

1 What is your name? Mary Duffy

Consultation Overview

14 Do you have any comments to make on the Consultation Overview chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures:

Yes the overview for Brent East gives too much importance to the wishes of Developers such as Quintain and Aitch. Just because these developers ask that they should be allowed to build as high as they like does not mean that they should. The guidelines on the proposed plan say no more than 5 storeys is allowable in the "intensification corridor" parts of Brent East.

Residents are aware that Developers especially Quintain have way too much influence in Brent council and are very unhappy about it. Neasden and much of NW London has been for many generations a predominantly low rise area and the London plan seems to be intent on turning everything near the North Circular into a high rise dystopia. Although Brent's planning department will argue to the contrary these developments display remarkable short-sightedness and cater only to the profit motives of Quintain (which in turn is owned by Asset Management companies) To allow with such a company free reign in Wembley Park and the College of NW London site on Dudden Hill is contrary to the socialist principles Corbyn and Momentum preach.

I do not see that Hipsters are clamouring to live in the Quintain "Tipi" development in Wembley Park and it is possible that Brent instead will have to buy these back and reassign these buildings to social housing use. a.k.a. council flats..

I also sincerely hope that the proposed West London Orbital line does not veer onto any conservation sites.

There is much flooding at the bottom of Blackbird Hill each time we get moderately heavy rainfall basements are flooded on Braemar Avenue along side the canal and Coombe Road are in the flood plain of the River Brent and adjacent to the Welsh Harp Reservoir. No developments should be built in a floodplain.

Introduction

15 Do you have any comments to make on the Introduction chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures:

"The council has a positive attitude towards development and the potential benefits that it can provide to residents, businesses and visitors."

What it does not address is that us council tax paying residents consider the existing and proposed high rise developments highly inappropriate. It has been widely expressed by residents and widely ignored by Muhammed Butt and his council.

I disagree strongly with this; Nobody in Neasden has expressed support for tall buildings around Neasden station except developers!!

"The local population to support it will be added to by the Neasden Stations Growth Area; a key focus for new housing and employment provided in tall buildings and a new West London Orbital railway station. "

Brent's Characteristics

16 Do you have any comments to make on the Brent's Characteristics chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures:

There are mendacious attempts to alter the characteristics of Brent East by inserting paragraphs such as "5.1.14 Tall buildings will not be in character with much of this place. As such opportunities for buildings over 10 storeys are directed towards the Growth Areas which it is proposed will undergo radical change, related to major improvements in public transport accessibility where there is also the need to secure a wide range of benefits and be consistent with the London Plan's priority of development near public transport."

We do not want 10 storey or 10 storey plus buildings in Neasden!!!

Every attempt should be made to preserve the integrity of the Welsh Harp area as it is a refuge for wildlife and SSSI

There should be no reduction of conservation areas.

The west London Orbital Line should not be used as a justification for building high rises.

NO mention of Neasden Recreation Ground is made in Brent East; as Brent has stopped cutting the grass in the park, planted NO meadow flowers and is deliberately running down the area.

"1.27 ...It will therefore be important to ensure the quality of existing open spaces are enhanced, even where scoring highly such as at Welsh Harp, Silver Jubilee Park, Kingsbury Recreation Ground and River Brent corridor. The Welsh Harp has the potential to offer so much more in terms of accessibility for recreation and leisure use and ecology. Its proximity to development areas increases the potential to improve its setting and also provide developer funding for its improvement."

Development Vision and Good Growth in Brent

17 Development Vision: Achieving our Potential

Development vision matrix of choices - How strongly do you agree/disagree with the development vision:

Disagree

Please provide feedback on the vision here:

Again too much precedence is given to developers and developments.

Much of the best improvements of an area are done by residents to their own properties and by community groups and bodies such as Canal and River Trust and Natural England

18 Good Growth in Brent

[ccX' [fckh\` a Uhf]I`cZ'W\c]WYg!' <c k`ghfcb [`m`Xc`mc i`U [fYY#X]gU [fYY` k]h\`h\Y` j]g]cb`Zcf` ; ccX` ; fckh\`]b` 6fYbh3.

