

Planning and Community Working Group/ECN
Record of comments made at the training event on the 16th Feb

Statement of Community Involvement

- The existing enforcement procedures need to be reviewed and overhauled.
- Noted that it is essential that the community voice is heard, particularly given the financial clout of developers.
- Concern noted in respect of the existing appeal system. It is unacceptable that an Inspector, who is unaware of the local situation or the community needs, can overturn a refusal.
- In considering submissions, how will the Council resolve differences of opinion between different sections of the community?
- It is essential that development is monitored upon its completion.
- Applications submitted by community organisations should be fast tracked. Concern noted that the length of time taken to determine applications presents significant problems for community organisations. Is it possible to have a dedicated officer for dealing with applications from community groups?
- Concern raised in respect of the current procedures for notification of major planning applications. Site notices and advertisements in the press are inadequate. Site notices are not robust enough. The circulation of the Gazette is also very low. The site notices should be user friendly and jargon free. Neighbour notification is also inconsistent.
- S106 – At what stage do the community have the opportunity to influence where money is spent?
- Better engagement with the community is needed at pre-app stage. It is recognised that this often happens for major planning applications, but there is little engagement for smaller developments which when taken together add up to a significant proportion of all new developments.
- Local community involvement in the planning process has been eroded overtime. Firstly, there are no longer any area planning committees. Area committees are not allowed to deal with planning matters. If community involvement is to mean anything it has to be strengthened at the local level.
- In terms of addressing the planning committee, third party representatives are only allowed one speaker, who is expected to outline their concerns in

only 3 minutes. This is not an adequate forum for communicating concerns.

Issues and Options

- It was noted that residential densities may be higher. Are office densities also expected to increase? Will the LDF allow for higher office densities?
- Is it possible within the LDF to incorporate criteria which will require that a certain proportion of jobs created are safeguarded/guaranteed for the local population?
- How well will the LDF be integrated with the work of the key transport providers, i.e. TFL and BAA?
- Concern was noted that the Mayor's plans for London as a whole will steam roll what our plans locally. How can we ensure input into the Mayor's strategic plans?
- Southall Gasworks. Concern noted regarding existing and planned transport links, which are inadequate.
- A lack of information in respect of demographics etc for parts of the borough will make it an impossible task to plan properly for the actual needs of these areas.
- What is the basis for the housing targets? How were they calculated, and was this done in consultation? Can we challenge these figures? - It was agreed that a further meeting would be organised to discuss this particular issue.
- Health provision must match the needs of the local area and population.
- Outside garden/amenity space is essential for all housing, and notably family housing.

- Clarification sought as to what affordable housing means. Concern raised that it is often sub standard housing which is usually small and of poor quality. Is shared ownership affordable?
- There are insufficient venues and spaces in the borough for community groups to meet. This should be expected as an essential component of all new development.
- Would there be scope to transfer ownership of some council land to community organisations?
- Planning for crime prevention should be prioritised in the LDF.