

Lionel Road Liaison Group

Notes of 9 February 2009 meeting

09 February 2009

Attendees:

- Steve Lancashire (SL), chair
- Brian Burgess (BB)
- Peter Murphy (PMU)
- Chris Gammon (CG)
- Sanjay Sharma (SS)
- Dave Hughes (DH)
- Peter Ladhams (PL)
- Ian Liddell (IL)
- Tim Lockett (TL)
- Phil Marchant (PM)
- Bela Cunha (BC)
- Steven Edwards (SE)
- Andy Millar (AM)
- Janet Burrow (JB)
- John Burrow (JBW)
- Andrzej Kuszell (AK)
- Sonja Leadley (SLE)
- Matthew Rockell (MR)
- Dorothy Boland (DB)
- Barbara Kuszell (BK)
- Chris Calvi-Freeman (CCF)
- Nick Woods (NW)
- Andrew Doe, notes

Welcome and apologies:

SL: Welcomed all present to the meeting and invited them to introduce themselves.

Apologies had been received from Ruth Cadbury, Matt Harmer, Steve Curran, Donald Kerr. SL also apologised for the fact that the notice of this meeting and the presentations to the last meeting had still not been put on the site. He hoped this would be rectified within the week.

Panel discussion:

IL: Begins with a brief transport presentation by IL based on slides he had shown in September. Details will be made available on the website.

DH: States that the key is to get people into and out of the triangle area outside of the stadium.

AK: Asks whether an investigation has been done on where people will be coming to the stadium from.

IL: Confirms that we have investigated this, using postcode data and surveys, and how this matches up to the public transport network. We have also looked the amount of parking around the stadium, and how this can be managed. States that there would be limited matchday parking and spectators will be encouraged to travel by public transport.

DB: States that the effects of the traffic going to and from Twickenham can be felt at Kew Bridge.

JB: Asks whether there is going to be any provision for coaches.

SE: States that currently the plan is to provide away coach parking at Capital Interchange Way.

AK: Believes that a key concern of the Strand on the Green Association is that the area is already challenged and the infrastructure under pressure. Would like to know what is being proposed to cope with this. Has an analysis been done of how existing fans travel to games .

SL: Reminds attendees that the September presentation gave an analysis of where current season ticket holders live and results of surveys of how existing fans travel to games.

JB: Asks how you can stop people walking to and from the riverside area.

SE: Says that the team can advise people on the routes to travel by, but can't prevent people from traveling along certain routes.

CCF: States that there have been plans to improve Gunnersbury tube, including new turnstiles and steps. There is a good prospect that this will be done in time for the opening of the stadium.

JBW: Asks whether a study on the modal split on public transport use has been done?

TL: States that an analysis of the current public transport situation would be useful. Says that he lives near the current Griffin Park stadium and that there haven't been problems with parking and crowd issues, and that people seem to find somewhere to park, with trains coming and going with ease.

JB: States that the closure of Lionel Road would cause even more pressure and problems on surrounding streets.

AK: States that the difference between the current situation and the possible situation with a new stadium, is that the main stadium would be situated on a main traffic artery, in terms of Chiswick roundabout and Kew Bridge. Says that people need to know what traffic improvements there are going to be and where they are going to be.

BC: Agrees with TL, saying that there is no pressure on parking at the current stadium. BC also lives close to Griffin Park.

IL: States that a study of the modal split has been done, and that the current split is 60% of people travel by car. Adds that the use of car parks (eg for office blocks) that are not normally used at weekends could be looked at. Says that the studies of the future have looked at the worst case scenario that involves 20,000 people traveling to the stadium. The aim is for an increase in the capacity not to result in more car movements – i.e. there would be the same number of car movements but the percentage share would be smaller. The project team wants to encourage walking and public transport. Reminds people that further details can be found in the September presentation.

NW: Says there have been only 3 or 4 restrictions a year around the Griffin Park stadium. There are very few complaints about parking, and that in the last survey there wasn't support for a CPZ. Agrees that with a 20,000 capacity stadium the situation could be different. Refers to Twickenham which has an event day traffic scheme, laying on extensive public transport and specific parking provision. Adds that the CPZ around Twickenham doesn't

come into operation for less than 30,000 people as the parking demand isn't that great, and that school playgrounds and other off-site parking areas are used.

