

At a meeting of the Isleworth and Brentford Area Committee (Planning) held on Thursday, 19 January 2006 at 7:30 pm at Brentford Free Church, Boston Manor Road, Brentford.

Present:

Councillor Reid (Vice-Chair in the chair)

Councillors Andrews, Bartholomew, Cadbury, Carey, Hibbs, Kirton, Lamey, Muston and Smart.

Apologies for Absence

Councillors Edwards and O'Reilly.

109. Declarations of Interest under the Council's Town Planning Code and Disclosure of Personal and Prejudicial Interests as defined by the National Code of Conduct

There were no declarations of interest, although it was acknowledged that some councillors lived within conservation areas.

Removal of Agenda Item 8:

Councillor Reid informed members that Agenda Item 8 had been removed from this agenda and would be brought to the next Planning meeting, scheduled for 16 February 2006. She added that, should the circumstances demand it, the item could be taken as a special agenda item at the Monitoring meeting, scheduled for 2 February 2006.

110. Minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2005 & Matters Arising

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2005 were agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record, with the following amendments:

Page 4: Item 102 – Isleworth Crown Court:

Members agreed that the minutes did not truly reflect the overwhelming strength of opposition members had expressed to the submitted application, both in terms of its scale, style and mass.

7.35pm – Councillor Bartholomew joined the meeting.

Matters Arising:

Page 1: Item 93 – Minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2005:

Councillor Hibbs highlighted that she had still received no response to her query from the Planning Department. Cathy Gallagher assured members that colleagues were working to resolve technical problems that prevented the electronic and printed lists from providing the same data. She committed to investigate this matter and whether it would be possible to include grid references for applications within the listings further and to report back to members at a future meeting with her findings.

111. 317-331 London Road, Isleworth

See report from the Director of Planning, Agenda Item 4.

Members were assured that the applicant would be required to resubmit a formal request to the Council, should any future requests for changes of use be necessary. It was also confirmed that the management of the on site car parking facilities would be the

responsibility of the site owner. Members noted support for the application, particularly in light of the efforts made to market the site (4.2 of the report) and the available public transport links.

Resolved:

That the application number (00707/317-331/P2) (P/2005/1970) for the change of use from car dealership to four A1 retail units be approved, subject to the conditions in the report.

112. 1 Oaklands Avenue, Isleworth

See report from the Director of Planning, Agenda Item 5.

Members sought clarification on the exact dimensions of the proposed extension and acknowledged that, although there were no formal safeguards to prevent the applicant building outside these dimensions, any breach of the approved planning permissions would be subject to investigation.

Resolved:

That the application number (00826/1/P4) (P/2005/3201) for the erection of a single storey rear extension to house be approved, subject to the conditions in the report.

113. 11 Langley Road, Isleworth

See report from the Director of Planning, Agenda Item 6.

In response to Councillor Andrews's query as to whether there was statutory guidance in place on the matter of 'enclosure' (5.1 and 7.10 of report). Cathy confirmed that no statutory guidance was available on this particular subject; rather it was a matter for each individual case to be judged on its impact. She highlighted the neighbour's large garden and the oblique angle at which both properties lay, in addition to the distance between the proposed extension and the neighbour's property, all of which had led to the recommendation to accept the application.

Resolved:

That the application number (00678/11/P2) (P/2005/3273) for the erection of a two-storey side extension to the existing house be approved, subject to the conditions in the report.

114. Conservation Area Character Appraisals

See report by the Director of Planning, Agenda Item 7.

7.50 – Councillor Kirton joined the meeting.

Maggie Urquhart, Historic Conservation & Urban Design Officer, apologised for the omission from the report of the Gunnersbury Park section. This was available to view within the report submitted to the Chiswick Area Committee and would be added to the electronic version of this committee's report after the meeting.

Members congratulated the officer on a fascinating and enlightening report and made the following comments:

- Though aware of the detail and complexity of some of the matters contained within the

report, members felt that some areas required expanded explanations in simpler terms to make the report accessible to a wider audience.

- Members highlighted a number of factual errors and offered to provide clarification on a number of historical errors, based on their local knowledge base.
- Members drew particular attention to the shop fronts adjacent to Kew Bridge railway station, which were locally listed buildings. Though it was acknowledged that the viability of these buildings as future retail sites had been diminished by the introduction of a red route and the deterioration of the material condition of the buildings, they reiterated previous concerns at the placement of advertising hoardings currently covering the buildings. Cathy Gallagher confirmed that she would investigate the matter.

