

Note on behalf of Prime Place, part of Willmott Dixon

Lionel Road Liaison Group Meeting (LRLG)

14 May 2015 - 7pm until 9pm

Venue: One Over The Ait, 8 Kew Bridge Road, Brentford TW8

Attendees:

Dorothy Boland – Strand on the Green Association
Caroline Brock – Kew Society
Derek Collett – Brentford Community Council
Andrew Dakers – Brentford High Street Steering Group
Marie Rabouhans – West Chiswick & Gunnersbury Society
Andrew Ross - Strand on the Green Association
Mike Simson – FOSH

Project Team:

Robert Gordon Clark – LCA (Chair) (RGC)
Barry Chaney – Prime Place (BC)
Simon Taylor – Prime Place (ST)
Simon Chatfield – be:here (SC)
Laura Cassullo - Broadway Malyan (LC)
James Gregory – Broadway Malyan (JG)
Peter Vaughan – Broadway Malyan (PV)
David Williams – Carter Jonas (DW)
Chris Gammon - Lionel Road Developments (CG)
Rhys Williams – Brentford Community Stadium (RW)
Matthew Doudican – WSP (MD)
Katherine Newcombe – Four Communications (KN)

1. Welcome and apologies

Robert Gordon Clark (RGC), Chair, welcomed attendees to the second meeting of the LRLG since planning permission was granted, and opened the meeting. Katherine Newcombe (KN) noted apologies. Apologies were received from: Cllr Mel Collins, ward councillor; Bela Cunha, Lionel Road North; Denis Browne, Brentford Community Council; Hilary Smith, Kew Bridge Owners Committee Kath Richardson, Brentford Chamber of Commerce and Brian Burgess, LRD.

2. Notes of previous meetings on 24 March 2015

RGC proposed that the minutes be approved for the purpose of the meeting, but noted that they are available online and that amendments could be made at a later date.

3. Project update

Chris Gammon (CG) provided an update on the project. He updated the group on project timings, including that the Network Rail agreement has been signed and that Network Rail and Southwest Trains have now withdrawn their respective objections to the CPO. He explained that a public inquiry is scheduled for early September,.

4. be:here – the private rental homes

Simon Chatfield (SC) introduced be:here and explained the standards and business model of the company. This included information on the length of tenancies, which can run for up to three years at a time. RGC asked SC to give more information on how many homes be:here is currently managing and how this scheme compares to the wider portfolio. SC explained that be:here's pipeline of homes is over 1,300 homes.

This then led to questions from the floor:

Business model

Q: Are the be:here homes in one building, or spread across the site?

A: SC – They are spread between buildings and will be shown in Broadway Malyan’s presentation today.

Q: What’s the size of your stock?

A: SC – 350 homes on the Lionel Road development.

Q: Where do you see your business and employees fitting in to the local community?

A: SC – We fully expect to see our people getting involved with the local communities. We are increasingly using social media to ensure we have a presence and to encourage collaboration with local business and community.

Q: Do the staff who look after residents live on site?

A: SC – Our employees are on site from 7am to 7pm. Outside of these hours we operate an out-of-hours service where someone can always be reached.

Q: What will the rental cost be?

A: SC – The typical cost of our two bedroom homes is around £2,000 per month, but this will vary according to the market rate at the time that the flats are delivered.

Amenities

Q: Does your management cover landscaping? What is the designated budget? Are you designing it?

A: SC – Yes, we do manage the landscaped areas and are working with the project team to discuss the design. This is part of the general budget for the site; it doesn’t have a specific allocation. Broadway Malyan will illustrate the exact landscaping strategy later in the meeting.

Q: Are the communal parts specifically for be:here or wider residents?

A: SC – There will be private amenity spaces for our residents, alongside the public realm.

5. Overview from the Willmott Dixon team

Peter Vaughan (PV), lead architect, began by explaining that the scheme is four to six weeks away from submission. He then presented indicative images of the scheme, including a site plan showing the location of Prime Place and be:here homes. As he showed the proposed CGIs, he explained that the envelope of the scheme in volume terms is approximately 30% smaller than the consented mass and gave some explanation of how the design has been developed.

PV also explained the public realm and landscaping proposals, particularly showing how these would integrate with and complement the railway wildlife corridor.

Contributions to wider landscaping were important to some attendees, although the project team was clear that Prime Place can only be responsible for delivering improvements within the red line site boundary, with Section 106 contributions being made to support wider works, to be allocated by Hounslow Council.

Matthew Doudican (MD) explained that a stadium management plan has been drafted, to consider how match days would impact on traffic and movement around the site, with Simon Taylor (ST) emphasising that this is part of a joint approach with the police, Network Rail and Hounslow Council. The team was

asked to liaise with neighbouring developers and work together to ensure the council understands residents' concerns about traffic and access.

Towards the end of this item (8.45pm), RGC made his apologies and left the meeting, as he had previously advised would be the case if it overran. CG then took over as Chairman.

Questions from the floor were taken throughout this design presentation:

Sustainability & greening

Q: Will sun get in to the private courtyard, given the surrounding height?

A: PV – Yes, we have mapped the sun path, which shows the light would permeate through. All apartments will also get sunlight.

Q: Can we discuss the landscaping budget?

A: PV – What we are showing here is within the scheme budget.

Q: Are you designing it as a landscaping approach? Prove that you are linking the surrounding wildlife corridors. There is engagement potential with Chiswick here. The political issue is the acceptability of this in Chiswick, so the more greening the better. £12million is already going to Gunnersbury for greening.

A: PV/JG – We cannot design a scheme outside of the red line. We are delivering a lot within the red line. It will be a material improvement.

Q: Is there S106 funding for wider improvements to greening the area and the wildlife corridor?

