At a meeting of the Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee held on Thursday, 21 July 2011 at 7:30 pm at Brentford Free Church, Boston Manor Road, Brentford.

Present:
Councillor Mindu Bains (Chair)
Councillors Ruth Cadbury, Peter Carey, Melvin Collins, Steve Curran, Theo Dennison, Matt Harmer, Ed Mayne and Sue Sampson.
Jessica Bass

Apologies for Absence
Councillors Jason Ellar, Sheila O'Reilly and Barbara Reid.

16. Apologies for Absence, Declarations of Interest and any other Communications from Members

Apologies had been received from Councillors Jason Ellar, O'Reilly and Reid. Councillor Curran gave apologies for lateness and joined the meeting around 8.00 p.m. It was noted that Councillor Cadbury was attending a meeting of the Central Hounslow Area Committee first and would be coming later from that meeting.

There were the following declarations:

Item 5 – 33 South Street
Councillor Harmer advised that there was a connection between his employer and the application team so he would declare and leave the room during discussion of this item.

Councillor Mayne declared that he had joined the Isleworth Society recently.

Councillors Bains, Collins, Dennison and Mayne had all received communications in respect of Item 5 but had no personal/prejudicial interest.

Item 7 – Land at Chiswick Roundabout
Councillor Harmer again advised that as there was a connection between his employer and the application team he would declare and leave the room during discussion of this item.

Councillor Carey had received communications in respect of Item 7.

17. Highways Infrastructure Planned Maintenance Programme 2011-2012 - Sonny Pham

See the report of the Director of Environment – Agenda Item 2.

Sonny Pham, Highways Area Engineer, introduced the report, which asked members to approve the highways maintenance programme for 2011-2012. £74,000 had been allocated to the Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee area for this purpose.

Mr Pham explained how data on road surface conditions was analysed independently. From this data, officers identified four roads, allocating the available funding equally to
spend £15-£20k in each ward.

Photographs were displayed to show the condition of the road. Mr Pham explained that there was deterioration in the surface of the carriageway in Northumberland Avenue and the application of a thin layer of anti-slip would extend the life of the carriageway by 5-10 years. This was a good and affordable solution. Similarly in Marlborough Road there were cracks and loss of surface and micro-surfacing would help. One section of Lynton Close was bad and the application would solve minor cracks. York Road also had severe damage to the road surface.

Mr Pham concluded by confirming that the Highways team sought approval for the list of roads proposed. The work needed to be done in August/September, otherwise the micro-asphalt surfacing was difficult to lay.

The Chair invited questions.

Councillor Dennison asked when the annual road condition survey was undertaken and what involvement there was of local residents.

Mr Pham explained that once per year all the West London boroughs, including Ealing and Hammersmith and Fulham undertook a survey, around February and March. Specialist high tech machines were used to detect the failure of the surface. Throughout the year, residents could report problems to Highways. These were looked at by officers as an ad hoc report, rather than as part of the planned maintenance programme.

Councillor Dennison sought to clarify whether residents should notify the team of problems before the survey in February or at any time of the year. He also asked the cost of the high tech survey.

Mr Pham could email the cost as it did not have this to hand. He explained that residents could report problems any time via the internet or other means and the team would do everything possible within the funding to patch or repair.

Councillor Carey noted that paragraph 3.3.6 of the report referred to liaising with councillors and putting into effect what they said. He asked how this was achieved and what form it took, for example via phone contact or meetings. The report said that officers would liaise with ward councillors.

Mr Pham explained that there was no set form or forum for liaising with councillors, but councillors could come to officers at any time to ask officers to look at certain roads and report on their condition.

Councillor Sampson joined the meeting at this point.

A local resident, Christine Diwell, sought to clarify whether the proposal for Lynton Close would cover the whole of Lynton Close, the slip road or both. She noted that the slip road was in worse condition than the Close. Sonny Pham advised that the data showed that part of this carriageway, including Lynton Close, was in need of repair. The proposal was to do all of the bottom of Lynton Close, including the slip road.

Councillor Harmer moved the recommendations of the report at paragraph 1.1. This was agreed by all members present and the motion was carried unanimously.
Resolved:

Members noted and approved the Micro-Asphalt surfacing and the schedule of maintenance for the Isleworth and Brentford area as detailed in paragraph 3 of the report. This covered the following roads:

- Northumberland Avenue, Osterley and Spring Grove ward
- Malborough Road, Syon ward
- Lynton Close, Isleworth ward
- York Road, Brentford ward

18. Proposed Traffic and Transport Improvement Scheme, Twickenham Road - Christopher Deakins

See the report of the Director of Environment – Agenda Item 3.

Christopher Deakins, Environment Department, introduced the report, which provided an update on the Twickenham Road project which had been introduced at a previous meeting. The scheme proposed to improve the pedestrian and cycling environment. The project had a number of phases to identify finance and progress the design.