CCF: States that the proposed location is served by a number of bus routes – no fewer than 5 at present - the 65, 237, 267, 391 and H91. Says that the presence of buses that close causes people to think about their behaviour. Also points to the close proximity of the railway station at Kew Bridge and that services have been improved at Gunnersbury. Says that there are transport connections very close to the new stadium.

Adds that people's behaviour changes depending on the information that is fed to them, and that people's behaviour changes according to the size of event. If 5,000 people are expected, then people may choose to drive, but that when this grows people get a different message and expect to make alternative arrangements. CCF recalls working in Sydney up to and during the Olympics, and that people traveled to the stadia by public transport.

SE: Says that, having worked around many football stadiums, football fans like using public transport, and that a lot are seasoned travelers who are good at planning their journeys. States that from the perspective of the police, the proposals are encouraging.

JB: Asks whether there are plans to upgrade Kew Bridge Station?

CCF: States that opening up the tunnel would provide access to the platform and convenient queuing for the platform. Also says that Network Rail have been looking to extend all platforms on the Hounslow route, and that South West trains plan to run 10 car long trains from the end of next year (current plan, so might change).

SE: States that the police would only close Lionel Road for a very large crowd - possibly if it got towards 10,000 but there is not an exact figure. Any road closure would be for a short period of time.

JB: Says that even if routes across Kew Bridge are improved, there would still be effects on the traffic. Also states that the stadium would have other uses in addition to football, and that a full assessment of the impact of these uses is also needed.

CCF: States that there are two types of stress on the local road network – 1) ramping up of traffic because of day to day use, and 2) problems because of a major event. Says that these are not coinciding in relation to Brentford FC, and that closing Lionel Road on a Saturday afternoon differs from closing it on a Monday morning.

AK: States that in the spring and summer there is often traffic chaos on Kew Bridge, and that people need to know the extent to which the stadium would worsen the situation, and how this pressure would be eased.

PM: Asks whether road closures would be likely before, during or after the game, and whether TfL would consider an extra lane on Kew Bridge.

IL: Confirms that the full range of stadium uses need to be considered in an analysis.

SLE: Says that a study of the Kew Bridge Junction was done for the St George site, and asks whether the effect of the possible consent of the St George site development has been considered.

IL: Remembers the St George study, saying that the Kew Bridge junction was mentioned as amongst the most cluttered in terms of signage and visual impact.

NW: Says that Kew Gardens has upped its game, and is attracting more people at weekends. Hounslow have had debates with TfL about the bridge, but that it is not quite wide enough for an extra lane. Confirms that a transport assessment will have to be produced and from that albeit will be possible to see what changes may be necessary. The assessment will come to LB Hounslow and to TfL.

IL: Says that the transport study needs to be produced in advance, and would cover all areas where there would be a potential impact. Adds that the study is not yet complete, but that the work done so far indicates that we are in the feasible area in terms of what can be accommodated.

CCF: Says that the Kew Bridge junction is odd in that the exit to it is the limiting factor – when two lanes merge into one. Believes that when congested the two lanes come into use, whereas at other times drivers treat it as one lane. The problems last summer arose when a toucan crossing was malfunctioning.

SE: On the subject of road closures, states that the last time Ealing Road was closed for a match was 3 years ago, and that Braemar Road is closed to bring the away coach into the ground. Suggests that the situation would be better at the new stadium, as there would be a concourse and the turnstiles are not next to the road.

PMU: States that the project team is considering using the route through Capital Interchange Way. Says that, if TFL agree, there might be a possibility to make the top-end of Lionel Road 2-way, giving supply capacity to the northern part of the stadium area. Also says that there are now few stadiums that people are able to drive to and park at. Cites the Emirates Stadium, where people have to park far away, and Wembley Stadium, where some people park at Stanmore. Believes that if attendances grow beyond 5,000, people would park further away from the ground and use buses, tubes and trains. Says that there would be bike storage as at many other football grounds.

CCF: States that tube and train closures come in two categories – emergency closures and planned closures, and that the latter are usually planned months in advance. Adds that the Piccadilly line is accessible from planned stadium, and agrees that people expect to walk further to matches where a large attendance is expected. Recalls a recent FA Cup semi-final, when tube lines failed but fans walked to where they were able to get onto the public transport network.

JB: Asks for clarification on the parking for residential and other uses.

AK: Says that Strand on the Green and Kew are villages that have managed to survive in an urban setting, and that the infrastructure has remained on a small scale. Suggests that there are social challenges. Points to Kew Gardens charmingly upgrading their events programme and facilities, and that there is a need to look at the social implications of this.

