an employment centre at both a strategic and local level encouraging diversity and providing for a variety of different sized businesses and sectors.

We support this aim, but recommend positive preference for local, as opposed to strategic, businesses.

6.2.7 Preferred Option 3: The borough should seek to achieve an appropriate balance in supply and demand of offices, encouraging the efficient use of land whilst meeting demand.

We consider this Option to be unworkable in practice. More useful would be objective criteria for establishing whether lack of demand and inappropriate location favour change of use.

Improvements to the quality of existing offices will also be sought through renewal in appropriate locations.

We support this aim but we are concerned that the Appraisal makes no reference to urban design or the quality of building design.

6.2.9 Preferred Option 4: There is a sufficient supply of offices in the borough, with capacity to allow new office development (including intensification/expansion) in some locations and the loss of offices in other locations. There is also a need to protect offices in appropriate locations.

We concur with this view, but recommend that preference be given to closely associated uses when considering change of use.

6.2.13 Preferred Option 5a: The intensification and expansion of offices should be in the most sustainable locations including town centres and sites that are strategically important. This includes Chiswick Business Park and subject to being made sustainable, Bedfont Lakes and strategically important offices on the

Great West Road. Intensification/expansion is also appropriate in other locations subject to its scale.

We support this aim but we are concerned at the lack of an overall urban design policy for the Great West Road area .

6.2.15 Preferred Option 5b: New development should be directed to the most sustainable locations including town centres and sites that are strategically important. This includes Chiswick Business Park and subject to being made sustainable, Bedfont Lakes and strategically important offices on the Great West Road. New development is also appropriate in other locations subject to its scale.

Scale is also very important in the Great West Road area.

6.2.17 Preferred Option 5c: A general presumption to retain offices in town centres and key office locations is appropriate given the importance of these locations for employment. The release of offices in these locations would be restricted and subject to criteria including an assessment of demand and alternative supply for offices over a reasonable period of time and the level of employment provided by the proposed use.

We support this.

6.2.18 Outside of town centres and key office locations, release will be acceptable subject to an assessment of demand and alternative supply, accessibility to the site, and effects existing offices are having on the surrounding area. Previous use as office does not imply office block scale for other uses

We support this

6.2.20. Release may allow for training opportunities

See paragraph 24 in the BCC response to the Brentford Action Area Plan.

6.2.22 Preferred Option 5d: Offices in the most sustainable locations should be protected. Other sites identified as strategically important (Key Office Locations identified including Chiswick Business Park, Bedfont Lakes Business Park and 2 clusters of offices on the Great West Road), and offices serving a local employment function in suburban areas, subject to being accessible by sustainable modes of transport, should also be protected.

We recommend objective criteria be set for sustainable transport access.

6.2.26 Preferred Option 6: An appropriate balance should be sought in the supply and demand of industrial land. There is an appropriate amount of industrial land at the current time but this may change over time. There is a need to monitor supply and the need for retaining sites. Where appropriate, release will be considered but this will be restricted.

We consider this Option to be unworkable in practice. More useful would be objective criteria for establishing whether lack of demand and inappropriate location favour change of use.

Where an alternative employment use is proposed, not only the number but also the type of jobs should be retained.

6.2.28 Preferred Option 7: New development should be allowed on existing industrial land including intensification and expansion. New sites should only be developed where there are no alternative sites and there is a demonstrated need. There is capacity for release of sites where there are negative effects due to a site's characteristics that cannot be overcome or an assessment against demand and supply demonstrates that release is appropriate. There is a general presumption to protect all existing industrial sites, recognising some sites as strategically and locally important through designations.

We support this but recommend that other uses be predominantly for employment.

6.2.30 Preferred Option 8b: Intensification and expansion should be allowed on all industrial sites

We support this aim but we are concerned that the Appraisal makes no reference to urban design or the quality of building design.

6.2.31 Preferred Option 9a: Hotel development and other types of visitor accommodation should be directed to town centres in the first instance. Hotel development is also appropriate on the A4 corridor close to Heathrow Airport where it serves the airport, has good public transport links, and there is a demonstrated need.

We support this aim but we are concerned that the Appraisal makes no reference to urban design or the quality of building design.

6.2.34 Preferred Option 9b: A mix of uses is appropriate on employment sites, whilst ensuring that jobs/ employment floorspace is retained on the site. This is subject to a range of factors including employment demand and supply including the number of jobs and/or floorspace, the types of uses, and effects.

We accept that higher value uses such as private housing can “subsidize” desirable uses such as affordable housing or employment, and that uses having activity at different times of day can make more effective use of land.

We approve of mixed uses on larger sites, if there is enough space to mitigate the problems caused by mixed neighbours.

On smaller sites, it may be better urban design to have all of one site in one use and all of an adjacent site in a different use rather than have both uses on both sites.

The density of such a proposal must consider all uses together, using objective criteria such as plot ratio. Densities should not double count site areas.

The design of such a proposal must be appropriate to the most sensitive of the uses involved.