Phase 1 of the project had been out to statutory consultation and involved waiting restrictions along the corridor and side road entry treatment. The aim was to achieve 1.5 metre wide cycle lanes, especially from Worton Road.

In respect of Phase 2, the outline design had been put to ward councillors the previous week and it was hoped to start informal consultation in August.

Christopher Deakins made particular reference to the shopping parade opposite Lynton Close. The aim was to introduce 1.5m cycle lanes in both directions, so there was a need to set existing parking bays back to achieve width and safety in opening car doors. Given the probable development of the public house site at the southern end, they would work with the developer to introduce a loading bay which would serve both the development and the shopping parade. There was currently no loading facility which led to frequent double parking.

At the junction of Twickenham Road and Worton Road the aim was to widen the carriageway to allow for cycle lanes and to widen the footway from Van Gogh Close, which was currently very narrow. It was possible to provide a straight crossing and widen the footway through a right turn only lane at the junction. Most motorists used this lane anyway so it was unlikely to affect the capacity of the junction.

It was hoped to consult in August with the results being brought back to the Area Committee in September.

The third phase involved the junctions with the Twickenham Road at St John’s Road and South Street. There had been traffic modelling of traffic flow. At St John’s constraints in width suggested the continuation of a mini roundabout rather than other junction control, but to improve safety and traffic approaching faster than it should, it was proposed to introduce a raised table at the junction with a different surface, changing the look and feel of the junction to slow traffic and make it more pedestrian friendly.
At South Street a number of scenarios with the existing traffic signals had been considered. The junction was very constrained with little room for cycle lanes and widening of the footway. Hence, the alternative of a mini roundabout, as at St John’s Road was considered. Mr Deakins demonstrated to the Committee via a video clip the traffic model for the existing junction and a mini roundabout. Details were shown of existing and predicted maximum queues. The mini roundabout model indicated that queues would be reduced, with the consequent reduction in journey times. A zebra crossing would be provided in South Street to the east of the junction.

The mini roundabout model would make it possible to put in cycle lanes and to widen a narrow footway, so there were benefits. However, it was recognised that this was quite a change, but one on which it was worth consulting.

Further proposals concerned consultation on the extension of cycle lanes and carriageway widening along the Twickenham Road, the sections by West Middlesex Hospital and Park Road.

Councillor Mayne thanked Christopher Deakins for getting the plans to members early. He considered these were interesting ideas and he was interested in residents’ views.

Councillor Mayne commented on the bus stops, especially along the Twickenham Road near South Street. There were narrow street pavements and consequent safety issues to take into account at this point. He asked the predicted impact on rat runs, especially along Park Road and Church Street. He hoped the changes would discourage rat running but asked whether there was any data or predictions on the impact.

Mr Deakins replied that there was no data currently as the element of the scheme from Park Road to Busch Corner was still being looked at. However, any improvement in South Street would be of benefit as there would be less advantage in taking the Church Street/Park Road route. Also any improvement in Twickenham Road was expected to put the traffic back on the main road where it should be.

In respect of the bus stops, Mr Deakins referred to the northbound bus stop and advised that they were looking at the feasibility of splitting the stop, utilising another stop at St John’s Road, so that the numbers waiting at one stop would decrease.

Councillor Carey commented on pedestrians crossing the road and the importance of taking account of pedestrian crossings. Mr Deakins explained that the advantage of this model for pedestrian improvement was that pedestrian crossings were an important consideration within the model. One aim was to improve traffic flow but the key proposals were for pedestrians and cyclists so there was a hierarchy with pedestrians at the top of the tree.

Councillor Dennison spoke positively of the modelling and modern methods. However, he noted that along Twickenham Road there were problems of rat running and the speed of traffic. He suggested that one consequence of this might be that people tried to jump the roundabout as they currently tried to jump the lights. Mr Deakins suggested that the possibility of raising the roundabout on a table to give a different visual impact to the junction would assist this safety concern.

Councillor Dennison was also intrigued to hear what might be done at Busch Corner and
asked Chris Calvi-Freeman about the costs and whether more money was available. Paragraph 4.2 of the report referred to a further £390k.

The Head of Transport explained that there was no additional money. Twickenham Road was a two year scheme. The work to date had been done from last year’s budget and the new work would be done from this year’s. That made £840k in total. The borough had done well in securing Transport for London funding but had not got any more.

With regard to Busch Corner, Mr Deakins advised that they had a model. It had been noted that the only approach which did not have a controlled pedestrian crossing was the Twickenham Road approach. Many pupils from the Green School crossed the London Road and it was felt that it would be possible to install a controlled crossing at the front of the school without impact on the junction. Improved north and south flow at the junction was also being tested but with no solution as yet.

Councillor Harmer moved an amendment to recommendations 1.1.2, 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 of the report to propose that rather than the outcome of the consultation being reported back to a future meeting of the Area Committee, the outcome should be reported to ward councillors in conjunction with the Chair of the Area Committee and that the Area Committee delegated to ward councillors and the Chair to consider objections and authorise implementation of the scheme.

