

# **Brentford**

## **Community Council**

c/o 48 Braemar Court, Brook Road South, Brentford, Middlesex, TW8 0NA  
www.brentfordcc.org.uk

### **LONDON BOROUGH OF HOUNSLOW LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

#### **Examination of the Brentford Area Action Plan**

**Session 5b – Thursday 1 May 2008**  
**Development Site Policies**

#### **Evidence of Brentford Community Council**

##### **Commerce Road**

*17. Whether the site should be allocated as a mixed-use regeneration site.  
What are the implications of adopting a different development mix on the Commerce Road site?  
What is the employment case for retaining the site as a preferred industrial location?  
Is the industrial-led development proposal justified by the need for employment land/industrial jobs in the area?  
What quantum of industrial development is needed on the site to contribute to the overall employment needs of the Borough?*

We support the reinstatement of the Preferred Options Policy BE2 (not to be confused with BAAP Site Policy BE2), for an industrially led mixed use development. See our separate proposals for the reintroduction of a Site Policy for the Commerce Road PIL.

*18. Whether the site should be included in the Town Centre boundary.*

At the Public Inquiry into the (then draft) 2003 UDP the inspector specifically ruled out the possibility of including the Commerce Road site within the boundary of Brentford Town Centre defined in the UDP.

We endorse the BAAP's stated aim of ensuring that all new development contributes to the coherence and function of the town centre by consolidating the primary shopping area and the High Street frontage.

Brentford is the smallest of the "Town Centres" in the Borough by some margin. The report "Brentford High Street: The Community Vision" of May 2007 considered the issue of the optimum target size for the retail centre and concluded that it was essential to the future success and prosperity of the High Street that it become a physically small and easily recognised area allowing good pedestrian access from one end to the other.

*19. Whether the over-hanging wharves should be excluded from the water-related designation.*

# **Brentford**

## **Community Council**

c/o 48 Braemar Court, Brook Road South, Brentford, Middlesex, TW8 0NA  
[www.brentfordcc.org.uk](http://www.brentfordcc.org.uk)

We concur with the Secretary of State in her Decision Notice on the recent Appeal on the Site that the overhanging warehouses must be retained, or replaced with visually or functionally appropriate buildings.

### **Waterman's Park**

*20. Whether there should be a policy for the site to guide the development of moorings.*

We support the creation of permanent moorings adjoining the site, which would add night-time occupation of the proposed riverside walkway, visual interest to the river, and being in a backwater here, would be well out of the main navigation channel.

### **Land adjacent to Kew Bridge Railway Station (61/001)**

*21. Whether the site should be included in the Plan as a high density housing site.*

We think it essential that this remain in the conservation area, and see no reason why there should be any preference for residential use. The site is physically separate from the Kew Bridge site (M3) and has quite different constraints. It should not be include in Site Allocation M3.

### **Brentford Diamond**

*23. What is the future of the Brentford Diamond site? Should the Plan set out clearer guidance for the future of the area? What is the current position with regard to the relocation of Brentford FC?*

We concur with the Council's support for the club's relocation their current site at Griffin Park to this site in the Brentford Diamond.

*26. Whether the site should be allocated for housing and commercial development, and shown on the Proposals Map for mixed-use development.*

The site is currently occupied by warehousing, industrial and waste transfer uses. Although not a PIL in the London Plan, the site is bordered on all sides by railways and is particularly suitable for such uses, with less demanding environmental requirements, that could affect the amenities of others. It also has good transport links, which would support its use for hotels or commercial offices, or a use such as a sports stadium with high public transport requirements.

Conversely, it has no existing amenity space, poor visual outlook, no residential infrastructure, and no existing facilities that would recommend it for residential use. There are other sites in Brentford that would better serve the provision of additional housing.