

Minutes: Meeting September 11 2017**DRAFT**

Ref MinSep017

1. Present: Denis Browne, Richard Linnell, David Farmery, Derek Collett, Kath Richardson, Chris Dakers, Vitas Puig, Stephen Browne, Martin Case, Anna Nasalka, Mary Drake, Linda Prince, David Fell, Laura Kemp-King, Stephen Kemp-King, Peter Hughes, Marilyn Baker

2. Apologies: Myra Savin, Hugh Mortimer, Mel Collins, Guy Lambert

3. Minutes of Last Meeting: Approved as correct record (see MinAug017) save that Marilyn Baker should be added to the list of apologies.

4. Matters arising (numbering from August minutes):

Item 8: St Paul's Rec. Conservation Area. DB reported that at the LBH Cabinet meeting on 19th September there would be a formal consultation on the six Conservation Areas including St Paul's Rec. CA. VP stated that he did e-mail Guy Lambert with the previous e-mail exchange with Rowena Scrimshaw of LBH. KR stated however that there was nothing in the matters being considered at Cabinet about the extension of the St Paul's Rec. CA except for the consideration of adding some buildings to the Local List in consultation with the Amenity Groups. The consultation at LBH Cabinet may be to confirm that there is no extension to St Paul's Rec. CA. It was agreed to monitor the outcome of the Cabinet meeting.

Item 10 f Sarah Trimmer House: SB said that he had discussed this with the architect and that he had been assured that some of the metal frame structure would be replaced with wood, but some of the metal arches will be retained. This remains with Guy Lambert.

5. Presentation from London & Quadrant (L&Q) on the former Citroën site:

Ed Tibbetts, project Design and Planning Manager, attended from the developer London & Quadrant and made a further presentation. This added very little information to that provided in the 'initial ideas' presentation at the previous meeting with BCC. The revised presentation was tabled; it now included a very small axonometric for the whole site and some images of the open space. Mr Tibbetts said that there had now been a further public 'consultation' in the Leisure Centre which about 75 people attended. He said that the feedback from the event was 'positive', particularly in respect of the 'high' level of Affordable Housing at 40%. The scheme is for approx. 400 homes. The main part of the scheme would be for sale, probably on 150-year leases. There would be 70 car parking spaces, and cycle storage would also be provided, together with a gym, nursery and creative club. The comments from the event were supportive of more vegetation and public benches, and of the 'uncluttered' appearance of the public plaza. Mr Tibbetts was not able to provide plans or comment any further on design or the mix of units in the scheme proposed. He pointed out that the tallest block was 18 storeys in height, which was lower than the proposal for the Capital Interchange Scheme adjacent, although it was pointed out that the Capital Interchange Scheme was being recommended for refusal by the Planning Officers, so reference to it was invalid as it is not a consented scheme. The Affordable Housing will comprise some shared ownership; some rented housing, candidates for which would be taken from LBH's list with deductions of 50% to 80% in rent depending on the size of the unit; and

intermediate housing which would be allocated according to LBH's criteria. The rent deduction for the rented housing was confirmed to be permanent.

L&Q's programme is that they aim to submit a planning application within the next two months. They have considered responses made at the public meetings but are not seeking further responses and do not intend to have any pre-app. consultations or to provide plans or any further details. In spite of various requests, Mr Tibbetts said that plans would not be provided to BCC before the application was made as the plans are not 'finalized'. DB suggested that the lack of any detail or any plans invalidated the presentation, which really had not taken matters any further than the last meeting. LP referred to a debate in Parliament focussing on just this issue of developers not providing plans before the submission of a planning application. Mr Tibbetts then left without confirming that it would be possible to provide BCC with any plans or any further detail.

After his departure, DB suggested that a period of five working days be allowed for a response from L&Q. If there was no response from L&Q, DB would draft a letter to LBH saying that so far L&Q had merely provided some outline information but that a proper consultation had not taken place as no plans or information about building mass, apartment mix etc. had been provided. Without these a proper consultation was not possible. The letter would seek LBH's action to ensure a proper pre-app. consultation with BCC and publicly.

6. Air quality issues:

These will also be covered in LBH's cabinet meeting in October. MC reported back generally. The LBH Air Quality Action Plan had been produced by a consultant based in Reading, but was not easily intelligible to the ordinary reader. It will be reviewed and revised as necessary, and will go out to the Amenity Groups, although probably not by the target date of end September. There is also consultation on this with other agencies.

The Mayor of London is also issuing an Environment Policy Document within the next two months, to cover matters including development, green spaces, working environments and air quality. The Mayor's London Plan is also to be issued soon and that will also have statements about air quality, including standards for new buildings for public use, and will confirm that housing should not be developed in areas of poor air quality, but that new developments should be suitable for use in terms of their construction and location, including having regard to air quality. Air quality needs to be considered in all buildings in terms of mitigation strategy, design and layout. Larger developments are to boost local air quality, and the London Plan will also cover questions such as the low emission zone and public transport emissions. TfL is also pushing for its fleet to become Euro 6 compliant within one year. They are also pressing for local road speeds to be re-considered, including a proposal to reduce the speed limit on the A4 from Chiswick Roundabout to the M4 from 40 to 30 mph. They are also encouraging the provision of more electric vehicle charging points. MC said that if we apply pressure on air quality issues, TfL are keen to work with us.

The LBH view, supported by Guy Lambert, was to press for the Mayor's Ultra Low Emission Zone to be extended on the A4 out to Gillette Corner. MC asked if we could push that as well.