A vote to approve the motion as amended was taken as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Councillors Mayne, Sampson, Harmer and Bains</th>
<th>Motion Carried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>Councillors Carey and Dennison</td>
<td>4/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstained</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resolved:

The recommendations of the report were agreed with the above amendments as follows:

1. The Area Committee noted the work undertaken by officers to date on the Twickeham Road project.
2. The Area Committee authorised officers to undertake consultation on the proposals for the St John’s Road and South Street junctions as outlined in paragraph 3.3.6 of the report.
3. The Area Committee authorised officers to undertake consultation on the proposals for Twickenham Road from Amhurst Gardens to Park Road as outlined in paragraph 3.4.2.
4. The Area Committee agreed that the Chair of the Committee, in consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors, considered any objections or representations to the Phase 1 statutory consultation already being undertaken.
5. The Area Committee agreed that rather than the outcome of the consultation being reported back to a future meeting of the Area Committee, the outcome should be reported to ward councillors in conjunction with the Chair of the Area Committee and that the Area Committee delegated to ward councillors and the Chair to consider the outcome of the consultations and any objections and to authorise implementation of the scheme if considered appropriate.
19. **Proposed Cycle Route Improvements - High Street, Brentford: Ealing Road to Half Acre - Chris Calvi-Freeman**

See the report of the Director of Environment – Agenda Item 4.

Chris Calvi-Freeman, Head of Transport, introduced the report. An outline of the scheme had been reported to the Area Committee on 19 May and this item reported back the results of the consultation and sought approval to proceed with the proposals, as modified as a result of the consultation. One change resulting from the consultation related to the removal of a pay and display bay opposite the Old Fire Station near Waterman’s Court and the introduction of a smaller loading bay in front of the Old Fire Station. Although local residents were unconvinced by the need for a loading bay, pointing out that there was parking elsewhere in Ferry Lane, officers felt that this bay was necessary as without this provision the Freight Association could exercise a veto and delay the scheme. This in turn would have further implications on the proposals to link changes to the timetable for the proposed resurfacing of the route.

Approval was sought to go ahead with the scheme, subject to Transport for London’s confirmation in writing to fund the majority of the work. It was hoped that a firm decision would be received on this point within a few days.

The Chair invited questions.

Councillor Collins asked for clarification as to whether the scheme would include reinstatement of the drop kerbs at the corner of Albany Parade and Wilkes Road and the resurfacing of the gateway to the County Court in Alexandra Road. Mr Calvi-Freeman confirmed that these were included. He explained that raised entry treatment might be deferred if not all the funding was secured but the drop kerbs would be done. The intention was to achieve the highest quality for pedestrians.

Members congratulated the Head of Transport on the excellent job of resurfacing Ealing Road. Mr Calvi-Freeman explained that the work was almost complete. He referred to de-cluttering from the use of a combined lamp column and traffic sign and the planting of five new trees. Residents had indicated that they felt this was an improvement of the local environment.

Councillor Dennison commended the recommendations of the report. This was seconded by Councillor Collins and a vote for approval was carried unanimously.

**Resolved:**

The recommendations of the report were approved as follows:

1. The Committee noted that Cycle Superhighway route 9 will be implemented along the A315 High Street, Brentford in 2013.
2. The Committee noted that the major improvements at the junction of Ealing Road and High Street and the adjacent section of High Street through to Wilkes Road are virtually completed.
3. The Committee noted that the design plans for improvements between Wilkes Road and Half Acre and the responses to the local consultation undertaken along this section of the High Street.
4. The Committee approved, subject to available funding, the proposed
implementation of the above improvements, as far as possible, before the High Street is resurfaced in September 2011, and the implementation of the balance of the improvements after that date, if feasible.

5. The Committee noted that implementation of the improvements will be dependent on funding from Transport for London’s Cycle Superhighway programme.

20. **Planning items for comment**

The Chair moved to the section of the agenda with planning items for comment by the Area Committee.

Before commencing discussion of any of these items, Councillor Mayne commented that there had been email correspondence outside the meeting about the opportunity for the Isleworth Society to speak at the meeting on Item 5, the application for 33 South Street. The clerk had clarified the present protocol for speakers under which the Chair would not normally permit speakers on items coming before the Committee for comment. However, Councillor Mayne noted that the Chair had discretion to take speakers. In the light of the clarification of the protocol, he proposed that the Chair should allow councillors to make their comments first but then might permit a representative of the Isleworth Society to address the Committee.

Councillor Dennison stated that he would like to second this proposal.

The Chair asked the clerk to clarify the reasons behind the present arrangements for speakers as agreed in the constitution and the clerk explained that the reason for the Chair agreeing whether or not to take speakers in advance of the meeting was to allow the applicant notice of the request and the opportunity to address the meeting as well. Agreeing speakers at the meeting did not allow for notice to the applicant.

The Chair also referred to what had been agreed by members in the constitution.

