

**Hamilton Road Development
York House Community Meeting
Monday 9th January 2006 – 19:00
Meeting Notes**

CDO = Councillor Doug Orchard
VC = Vincent Cable MP
CC = Cathy Cooper (TRAC)
RR = Ruth Rouse (TRAC)

Meeting began with a passing round of the most recent graphic realisation of the proposed development.

CDO asked for a show of hands in favour or against the proposal. All present were against the plans for re-development.

CDO outlined the planning process and procedure for presenting to the planning committee with a suggestion that the three speakers allowed for represent Talbot Road, Hamilton Road and Traffic/Parking respectively.

CC explained the conservation plans for the area that have been put in motion, reliant on a council meeting on Monday 16th January. It was made clear that such a motion would not halt re-development of the site, however the developers would need to work within a design scheme that kept within the aesthetic of the existing buildings and surrounding area. This news was positively received by all.

An independent feasibility study had shown that development of the existing buildings could result in 20 new units or apartments. While this would be a significant reduction in the number of units in the current proposal (35) the feeling was that with a realistic allowance of 2 cars per household, the addition of 40 new cars to the area would stretch the current traffic/parking problems in Hamilton road, that many feel has already reached saturation.

A concern was also raised on the traffic implications of the proposed work/live units that could encourage any number of visitors and supply vehicles at any time of the day subject to the type of business being carried out in the 6 proposed units. CC pointed out that there are existing proposals for passing bays in the Hamilton Road if the development goes ahead, that would remove approximately 4 of the existing residents' parking spaces.

CDO reminded those present that the council had commissioned a survey over a year ago that showed that local residents had turned down a CPZ in the area – many believed because it would actually decrease the number of parking spaces.

It was pointed out that the current guidelines on parking spaces show 34 spaces per 35 units. The current proposals do not meet these guidelines.

It was generally felt that the consultation process had not reached a wide enough circulation, highlighting that those living immediately adjacent to the development area had not been consulted or informed. CDO agreed to speak to the planning department

and encouraged all present to write a letter to the palling department to ask them to ensure that they are kept informed/consulted in the future.

VC pointed out that the current planning system was tilted toward the developers – the developer has an appeal while the local residents will not. VC called for all present to get organised, to talk to one another and to form action groups.

VC also recommended that some contact was made with the action group opposed to the development of the Jewson site on Sandy lane – this case resulted in direct negotiations with the developers.

Volunteers were sought for the three speakers to stand in front of the planning committee:

Traffic Andrew Clarke 64, Hamilton Road 07956 288505
andrew.clarke@uk.bp.com

Hamilton Road Ruth Thomson 48, Hamilton Road 07966 126838
ruth.thomson@eds.com

Talbot Road TBC (Likely to be CC or Peter Lineham)

RR raised concerns over the drainage under the building with particular relevance to Talbot Road. CDO agreed to once again look into the drainage problem at Talbot Road and report back any findings.

This also highlighted the implications of the development of the underground car park on water levels and sewerage increases. CDO pointed out that the latter would not be seen as a planning issue.

RR returned to the issue of live/work units with regard to noise levels and the hours of trading. CDO agreed that such developments could be a public nuisance. It was pointed out that the designs allowed no means for the absorption of noise generated from the general use of the facility.

CDO pressed again for all present to write a letter to the Head of Planning (Mister Richard Barns) asking to be kept informed, and to also increase the number of objection letters or emails to the planning department.

CDO suggested that all also write to the planning committee stating that they would be present at the planning hearing, but will not speak. It was felt that this action would give the committee a clear idea of the feeling in the area.

CDO stated that while the developers had suggested a meeting with the local residents, they had been advised against this by the planning department. However, if the application is thrown out at the planning hearing, CDO and VC suggested that direct negotiations between the residents groups and the developers commence.

VC also suggested further research into Section 106 on planning gain as it was felt that this would be levied if the application got to that stage.

CC was to continue to look into any ecological arguments relating to the site, such as the effect on the bat population. CDO highlighted the example of the lights on Richmond Bridge and suggested speaking to English Nature.

CDO clarified his role at the planning hearing and said that he would ask any questions during the Q&A from his position on the panel that he was directed to do so – this would allow for expansion on key issues outside of the allocated 3 minutes for each speaker.

Those present could expect a minimum of 3 weeks notice of the planning meeting.

Illustrations were encouraged for the 3 presentations and CC was to provide her photos when necessary.

CDO offered to help all speakers with their presentations in dry runs and all three were charged to go and write first drafts.

End.