Öä•æ*!^^

Q•Á} [cÁR~•cä-ä^âÉÁQ•Á} [cÁÖ~^^&cäç^

Ø [!Ác@ [•Á , @ä&@Á@æç^Áà^^}Á&@^&\^âÉÁ]|^æ•^Á•cæc^Á^ [~!Á!^æ• []•K

QÁäâ•æ*!^^Á , äc@Ác@^ÁŠ [] ä [] ÁÚ|æ}Áæ} äÁPæcä [] æ|ÁÚ|æ} }ä} *ÁÚ [|ä&^ÁØ!æ { ^ , [! \É

P [~•ä} *Á { æ^Áà^Á} ^^ä^âÉÁà~cÁ} [cÁ@ä* @Á!ä•^•É

Ùc! [] *Á& [{ { ~ } äcä^•Áæ!^Á} ^^ä^âÉÁæ} äÁÓ!^}cÁ& [] c!äà~c^•Á} [c@ä} *Ác [Ác@ä•Áà^Á} æ} ä^!ä} *Ác [ÁÚ~ä} cæä} ÉÁcÉäc&@Á^c&Áæ} ä

FJÁÁÚ [|ä&^ÁÖTÚFÁÇÖ^Ç^ [] { ^ } cÁTæ}æ*^ { ^ } cÁÖ^}^!æ|ÁÚ [|ä&^DK

ÖTÚFÁ { æc!äçÁ [-Á&@ [ä&^•ÁÉÁP [, Á•c! [] } *|^Áä [Á^ [~Áæ*!^^ðäâ•æ*!^^Á , äc@Ác@ä•Á} [|ä&^ÑK

Öä•æ*!^^

Q•Á} [cÁR~•cä-ä^âÉÁQ•Á} [cÁÖ~^^&cäç^

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons:

Too much sway is given to developers, who are owned by Asset Managers and offshore funds

Places

20 Which Place would you like to comment on? (you will get the opportunity to select additional places to comment on throughout the survey)

Please select a place:

East

East Place

36 Please check the boxes of the soundness test which you believe policy BP2 East does not pass:

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons:

For the Coombe Road site in Brent East "Thames Water has indicated the water network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development, and upgrades to the wastewater network are likely to be required. Thames Water will need to be engaged at the earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan to ensure essential infrastructure is delivered prior to the development creating identified additional capacity requirements. Local upgrades to the existing water network infrastructure may be required to ensure essential infrastructure is delivered prior to the development creating identified additional capacity requirements. There are public sewers crossing or close to the site." These sewers already flood into the canal between Braemar Avenue and McDonalds on Coombe Road every time there is heavy rain; and despite numerous calls to both Thames Water and the Canal and River Trust absolutely nothing has been done about it.

37 Do you consider the site allocations within the East Place sound?

East site allocations test of soundness - BESA1:

Is not Effective

East site allocations test of soundness - BESA2:

Is not Effective

East site allocations test of soundness - BESA3:

Is not Effective

Please state your reasons for those you have checked, being sure to reference the site allocation:

BESA 1 the brick reclaimers yard on Coombe Road has been acquired by Aitch and planning permission given for a 6 storey building on the site; the

"consultation" with existing residents was almost non-existent.

Developers have already requested that Brent revise its local plan to allow higher than 6 storeys, this should not be allowed.

The entire site is in a floodplain of the Brent River and in an area that Thames Water recognises has a problem with flooding sewers

38 Would you like to comment on another place?

No

Themes

47 Which theme would you like to comment on? (you will get the opportunity to select additional

Please select a theme::

Heritage and Culture

Heritage and Culture

78 Policy BHC1 (Brent's Heritage Assets):

Agreement matrix BHC1 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Neutral

Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

Brent is not recognising that a low rise neighbourhood is a heritage asset in itself.

It is destroying the quiet residential nature of the area and replacing it with high rise monstrosities

79 Policy BHC2 (National Stadium Wembley):

Agreement matrix BHC2 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Disagree

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

The view of the stadium has been destroyed by Quintain's developments and Brent Council pandering to their every demand.

The Boxpark is turning into a white elephant as is the entire build to rent endeavour.

If the FA had owned this land this horrible building project would not have been allowed.

80 Policy BHC3 (Supporting Brent's Culture and Creative Industries):

Agreement matrix BHC3 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Neutral

Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

Rebranding the Tricycle Theatre as The Kiln is idiotic. Also Brent is losing pubs to developers at a fast rate with little or no thought to their cultural significance.

