

Lionel Road Liaison Group

Notes of 2 June 2008 meeting

05 June 2008

Attendees:

- John Assael (JA)
- Steve Lancashire (SL), chair
- Chris Gammon (CG)
- Mike Power (MP)
- Donald Kerr (DK)
- Phil Marchant (PM)
- Steve Curran (SC)
- Tim Lockett (TL)
- Patricia Wright (PW)
- Peter Hughes (PH)
- Dave Hughes (DH)
- Peter Murphy (PM)
- Sanjay Sharma(SS)
- Phil Andrews (PA)
- Bela Cunha (BC)
- Andrew Doe (AD), notes

Welcome and apologies: SL welcomed all present to the meeting and invited them to introduce themselves. Apologies had been received from Brian Burgess (Mike Power attending), Luke Kirton, Mike Simson (Patricia Wright attending) and Councillors Peter Thompson, Barbara Reid, Matt Harmer.

Masterplanning and regeneration: John Assael made a power point presentation, discussing the range of ideas and concepts behind the masterplan, particularly the objective of providing a stadium that would provide a basis for the football club to be sustainable in the future. He mentioned the various infrastructure demands and indicated that the bulk, if not all, the income would be generated by the residential aspects of the scheme to be developed on all three sites. Where possible, e.g. at points around the stadium, there would be towers of comparable height to existing ones. This presentation led to the following questions and points being raised.

PH: Why has the Fountains Leisure centre struggled in recent years?

PM: Four years ago studies were being done on the leisure centre, and it became clear that there would be substantial expense to any refurbishment. It was then that the concept of replacing the leisure centre came on agenda.

PH: How will construction costs change in the months and years to come?

PM: The £500m figure mentioned is a revenue figure not a build cost figure. Need to make sure that build costs are less than revenue. We will make sure that the project is financially viable and when we seek full planning permission the whole project will be fully costed.

BC: Will the height of the towers impinge on the stadium. Can we watch matches from the towers?

JA: The towers won't cast shadows on pitch because they will be to the north of site.

TL: How close are you to getting issues relating to the entry and exit points to stadium sorted?

JA : Have had conversations with LB Hounslow and others and people who specialise in large venue access. We are aware that we need a large bridge at the northern end of the site, and without this there would be a problem.

PM: We have had a discussion with the LDA on whether they can offer assistance. They have offered to lobby on our behalf on with the necessary agencies.

TL: Have you spoken to Network Rail?

CG: We have had discussions with Network Rail, but they want other improvements to Kew Bridge station. They want money spent on this.

DH: There are areas such as the Junction with Lionel Road that technically we don't have to change, but we want to do it to improve access to the site. We plan to get a speaker on traffic and people movement to a later meeting.

PM: If the penalty on getting the go ahead on the bridge is to spend money on station, then trade off is worthwhile.

PW: The south circular is congested and is not an easy junction, and it is not clear what your plans are for traffic and parking. What are you considering?

JA: In terms of parking, we would like to provide parking for at least 60% of residents. We are not proposing much parking for stadium, but it is a balancing act. Having parking underground across most of site would mean very expensive excavation. Residents will have parking and there will be limited parking for other users. We will be discussing these matters with LB Hounslow, Primary Care Trust and others and will be complying with what they say. There will be an opportunity for a north access point, that we propose will be for residents.

PW: What about coaches?

PH: Will the north section of Lionel road become 2-way to take pressure off south circular? We would then need another bridge. Traffic is a challenging issue.

PA: This project has the full support in principle from the local authority and this is across all Parties. What the Executive can't yet do is say yes we'd give planning permission, as this is a quasi – judicial process. But can discuss ideas and issues and incorporate them into plans, so we can inform the decision. Height might be an issue with Kew in terms of lines of vision. If there is opposition it is likely to come from West Chiswick so they need to be engaged. I don't detect huge hostility, but there will be concerns.

PH: How high will the stadium be?

JA: Difficult question to answer at this stage. We will be designing a 20,000 capacity stadium, with an opportunity for another 5,000 seats. We want a roof structure that is cheap to maintain, with no fancy arches. The benefit of a flat roof is that you can have advertising, which will provide the club with an income stream. Most of the community hub building will be 4 or 5 stories. In the southern end of the site we could make a case for 9 stories.

PH: Why not put residential on top of the community hub?