MC said that he had been pressing LBH to get Defra to run the air quality monitoring but this had not been successful as it would be more expensive to do so. He had also asked J C Decaux to undertake an idling engine campaign but they were not willing to do so.

7. 'Chiswick Curve' scheme – appeal by owner against planning refusal:

The proposal was for a 31-storey tower, which would make the building the tallest in West London. DB reported that there had been a meeting between BCC and West Chiswick & Gunnersbury Society (WCGS) to discuss this, with the local MP and the Leader of LBH in attendance. WCGS have written to the Planning Inspectorate to support the refusal, partly on the grounds that the time between the refusal and the submission of the revised application was not used to revise the application in an appropriate way. BCC letters BCC 759, BCC 760 and BCC 779 refer. BCC agreed not to write to avoid any exposure to potential cost liabilities in the event that the appeal is granted and the appellant seeks to pursue opponents for costs for 'unreasonable' behaviour. DB said that BCC members should, however, be willing to be witnesses and that BCC should encourage LBH councillors to be willing to come forward as witnesses at the Inquiry.

There is until 19th September to submit papers. DB encouraged everyone to write a short note to the Inspector at the following address:

Elizabeth Humphrey, The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol BS1 6PN

DB asked if the BCC should write as well? WCGS had submitted a very good paper and DB suggested that BCC should support them and reiterate that the views previously expressed in requesting that the application be refused were fully vindicated. WCGS had been in liaison with Marilyn Smith at LBH and it was proposed that after the CPO for Brentford High Street had been heard, a meeting on the Chiswick Curve should be convened with LBH, WCGS, and BCC, possibly also with Strand on the Green group to consider collective action.

There was a discussion about appearing as Rule 6 Parties, which allows cross-examination of witnesses. WCGS had suggested that rather than appear individually, the Amenity Groups involved could appear collectively as a single Rule 6 Party. The Inquiry had now been postponed from February 2018 to June 2018 so there would be more time to prepare this and possibly more time to submit papers, although the September 19th date remained set for the time being until the DoE stated otherwise. DC exhorted members and all local people to support the WCGS paper. DB agreed to circulate the necessary papers for members to consider with a view to writing in support.

RL enquired about the potential cost liabilities of appearing as a Rule 6 Party in the event of an adverse decision and the appellant claiming costs. DB said it seemed unlikely that a successful appellant would pursue a costs claim against local Amenity Groups.

8. Capital Interchange Way update:

The planning application for three irregular towers has been amended to provide two 'curvy' towers and one rectangular tower. There are also some changes of use in the revised application, and the car showroom and IT workspace have been omitted. The number of residential units has been increased from 350 to 550 units 'to balance the books'. LBH officers are recommending refusal of the revised application. It has not been decided yet whether or not the decision will be made by delegated powers.

9. AoB:

a. Kew Bridge Pontoon. PH stated that the kayaking club had been campaigning for the removal of the current pontoon that had been installed by the developer St George. Prior to installation, there had been no or inadequate consultation about

the actual requirements of the club. St George have now applied for permission to remove or demolish the pontoon. PH expressed concern at the waste of £0.25m of s106 money in installing the pontoon in the first place. The club has had a formal meeting with the Port of London Authority and have stated that the current pontoon is an obstruction and possibly a hazard in view of its height from the water. Instead of this, the club had suggested the improvement of the slipway just to the east of Kew Bridge, as this would serve its purpose much better at a much lower cost. BCC agreed to comment in favour of the removal of the current pontoon. PH will e-mail DB with suggested comments that BCC could consider making.

b. Draft Brentford East Planning and Design Brief. SB commented that this was to be considered at the LBH Cabinet meeting on 19th September with a view to being approved for public consultation. This would occur in parallel with the review of the Great West Road Corridor Masterplan. The consultation will take place over six weeks in October and November. SB will send links to the documents issued and requested that this be an agenda item at the October BCC meeting.

d. Waterman's Centre. DF asked if the centre was closing. DB commented that there is a planning application to close it and replace it with flats, with a new Arts Centre on the Ground Floor and Basement of a new building on the Police Station site. No detailed plans were available yet, but it was understood that the planning application has been made. BCC had made a formal response previously to this. The planning applications for the Waterman's site and the Police Station site are separate applications but made by the same developer. In practice, they are connected by a deal agreed by the Leader of LBH, so that neither scheme is likely to proceed in isolation from the other. MD commented that 300 seats was a minimum capacity for an auditorium to be commercially viable, and that if the new Arts Centre were only the same size as the present centre, its viability was doubtful.

c. Subscriptions. DC asked that all members who had not paid their annual subscriptions of £10 should do so as soon as possible. This did not apply to those attending for the first time who were acquainting themselves with the proceedings of the BCC.

e. Brentford Stadium – application for minor changes to permission. RL asked for an update. DB stated that the application had been made (as a s.73 amendment to the permission). The BCC's general position was the same as before. DC said that Guy Lambert has invited further communication as to views of the proposed changes to reduce the seating capacity of the stadium whilst improving facilities for luxury seat occupants and for television. This is an opportunity for LBH to claw back some of the benefits granted and obtain a higher level of social and Affordable Housing in the developments ancillary to the proposed stadium. It was agreed that BCC would write to request a proper consultation in respect of the application for revision of permission in this case.

10. The meeting closed at 9.25 pm

11. Dates of Next Meetings: October 9th and November 13th