Councillor Dennison stressed that the application was not before the Committee for decision. He believed that there would be the opportunity at the Sustainable Development Committee for the applicant to speak and reiterated that the Chair had discretion to allow the Isleworth Society to comment.

Councillor Mayne pointed out that he and others had already raised issues about possible amendment of the constitution to widen the opportunity for Co-opted Members and residents to comment. He again made the potential suggestion that members might ask questions and comment on the item and then adjourn before residents had the opportunity to make their comments.

The Chair discussed this option with the clerk as there was some strength of feeling from Councillor Mayne and Councillor Dennison that she should allow a representative of the Isleworth Society to address the meeting. She agreed to grant the opportunity to speak. She advised the Committee that she wished to take the other items for comment first, namely items 6 and 7. She would then take Item 5 and take discussion with members first. Once that was complete, she would allow public comment.

Councillor Mayne agreed to this arrangement and Councillor Dennison thanked the Chair for allowing residents this opportunity.
21. Emcroft Works

See the report of the Director of Environment – Agenda Item 6 and the addendum report.

Sunny Desai, Planning Officer, introduced the report and reminded members that an addendum report had been issued in respect of this item. The site in question was the former Emcroft works site near the boundary with the London Borough of Richmond, so had previous industrial use. The area to the north was the Royal Mail site and this application related to the central area of the site. The application was for three buildings with use related to vehicle repairs.

Mr Desai reported that the London Borough of Richmond had objected to excessive height but the present design had decreased the height from that previously approved. Residents had asked for enhancement of the Whitton Brook and the Environment Agency wanted increased set back to assist biodiversity.

The key neighbours were Butterfield Court and Marlow Crescent. The original building had been up to the boundary whereas the present design was set back 24 m from the boundary. There would also be separation by a mature tree screen. There would be restricted hours of operation and parking to maximum standards. It was considered appropriate to seek S106 contributions to improvements in public transport and job creation.

The Chair invited questions.

In response to a question from Councillor Sampson, Mr Desai confirmed that this was within Isleworth ward. He also confirmed in response to a question from Councillor Dennison that whilst the nature of the business would generate cars to the site, there was substantial parking on site, including a basement for storage of parked cars.

Resolved:

Members of the Area Committee made the following comments to be reported to the Sustainable Development Committee:

- The employment prospects and the general proposal were welcomed.
- Members hoped that the Sustainable Development Committee would support the proposal.
- Members sought assurance that there would be sufficient parking on site to avoid any impact of queuing traffic for residents but were assured that there was substantial parking.

22. Land at Chiswick Roundabout

See the report of the Director of Environment – Agenda Item 7.

Having declared an interest, Councillor Harmer left the room during the discussion of this item.

Sunny Desai, Planning Officer, introduced the report which related to the site at the junction of Gunnersbury Avenue and the Great West Road. The site was currently vacant.
apart from advertising hoardings and was surrounded by commercial and industrial buildings, adjacent to various Conservation Areas, including Gunnersbury Park. It was noted that there was extant permission from 2002 for a 13 storey building.

The current proposal was for B1 use. The building had been named 'The Octopus' from its unusual design. The building would cover 4,800 square metres. There would be a basement car park and the building would be glazed with a metallic shroud and LED lights. There would be four advertising panels, one facing the elevated section of the M4. It was estimated that the site would provide 330 jobs.

The application was a resubmission of a similar proposal refused in 2010. The amendments were a decrease in the height, an increase in the size of the office space and a decrease in the size and number of advertising screens. There was also the inclusion of a roof garden and soft landscaping. There would be a retail showroom below and different treatments with the car park to the basement.

A previous refusal on grounds of highways safety had been allowed on appeal and the Council had taken a challenge to the High Court. Two hundred and four letters of support had been received. The West Chiswick and Gunnersbury Society and the Brentford Community Council had objected on grounds of safety and size. Transport for London and the Highways Agency had not objected, subject to safeguarding measures. CABE had welcomed the design, subject to safeguarding conditions. The principle of office use had been approved already and the advertisements were subject to separate consent.

Planning matters to consider were the impact on the Conservation Areas, on Metropolitan Open Land, heritage and the immediate context of the M4 and industrial buildings and policies in respect of the dramatic form of the building and the fact that the shroud could change colour. Neighbours had raised concerns about light pollution from the LED screens and the shroud. There were also objections to the 9th floor roof garden. The nearest neighbour was 90m away.

It was proposed that there would be a combined heat and power plant. S106 contributions were proposed towards public art and transport. The developer had offered time on the screens for borough charities.

The application had also been reported to the Chiswick Area Committee for comment. The Chair took questions and comments on the application.

In response to questions, Mr Desai advised that the issue of the advertisements was to be assessed and the retail provision was limited in size at below 200 square metres. This was below what was previously approved as offices. In respect of S106 contributions to landscaping this included Gunnersbury Park but it was unclear whether it included the roundabout.