TL: Says that, listening to people who live near the Kew Bridge junction, the traffic situation in the area seems untenable. Asks what is being done to solve the current problems and whether the stadium development can be factored in and contribute to these solutions.

IL: In terms of residential parking on the stadium site, the ratio is less than 1:1, partly because for flats owners the ratio of car ownership is less than 1:1. Says that the idea is to not over provide but to accommodate.

NW: Raises the issue of a CPZ, saying that there seems to be pressure for it from some in the Strand on the Green area. The issue would be decided based on the majority view of people in the area who respond. States that CPZs are not always good for residents and that there are measures we could request to be included in the development fund to help with traffic and parking problems. States the public transport accessibility level for the area is currently 2/3, with the scale ranging from 0-6.

CCF: Suggests the possibility of a pedestrian/cycle bridge across the Thames in Brentford, and that this wouldn't be outside of the bounds of reason.

BK: Suggests that the ferry across the Thames could be re-instated.

NW: Says that Kew Gardens don't need planning permission for the extra attractions they are putting on. Says that he will talk to the London Borough of Richmond to discover the

approach they are taking to Kew Gardens.

DB: Asks who would be in charge of traffic management for stadium events.

NW: Says that there is a transport committee and an event day committee, and that the police manage the events and the crowds, with a lot of planning going into this beforehand.

SE: States that there is an advisory group including all partners, which discusses safety issues.

CCF: Confirms that as part of the planning application, developers would need to submit a travel plan, which they will be held to. Section 106 and 278 obligations on improving the road network would be likely.

BB: Says that it is important to get the stadium management right, and that a subsidiary company has been set up, with the assumption that this stadium development company would become the stadium management company. Emphasises that the management of all community stadium facilities would need to be coordinated. Raises two more points: 1) That there needs to be enough parking on site so that people who want to use facilities such as the health centre on matchdays can do so; 2) Parking for people going to football matches would be restricted to those who have pre-booked and have been given permits. Points to a recent visit to Shrewsbury FC, where he couldn't drive within half a mile of the ground without a pass. Adds that the project team want to establish what any potential issues are now, to get involved early and to help solve the situation. Emphasises that the team is very keen to work with the plans to redevelop Brentford town centre, and that they are anxious to be a good neighbour.

PMU: Says that the above situation with Shrewsbury FC is the case, despite the fact that it sits within seven acres of ground.

JB: Asks whether the Strand on the Green Conservation Area has been considered.

SL: Says that the March LRLG meeting will focus on design, which will include conservation issues. The meeting will also focus on the demand for the football club and economic matters.

DB: Asks whether there is going to be consultation with the wider public?

SLE: Says that air pollution in the Kew Bridge junction area is already bad because of traffic, and that it often causes her eyes to run and impairs her vision.

SL: Confirms that there will be a full Environmental Impact Assessment and that he will make an announcement on wider consultation later.

Notes of 12th January meeting:

Notes agreed, with the addition of David Chare to the list of attendees.

Matters arising:

PMU: Says that there are discussions with the Council and other relevant officers about the scope and programme for the planning process. Adds that as the team gets closer to being able to submit an outline planning application the wider consultation will be geared up. Emphasises the importance of engaging with the wider public, and that the team needs to make sure the application is right and takes account of issues raised. Therefore, it is important to establish what all the issues are now so that we can come up with the right solutions.

SL: Says that for the last three LRLG meetings the offer of presenting and discussing the

scheme with individual groups has been made, and meetings have already been held with the Brentford and Hounslow Chambers of Commerce and with Stile Hall residents. A meeting with Griffin Park residents is planned and he was hopeful a date will soon be settled for meeting with Strand on the Green residents. Reaffirms that there is a desire to engage, and says that if anyone knows of other groups who would like a meeting to get in touch.

BK: Says that there needs to be better signage for the location of the LRLG meeting.

CG: States that there is not a formal arrangement with London Welsh rugby club, but that discussions are taking place as to the possibility of the club using the Community Stadium.

SL: Thanks everyone for attending and for the very informative and productive discussion.

Any other business:

No further items were raised.

Date of next meeting:

The date is Monday 9th March, between the times of 7pm and 9pm. Kew Bridge Steam Museum was agreed as the venue to approach, and has since been confirmed.