JA: The residential is integrated with the community hub in the southern end of the site. This provides access to the stadium and the hub reception will provide access to hotel, surgery, with residential above.

Notes of 30th April meeting:

Notes were agreed as accurate and giving a good and clear idea of what went on for those not present.

Terms of reference:

PW: Felt from reading the terms of reference that we were not able to influence proceedings. Wants discussion rather than being dictated to. More about allowing local groups to input on how this is local community hub.

SL: That is a very important point, and we will re-draft to reflect that emphasis more clearly and present them to next meeting.

PM: We will use workshops to more interactively engage residential and other groups. Through a workshop mechanism we can put the emphasis on solving issues together.

SL: We want to promote dialogue, not dictate. We also want to be clear what issues we can have dialogue on.

BC: There is a difference between input and dialogue, and perhaps the emphasis on the input is missing.

SL: With regard to membership of this group, are there any other groups we should be contacting?

PA: Aware that there are groups in Chiswick as well.

PW: This is quite good coverage, and you've probably picked up most. Perhaps the triangle north of Chiswick road is currently missed.

SL: Explained that the procedures section outlined the rules of engagement for this particular group. He emphasised, as had already been discussed, there will be other activities to involve local residents and he expected there will be further discussion under the Communications item later.

DH: We have a meeting next week with the website designers. Plan is that by the end of June to have an LRLG website. All notes and links to other websites will be included, and it is intended to develop a forum discussion facility on the website. As plans develop these will also go on.

DK: Would be best if we don't send out notes until they've been issued by Four. This was agreed.

SL: You will need to let us know if any error in notes.

Communication:

SL: How else would you like to communicate?

TL: A newsletter worked well for the High Street project. We put copies in local libraries etc. It was issued on a quarterly basis. Good idea to invite members of the group to write articles.

BC: I have access to notice board on Lionel Road, so I can put posters there.

PA: Take advantage of the Brentford TWA website. Use forum also.

PM: When doing GWQ planning we had a series of half page slots in the Hounslow magazine focusing on different aspects of the scheme.

BC: Was going to suggest the council magazine.

PA : Note that their copy and print deadlines are far in advance so information may be a bit dated.

TL: Could use the football club programme.

PW: Use local papers, including the free ones like Brentford Informer and The Chiswick.

SL: These ideas will grow, and the group will have a monitoring role on issues like this.

DH: There will also be workshops and exhibitions.

DK: Kew, Twickenham and St Margaret's all have fairs. I am contacting them all, so there is the possibility for collaboration here.

PH: What about producing a model?

MP: Consider going to schools.

TL: Consider older groups, elderly community groups, disabled groups. BFC have many elderly supporters.

MP: Consider the hearing and visually impaired.

Future topics:

SL: What are your thoughts on the future topics that have been circulated?

PH: Consider a topic covering employment and business opportunities. PH has spoken to chamber of commerce about doing a meeting at the Club in early October.

PM: A session on the detail of the employment sites would be good, as there is scope for generating employment and positive knock on effects for local businesses.

PW: Would recommend a discussion on health.

SL: Once the PCT have made their intentions clear they will also come to present.

SL: Thought was that the next topic would be the stadium design. We should be doing traffic and connections early on, and also the public realm.

PM: On public open space/realm – should extend the topic to other surrounding public spaces such as Gunnersbury, and get representatives to speak from these places as well.

DK: Issues affecting Griffin Park residents should be of high importance.

BC: On Gunnersbury Park, there's a new regeneration and development director. Could he be on the list? A board has been set up to prepare a bid to the lottery.

PA: Community cohesion - there is a cohesion issue. Should be looking for ways in which we can use the development to promote community cohesion.

PM: The community stadium concept could be widened to look at other aspects, including social inclusion.

TL: What is the limit to the number of meetings?

PM: If our target is to submit a planning application next April there is a limit to number of these monthly meetings we can have but, as has been said, they will be supplemented by

other consultation activities. We need to cover the major topics before we put in an application.

SC: Can we have a meeting timetable?

TL: Can we prioritise meeting topics?

PM: We will timetable meetings on monthly basis.

Date of next meeting

SL: We need to discuss and agree a regular time of month for meetings to help you and others invited, who have lots of other commitments, to plan your diaries.

After discussion it was agreed the second Monday of the month, 7-9pm

Next meeting date confirmed as Monday 14th July. Venue TBC.