Resolved:

Members of the Area Committee made the following comments to be reported to the Sustainable Development Committee:

- Objections to excessive advertising in respect of the proposal.
- Questions were raised about the type of retail facility on the ground floor and what
additional traffic and parking need this might produce.

- Principle concerns were the extent of advertising and the potential impact of access and egress from the retail facility on traffic flow.
- Members noted that the previously approved Pinnacle scheme included S106 for environmental improvements and maintenance including the roundabout and would wish to see the same.
- The design was described as unpleasant, unfortunate, horrible and looking ‘like a car crash’.
- There was concern about the flashing lights.
- Parking and traffic were considered as a problem.
- It was considered positive that development would bring business to a site which was currently an eyesore.
- Nevertheless there were serious concerns about the distractions arising from adverts along the road.
- It was suggested that the Sustainable Development Committee should consider the long term plans for this stretch of road, as a ‘gateway’ site on view to visitors coming into the UK from Heathrow. The building would stand out if there were other alternative plans for this area and this needed to be taken into account.
- The long term vision for the area – aesthetically and in respect of its economic potential – needed to be taken into account.

23. 33 South Street

See the report of the Director of Environment – Agenda Item 5 and the addendum report.

Having declared an interest, Councillor Harmer left the meeting during discussion of this item.

An addendum report had been issued in respect of this item.

Nikolas Smith, Planning Officer, introduced the report, which was for the refurbishment and extension of the existing public house and change of use to A1 retail, together with further residential development, parking spaces and landscaping of a public square. The application indicated that the potential occupier might be Sainsburys but the planning application did not distinguish occupiers. The change of use from a public house to A1 retail would normally be permitted development and would not require planning permission. However, in this case permission was required because of the proposal to extend the building. The principle of the loss of the public house and residential use had been established through the permission granted in 2008.

Mr Smith advised that matters to consider were the relationship of the development to the local context in respect of the character of the townscape and the Conservation Area, as well as the impact on neighbours. There was a modest shortfall in the standards of room sizes and in amenity space, but the Inspector considering a previous application had considered contributions to open space off site to be acceptable. Six parking spaces were included for the residential flats. There was no parking designated for the retail unit but the traffic survey had identified pay and display spaces in South Street. The unit would be serviced via a pay and display space, two hours before and two hours after operating times, and highways consent would be needed for this.

In response to questions, Mr Smith set out the changes from the previous 2008 design and the more modern approach. The applicant had submitted a robust explanation of the
design approach. Mr Smith also explained in respect of parking and deliveries that the traffic assessment advised that the arrangements proposed worked elsewhere and examples of that could be sought and the intention was to use smaller vehicles for delivery. It was possible to condition the type of vehicles, frequency and hours of delivery. In respect of concerns about alcohol sales and the impact on anti-social behaviour, Mr Smith advised that A1 use involved less alcohol consumption that a public house and licensing regulations would apply to the occupier. He also confirmed that waste storage and collection was a planning consideration.

Members of the Area Committee made the following comments to be reported to the Sustainable Development Committee:

Traffic and Parking

- The application should be refused on parking issues as these would have a huge impact on the area.
- Members noted that there was an assumption that no further parking spaces would be needed and that deliveries would be made via smaller vehicles to avoid traffic congestion. They sought further information about the basis for this assumption and examples of how this might have been implemented in other locations and its impact.
- Members also wished to ensure that there could be conditions on delivery and servicing in respect of the type of vehicle, frequency and hours.
- Members wished to preclude late night and overnight deliveries and deliveries around school start and finish times, recognising that there were 2 schools and a nursery very close by.
- Members quoted the example of another store on the London Road which had better access via a slip road but where deliveries still led to problems for local residents. Without a slip road, it was felt that there would be impact on traffic in South Street and surrounding areas.
- Members did not feel that multi-site stores dealt well with problems arising from traffic and parking.
- Traffic in South Street was constant and parking was already tight to access the shops and facilities there.
- There were concerns about rat running in surrounding streets, particularly in Church Street, and the impact of additional traffic and parking, as it was recognised that the retailer would wish to attract passing trade.

Community Safety

- There were concerns about the impact of a competitive retailer on cheap alcohol sales and the potential for an increase in Anti Social Behaviour. Members wished to know the views of the police on this point.
- Three different retailers in the area, including an existing off license, competing on the cost of alcohol, would not improve the position in respect of anti-social behaviour.

Waste collection

- More information was sought on waste and recycling facilities, especially in respect of recycling for flats above shops which did not form part of the normal borough recycling arrangements.
Design and appearance

- The design was a monstrosity compared with that approved in 2008.
- The design originally approved was preferred.
- This was an historic street and the proposed development did not fit within the Conservation Area – this was the heart of the Isleworth Society’s petition. There were old photographs of South Street in the past and it was felt that its future should reflect that historic appearance. The flats were not felt to fit with the remainder of the street despite there being other modern buildings.
- The design was not felt to be in keeping with the area, was considered inappropriate and did not enhance the Conservation Area.