Members asked whether residents would be given the opportunity to submit suggestions for the possible extension of their conservation areas. Maggie confirmed that this would be possible and explained that conservation areas had originally centred around historic buildings, such as Osterley House, but that due to changing perception and the effect on quality that the location had produced in development, there was a case to extend areas to adjacent areas or buildings of character.

Any planned consultation process would need to look at each conservation area in turn and would most likely include an exhibition and local events involving local societies, etc. A possible route would be to set up questionnaires, which would canvas local opinion on the inclusion of certain streets of particular character.

Members were informed that maps showing basic conservation areas were now available to view on both the public Internet site and the internal Intranet. During consultation historic maps sequences could be shown, including the Ordnance Survey maps from 1865, so that people could trace the development of each of the conservation areas. The academic descriptions of buildings related to List or other official descriptions of historic buildings, which were not necessary to understand the conservation areas, and could be reduced or simplified. It was hoped that, in time, reports would include individual sketches, photographs and explanatory notes to help the reader understand the subject matter better.

Resolved:

That members comments as set out above be submitted to the Sustainable Development Committee.

115. 5 Albury Avenue, Isleworth

This report was deferred to the next scheduled Planning committee.

116. Worton Estate - Traffic Calming & Parking

See report from the Head of Street Management and Public Protection, Agenda Item 9.

In response to Councillor Andrews' statement that he was unaware of any meetings with ward councillors (4.1 of report), Jay Gopal confirmed that meetings had been held on 26 April 2005, 14 June 2005 and 20 September 2005 and had included representatives from Thames Valley Housing, Hounslow Homes, local residents and the site contractors.

Jay confirmed for Councillor Andrews that approval of the recommendations at this

meeting would not preclude further discussions on the location of the speed humps (as indicated on the plan) should a better location be found. He added that the location of the speed humps resulted from guidance, which stated that speed humps should be spaced at between 70-80 meters apart in order to promote an average road speed of 20MPH.

In response to Councillor Carey's question on the number of respondents (4.4 of the report) as a proportion of the number of residents on the estate, Jay indicated that, although he didn't have the exact number of residents to hand, the average response level was approximately 20%.

Resolved:

1. That the consultation carried out on the proposals to carry out traffic calming in the Worton Estate be noted.
2. That Option 1 be approved as described in this report for implementation.
3. That, should any objection be lodged in response to the statutory consultation process, then this should be reported to a future Area Committee meeting for consideration.

117. Safer Crossing Proposals for St Mary's School, Isleworth

See report from the Head of Street Management & Public Protection, Agenda Item 10.

Councillor Andrews noted concern at the lack of detail available on the exact proposed location on the southbound approach to the junction to be widened, in light of the location of the war memorial. Jay confirmed that the southbound approach to the junction would only need to be widened by .5 meter and would, therefore, not impact on the location of the war memorial. The proposed works would necessitate the removal of the cycle lane but would retain the cyclists' reservoir at the junction.

Whilst acknowledging the laws preventing cyclist from using footways, Councillor Andrews queried whether the removed cycle lane could be incorporated alongside the former slip road to the east of the junction. Jay confirmed that he would investigate the possibility of this and consult with TfL.

Councillor Bartholomew supported the completion of the other recommended projects, in particular the works on Worton Road and at Marlborough School. He agreed that the current location of the cycle lane on the southbound approach to the junction was dangerous for cyclists and supported its removal but suggested that the road widening should be taken as part of a future discussion on Twickenham Road as a whole.

8.25pm – Councillor Carey left the meeting.

Jay assured Councillor Lamey that the additional requested works around Marlborough School could be completed within budget.

Councillor Muston drew attention to the 3 deaths of cyclists in Hounslow and requested assurances that any removal of cycle lane facilities on the Twickenham Road carriageway would be replaced with an alternative cycle route close by.

Resolved:

1. That the funding already committed to schemes at its meeting on 14 July 2005 be noted.
2. That the balance remaining be noted and committed to further funding for Marlborough School and for traffic calming measures on Worton Road.
3. That the recommendation on incorporating a pedestrian phase within the signals at South Street/ Twickenham Road junction to tie in with Transport for London (TfL) programme of modernising the signals at this junction be approved.
4. That the widening of Twickenham Road, southbound approach to the junction, be progressed at a later date, subject to identification of additional funding.
5. That the possibility of re-routing the cycle lane from the Twickenham Road carriageway, southbound approach to the junction, to the proposed alternative location alongside the former slip road between Twickenham Road and South Street should be investigated.
6. That the use of Section 106 contributions to make up for any shortfall on budget be approved.

118. Delegated Decisions Report

See report from the Director of Planning, Agenda Item 11.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

The meeting finished at 8:45 pm.