The Queensbury pub at Willesden green is a prime example of the sheer vandalism that the Brent Planning committee has unleashed on the borough

81 Policy BHC4 (Brent's Night Time Economy):

Agreement matrix BHC4 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Disagree

Is not Effective

For those which have been left unchecked, please state your reasons::

There is not much good nighttime venues in Brent as business rates are crippling all but the most profitable of bars and restaurants

82 Policy BHC5 (Public Houses):

Agreement matrix BHC5 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

Brent is losing pubs to developers at a fast rate with little or no thought to their cultural significance.

The Queensbury pub at Willesden green is a prime example of the sheer vandalism that the Brent Planning committee has unleashed on the borough

83 Would you like to comment on another theme?

No

Green Infrastructure and Natural Environment

84 Policy BGI1 (Green and Blue Infrastructure in Brent):

Agreement matrix BGI1 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Neutral

Is not Justified, Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

The policy neglects completely to mention the existence of Neasden Recreation Ground.

Brent has not cut the grass in two years and it is left to the residents to clear the litter from the park. It seems to me to be a deliberate policy of managed neglect. It has been featured on News at Ten and "You and Yours" on Radio 4 with myself guiding Tom Clarke around what is a SSSI that has not been visited by Natural England in over 6 years and what Brent had allowed to become a homeless camp until us residents got together to clean it up. The chair of Natural England later resigned when the collective negligence of Natural England and Brent Council had been exposed.

The park has been neglected by Brent council whereas nearby Gladstone Park gets classed as an "ornamental park"

Brent should in-house its parks service as Veolia clearly is not capable to maintain parks or even acknowledging the existence of some..

85 Policy BGI2 (Trees and Woodlands):

Agreement matrix BGI2 - How strongly do you agree/disagree with this policy?:

Neutral

Is not Effective

For those which have been checked, please state your reasons::

Brent has not been planting enough trees and is this week cutting down healthy mature trees in parts of Brent to widespread protest from residents.

There seems to be a lack of common sense in Brent, where contractors employed to maintain the trees see them as an expense that can be reduced if the trees are eliminated altogether. Again this policy is mendacious

86 Would you like to comment on another theme?

Yes

Delivery and Monitoring

97 Do you have any comments to make on the Delivery and Monitoring chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures::

I think the entire Local Plan should be subject to central government scrutiny.

Efforts should be made to curtail the influence of big developers/asset managers.

Appendices

98 Do you have any comments to make on the Appendices chapter?

Please ensure that you reference specific paragraphs/ figures::

I am very against high rises in the borough of Brent.. They are an eyesore, I don't want them

Integrated Impact Assessment

99 Do you have any comments to make on the Integrated Impact Assessment?

Please make sure you reference the section you are commenting on::

I have noticed that "the upper heights for Staples Corner have been increased to 15 storeys." This is unacceptable and dishonest and an act of vandalism, the impact of this will be to destroy the area

I am very happy with the findings of DEFRA and Historic England

Include DEFRA Biodiversity Calculator under 'potential indicators' for EN5.

Undertake a mapping exercise every 3-5 years for newly created habitats to track effort.

Carry out river morphology surveys for River Brent catchment.

No mention of impact of flooding on communities and rivers.

Policies should seek to achieve the equivalent of 'Good' ecological status post Brexit.

Characterisation Study will be of high value in understanding the impact of, and helping to shape developments. Some site allocations (BCSA1, BNWSA1, BSSA17, BSESA21) not identified heritage considerations which exist.

Historic England

Brent Reservoir SSI should be included as a criterion under EN5 which a target for a net increase in biodiversity.

Natural England

Health impact assessment should be separate.

Concern over MOL land swap proposal.

Too complicated.

Green space should be increased.

Infrastructure improvements need to happen prior to, or alongside residential development, not after.

Residents

Changes made
to the document

Included following recommendations from the Environment Agency: reference to DEFRA Biodiversity Calculator, mapping exercise for newly created habitat every 3-5 years, reference to river morphology surveys on River Brent catchment.

Amend the second EN% target to 'development schemes within the borough achieve a net gain for biodiversity.'

Survey Feedback

100 Please provide feedback on the format and content of this survey below:

Feedback on survey:

It is a good effort at outreach, but trust in Brent Council has been severely eroded this past 5 years by the activities of Quintain (who are mentioned 38 times on the Consultation Document) and who seem to call the shots in this consultation.

Please do not let them get their greedy hands on Neasden, they have already destroyed Wembley Park and are trying to destroy the site of the former Warranty House on Dudden Hill Lane

Fair Processing Statement

101 Would you like for your personal data to be used for reasons other than identifying your representation and for contact in relation to this?

No