Application of planning policies

- There was concern that 4 rooms within the proposed flats were under permitted development space.
- In respect of the policies and in particular Policy ENV-B.1.1 quoted in paragraph 7.20 of the report, members commented that of the seven bullet points this development only met the element ‘to contribute to urban regeneration and reuse of existing buildings wherever possible.’ It was felt that the development contradicted the remaining 6 elements.
- Members recognised the issue that the change of use to A1 was not dissimilar to the present use category but this did not take into account the issue of the need for additional parking.

Impact on local businesses

- Members had concerns about the impact of local competition on the area as the development was out of scale with the area and would impact on local businesses.

General

- For all the reasons above the Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee wished to report to the Sustainable Development Committee that the Area Committee did not support the development in its current form.

Resolved:

That the above comments should be reported to the Sustainable Development Committee.

At the conclusion of members’ comments, the Chair invited the Isleworth Society to address the meeting for no more than five minutes.

Christine Diwell spoke on behalf of the Isleworth Society. She thanked members for agreeing to allow her to speak and for the comments made in respect of the application.

She commented that this application was technically a minor application and significant locally. She felt that it would be best if it were dealt with within this Committee by local councillors who had demonstrated that they knew their area. She believed that the proposed application would impact on pedestrian safety, local amenity and would be detrimental to local traders. Local people were overwhelmingly against the application, as
was demonstrated by 500 signatures on a petition and 130 letters of objection, compared with only 10 letters in support.

Ms Diwell suggested this provided an excellent example of the community working together. Two societies had been involved, both of which knew the community. She hoped that it would be conveyed strongly to the members of the Sustainable Development Committee that this was not something which local people wanted.

Ms Diwell advised that members had been sent a lengthy document which demonstrated the concerns. It was felt that the application would do immeasurable damage to this part of Isleworth. The main concerns were:

- Unacceptable impact on traffic flow in South Street, especially as a result of deliveries.
- Increased traffic and an increase to existing rat runs.
- Parked delivery vehicles would block sight lines as they would be larger than a car and would impact on safety.
- This would be immediately in front of the site where a lollipop lady ensures crossing for Isleworth Public Hall, three schools and a Nursery.
- No parking provision for customers or staff – this would impact on adjacent roads.
- Detrimental impact of shop opening 7.00 a.m. to 11.00 p.m. in respect of noise from customers and deliveries.
- Detrimental impact on independent shops, resulting in more empty shops and a decline in South Street, Shrewsbury and Lawrence Parade.

Ms Diwell noted that the officer had referred to an amended report but the public had had no chance to see this. She asked members to turn down the application. She understood that it was open to this Committee to instruct officers to refuse the application under delegated powers rather than referring it to the Sustainable Development Committee.

The representative of the applicant who was in the audience also came forward and requested the opportunity to respond as the objectors had been permitted to speak. He pointed out that he had come to the meeting under the assumption that no parties would be permitted to speak but as the objectors had been granted the opportunity it would be unfair not to be accorded the same privilege.

The Chair explained that, in accordance with the protocol, she had not intended to allow speakers but had used her discretion to accept the Isleworth Society as they had already spoken to ward councillors about being able to address the meeting. Other members considered that there should be equity and the Chair agreed to allow the representative of the applicant a maximum of five minutes to address the Committee.

The representative appreciated the Chair’s use of her discretion. He pointed out that he had not had the opportunity to prepare comments but wished to pick up on a few points.

He pointed out that as representatives of the applicant, they had undertaken public consultation prior to the submission of the planning application and had worked with officers to seek a scheme which was acceptable. It was not disputed that residential use on the site was acceptable. The change of use from a public house to a supermarket was allowed under permitted development, but they looked to extend the A1 unit so a planning application was required.
The concerns about parking and traffic were understood but the government over the last 10-15 years had pushed for local services. It was expected that the supermarket would serve a local catchment area of 500 metres and that people would walk to the shop. It was also acknowledged that there might be people using the services via cars, but parking restrictions were already in place in the area. In respect of anti-social behaviour, it was noted that the building was currently a public house. Also if Sainsbury’s were aware of such issues, they would ensure that they were addressed.

In respect of refuse storage and collection, there was a significant area of flats which would use facilities and hence an appropriate access route.

In respect of the retail development, the representative of the applicant advised that a comprehensive report had looked at all aspects of national and local guidance and this was considered to be an appropriate location where Sainsbury’s would complement other local shops. Under the terms of the guidance, they had looked at sequential sites and considered that there was sufficient ‘top up’ expenditure within the area to support the new and current businesses. This complied with the guidance for sustainable economic growth.

There were no questions to speakers so the Chair closed the item at this point and Councillor Curran called Councillor Harmer back to the meeting.