A: DW – S106 contributions of £91,000 will be made to sustainability and public realm towards Gunnersbury, as well as additional funds toward the Gunnersbury Park regeneration.

NB post meeting note – the S106 contribution is £90,000 and is split between a £45,000 Pedestrian Network Contribution serving Lionel Road and a £45,000 Sustainable Transport Contribution relating to Lionel Road. The additional funds towards Gunnersbury Park are for projects and initiatives to reduce carbon emissions and total £118,390.

Q: Are you meeting TfL? I would encourage you to suggest how that S106 money is spent. There is a history of it not being spent well.

A: ST – We are continuing to meet TfL and will have these conversations wherever possible.

Q: It's important that you don't just consider your relationship with Gunnersbury Park in terms of a link for biodiversity; it is also important for children to physically get there. I echo the request that you suggest to the council where the S106 can be spent.

A: DW/ST – we will try, although it is not strictly within our gift.

Q: Is the landscaping too manicured?

A: JG – We are looking at natural, native planting and species that will attract wildlife. We are also considering edible landscaping, in reference to the history of the site as a market.

Q: St. George didn't deliver riverside trees – what species are you going to use along the river and the railway?

A: JG – We are going to use lots of native trees. We haven't been on the track, to check what trees are there, as it is Network Rail land.

Q: Can you influence Network Rail to stop them removing the greenery you plant along the track?

A: ST – we meet with them regularly to discuss issues such as this.

Design & materials

Q: The old frontage to the market is in a skip – is it worth visiting to see if it could be incorporated in this site?

A: *Team to consider this.*

Q: Can you explain why there is a reduction in overall mass but not height?

A: PV – Because it is a large site and we cannot fill the original massing proposed and still retain the quality of accommodation we are looking to build. .

Q: Will your application show all the verified views? Stile Hall Gardens is an important view.

A: PV – we have already commissioned 14 images. **We will show these viewpoints on a map and include Stile Hall Gardens.**

Q: Lionel Road South is still the slip road to the M4. Do you think this will really be a pleasant public space?

A: ST – We have been working with the council on this, but the way we are designing it is to improve the character of the roads.

Q: How is brick weaved through the scheme?

A: PV – We are looking at material selection, there may be limited use of brick in the project

Q: What is the proportion of glass in the façade? When it is lit, the light pollution will transform the skyline, ruining views from Gunnersbury Park, a very biodiverse area with a lot of bats.

A: ST – Only one façade faces Gunnersbury Park and will be shielded by the neighbouring storage building. More generally, this was considered as part of the outline planning application and found not to be an issue.

Q: Why use carbon dense materials with a huge carbon footprint and not timber?

A: PV – We are taking our clues from our surroundings. Timber isn't going to age well.

A: RGC – We can talk about how it fits in to the carbon budget separately, but ultimately the materials are the developer's choice.

Q: I am encouraged by the use of aluminium, but why does only one view show this?

A: PV – Each building serves a different function. Some need verticality and others don't.

Q: The darker brown is desperately austere – can you avoid this development appearing as a dull, homogenous mass in distant views?

A: PV – The nature of the buildings is to have neutrality in the distance, then reveal itself close up. **We will get photos of Potter's Field in Tower Bridge that shows how good the material looks in real life.**

Transport & access

Q: The coaches for drop off and the bus garage will all change the nature of the area.

A: MD – The proposals for the new bus garage will need to reflect that the football stadium has been permitted. We can of course work with the promoters of the bus garage and the local authorities to ensure that on match days coaches and buses can all work together in safety.

Q: Will the bridge allow double-decker buses over it?

A: ST – the bridge is primarily for pedestrians and smaller vehicles to cross over the railway for access to the Central Eastern Site and Stadium Site.

Q: Concerns were raised about the ability of Kew Bridge Station to safely manage match day crowds given the existing low platforms which result in a gap between platform and train boarding levels. The view was expressed that the low platforms will pose a safety risk when being used by large numbers of passengers on match days.

A: The Club have agreed a payment of £250,000 to Network Rail towards station improvement works at Kew Bridge Station. As agreed in the S106 the Club will also implement a Stadium Management Plan which will put in place measures to manage match day crowds.

NB post meeting note: The next meeting of the Lionel Road Liaison group will focus on traffic and transport issues to specifically address these concerns.

Q: What about Gunnersbury? Residents near Gunnersbury have already had a letter to ask them not to use the station in peak hours – that’s without the stadium.

A: MD – An assessment of the number of fans using Gunnersbury Station was undertaken within the Transport Assessment which supported the planning application. The analysis showed that on match days there would be a need for crowd management at Gunnersbury station for weekday evening pre-match and all matches post-match. These matters were agreed with the authorities, and as part of the Stadium Management Plan will be developed prior to the stadium coming into operation.

Q: Isn’t there a health and safety issue in the tunnel to the station? It would be interesting to have another session on this, including the psychological impact of tunnels and the danger if there is an altercation.

A: CG – We actually see the opportunity to queue our fans on our own land and thereby assist controlling the fans entering the station as a huge advantage.

Q: Can you describe your conversations with the Golden Mile Strategy Group and the Heating Network? Is Hounslow actually working on a strategy? They are quoting you as their best way of delivering benefits.

A: DW – We are having regular meetings on this. A strategy is being developed.

6. Public exhibition for the residential development

[None]

7. LRLG membership

[None]

8. AOB

It was agreed that due to background noise, ‘One over the Ait’ was not suitable as a meeting venue and an alternative should be found.

9. Date of next meeting

10. It was agreed the next meeting will be in September/October, with a date to be circulated by Prime Place/LRD shortly. This will be to discuss transport logistics. ST will request that Hounslow Council broker a meeting with other developers to discuss the cumulative impact of developments on transport.