24. Addendum Report

Addendum reports were issued on the following Items:

Agenda Item 5
Agenda Item 6
Agenda Item 9
Agenda Item 11

25. Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2011

The Co-opted Member of the Committee present, Jessica Bass, was invited to join the Committee prior to the discussion of the minutes. Councillor Cadbury also joined the meeting at this point.

An addendum report had been issued in respect of this item with amendments to the minutes.

These were as follows:

Item 3, page 130, point 4 – Declarations of interest and other communications from Members.

In addition to the text of the minute, Councillor Reid declared that she had a close family member who worked at BSkyB.

Councillor Reid’s other declaration was in connection with Land Adjacent to Kew Bridge, not the Alfa Laval site. She also stated that she had attended the public exhibition where she had met the developers and some of their agents. She also said that as far as she was aware no officers were present.
Therefore – amend paragraph to read:

‘Councillor Reid declared that she had acquaintance with individuals at BSkyB. She had a close family member who worked at BSkyB. Councillor Reid also stated in connection with the application for Land Adjacent to Kew Bridge that she had attended the public exhibition where she had met the developers and some of their agents. As far as she was aware no officers were present. She also stated that she recognised one of the developers in the audience tonight from elsewhere.’

The minutes of 9 June 2011 were confirmed, subject to the amendments in the addendum report.

There was one matter arising from the minutes.

Page 130, Item 4 recorded that Sunny Desai would inform Councillor Carey of the number of floors in the Tower. Councillor Carey had not heard anything on this point. Mr Desai apologised for this. He believed the figure to be 15-20 but would confirm the figure to Councillor Carey the following day.

26. **Local Policing Update - Inspector John Partington**

See the report of the Sector Inspector and the Safer Neighbourhood Teams – Agenda Item 10.

Inspector Partington had given apologies and no police officer was able to attend.

Concerns were raised by the Vice Chair of the Syon Safer Neighbourhood Panel about what was happening with the Syon Safer Neighbourhood Team. The speaker appreciated that there were local difficulties but was concerned that there had been no Ward Sergeant since April and the Safer Neighbourhood Panel had not met for the last three months. Attempts to get information had proved unsuccessful with the exception of information from a PCSO. This was causing great concern and there was also concern about implications for police resources in the local area. The speaker asked members to raise these concerns with the Borough Commander at the next opportunity. It was agreed that these concerns would be discussed with Councillor Mayne as the Lead Member outside the meeting.

Councillor Collins, as the Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee representative on the Hounslow Community Police Consultative Group (CPCG) informed the meeting that at the meeting of the CPCG on Monday that week, members had been told the borough was to lose five Sergeants. He advised that Syon Ward had an Acting Sergeant, Chris Jones. Councillor Curran expressed concern that over the last few meetings there had not been a clear indication from the police about the impact of government cuts and the potential demise of the Safer Neighbourhood Teams as members knew them.

**Resolved:**

The Committee agreed to hold over specific questions to the next meeting.
See the report of the Director of Environment – Agenda Item 11 and the addendum report.

Jamie MacArthur, Environment Department, drew members’ attention to the addendum report, which set out Equality and Legal comments. The main report set out available S106 funds which were unallocated in the area, set out by ward area and those already committed. He explained the processes in place to work with spending officers on a quarterly basis and working with Area Committee sub groups to allocate and monitor the spend. The report set out unspent funding by ward and area in order to assist the work of the sub group.

Mr MacArthur spoke of the improvements in available information on S106 funds and the establishment of a dedicated webpage. Currently information prior to two years old was not live but it was expected this would be available shortly. There would be the opportunity for members to submit proposals and queries to identify whether S106 funding was available.

Members welcomed and noted the report.

Members main concern was that the spend was not progressing quickly, even when ward councillors had sat with the spending officers to move schemes forward. Councillor Cadbury suggested that members should take responsibility for driving on implementation of projects and tracking progress, via a co-ordinating role for the Area Co-ordinators. She also suggested, referring to paragraph 2.9 of the report, that once spend and cost had been agreed, it should not be necessary to bring a report back to the Area Committee for approval. Instead she suggested developing a system whereby projects within the budget could proceed whilst those costed over budget could be signed off through the Area Co-ordinator via the ward councillors and the Chair. Members supported this approach.

Jessica Bass, Co-opted Member, acknowledged that this was a detailed report but as an observation considered that despite the long list there was no real picture of how performance was managed. There was a lapse in time in the monies being committed and spent. She suggested the introduction of a couple of Performance Indicators (PIs) as an easy way to see progress.

Jamie MacArthur explained that last year the department had spent time on a large S106 exercise and as a result new agreements were working well. However, there was a problem with wording in older agreements. He suggested that the stocktake report should form the monitoring of progress. This identified commitments and showed when the money would be spent. If there was a diversion of the spend, this needed to be known to identify problems. However, the report would show a timeline.

Councillor Dennison commented that his concern was that movement should be over weeks and days rather than a year. He noted that Performance Indicators did need to show performance. However, he was raising general concerns and pointed out that he did like the report format which showed clear and identified actions. He thanked Jamie MacArthur for the report.

Councillor Harmer also thanked the officer and supported Councillor Cadbury’s suggestion. He asked whether this would require a Cabinet or a Single Member Decision
and Councillor Cadbury believed it would be a Single Member Decision, which could be achieved more quickly. Mr MacArthur also clarified, in response to a further question, that remaining balances could be recommitted and this had been done with a number of projects.

Councillor Carey suggested it would be helpful to emphasise in the report what date funds had been committed, by which time they must be spent and when the work started. This would enable members to see the current position more clearly. Jamie MacArthur explained that funds should be spent within 3-5 years but ideally as soon as possible after the development was completed. This was something he promoted with the spending departments. They were working through uncommitted funding but there were some clauses which could not be changed.

A local resident, Christine Diwell, made a number of comments on the report. She welcomed the idea of a webpage but noted reference at paragraph 4.3 to the public submitting proposals and feedback via the sub committee, but she understood that the Isleworth and Brentford Sub committee had been disbanded a year ago. However, she felt that there were contradictions in the references at paragraphs 2.3, 2.9 and 2.10 in giving spending officers the lead work on the proposals. The report did not say when the Area Committee would decide how the money would be spent. Members input appeared to be after officers had drawn up spending plans. Previously members had drawn up a wish list to decide spending but she had not seen this for several years and asked who kept this.

There were a number of specific points raised by Ms Diwell in respect of Schemes 381, 396 and 197 which the Chair suggested might be clarified to members in writing.

Resolved:

Members noted the process and outcomes of the 2011 Stocktake of unspent S106 monies in the Isleworth and Brentford Area.

28. **Town Centre Management presentation - Patricia Huertas (Town Centre Manager)**

Reference the presentation – Agenda Item 12.

Patricia Huertas, Town Centre Manager, gave a presentation on the background to the establishment of her post and the way forward for the future. She spoke of the underperformance of certain town centres in the borough, the previous lack of a Brentford Town Centre Manager, the funding of her post to take responsibility for Brentford and Hounslow town centres via S106 funding for a three year contract via Planning Policy and Economic Development Unit, starting in April 2011. Jan Henson from Economic Development Unit was also present at the meeting.

The aims of the post were to raise the profile of the town centres. This was being pursued through analysis of strengths and weaknesses, benchmarking with similar areas in West London and contacts with stakeholders and responsible officers. There was the opportunity for funding from the Outer London Fund to regenerate town centres, with an application being submitted for Brentford for funding of £225k for a short term project.

Analysis so far showed strengths to be key landmarks, active groups, the character of the
area and a brand/identity in place. Weaknesses were the area being run down with limitations in strong trading and a lack of strategic approach to tourism despite the attractions.

The Committee agreed to suspend standing orders to continue beyond 10.00 p.m. at this point.

Ms Huertas noted that the opportunities for links with the Great West Road were not maximised and footfall was low. There was room for capacity building amongst local groups and opportunities for leisure development of the waterways. Key attractions such as local museums were not in the High Street. A strategic marketing approach and a strategic approach to tourism needed to be considered. For example, other areas had themed markets. It was important to decide what people wanted to see in the High Street.

Areas of work to pursue as a way forward included prioritising economic growth, investment in public realm, developing a cultural identity and contributing to safety and security. The workplan for the Outer London Fund bid included short term projects including web marketing via local websites, business awards, Christmas lights, a campaign for shop frontages and public art. There was also a co-ordinated signage project drawing on S106 funds for environmental improvements, for example a new car park sign in the High Street and welcome signs.

In the medium term, the aim was to submit a second bid to the Outer London Fund. The future workplan here would include environmental projects, consultation and delivery with partners and making the links with the Great West Road and the Thames Pathway, together with way finding, cultural events, inward investment and the use of public space. Over the longer term beyond the present three years, there would need to be consideration to the sustainable funding of the Town Centre Manager post and hopefully a legacy of sustainable business plans, vitality, viability and good links. Performance indicators were being established to measure improvement and would cover the diversity of use and residents’ perceptions. The next steps involved ongoing activities involved with short term projects and the Outer London Fund bid and a report to the Cabinet in September.

Members welcomed the presentation. Members noted that there would be presentations by developers involved in the regeneration of the south side of the High Street to amenity groups but wished to stress that members were the decision makers so it was important to have a route to ensure they were part of the process of consultation.

Resolved:

It was agreed that a copy of the Outer London Fund bid document would be circulated to members and a copy of the presentation. The latter would also be posted on the website.

29. Open Forum

There were no items for the Open Forum but Councillor Carey suggested that this was probably a result of the lateness of the hour and suggested that the Open Forum might be taken earlier.

Members agreed that at future meetings the Open Forum should be taken earlier in the meeting.
30. **Urgent Business**

   There was no urgent business.

31. **Date of next scheduled meeting - 15 September 2011**

   The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, 15 September 2011.

   The meeting finished at 10:05 pm.