



Cabinet
12 October 2020

**Report from the Strategic Director
of Regeneration and Environment**

**Application for the re-naming of the eastern section of
Meadow Garth to Pramukh Swami Road**

Wards Affected:	Stonebridge
Key or Non-Key Decision:	Non Key
Open or Part/Fully Exempt:	Open
Appendices:	One Appendix 1: Location Map
Background Papers:	None
Contact Officer:	Alice Lester, Operational Director, Regeneration Growth and Employment alice.lester@brent.gov.uk Tel: 020 8937 6441

1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report refers to an application (SN/19/08678) from the Shree Swaminarayan temple to rename the eastern section of Meadow Garth to Pramukh Swami Road. It details the consultation carried out and the responses to that consultation, and the guidelines for making a decision on street names.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Cabinet confirms whether it wishes to make an order to change the name of the eastern part of Meadow Garth to Pramukh Swami Road as requested in the application.
- 2.2 That if Cabinet wishes to proceed with the name change:
- 2.2.1 Authority is delegated to the Strategic Director for Regeneration and Environment to implement the proposed order.

2.2.2 Authority is delegated to the Strategic Director for Regeneration and Environment to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that the Applicant covers the reasonable costs that are incurred by the Council and occupiers affected arising as a result of the change to the street name at eastern section of Meadow Garth, plus, to the occupiers of the properties, an inconvenience fee.

3 Detail

3.1 Meadow Garth is a road running east to west, with a metal road closure gate circa 100 metres from its junction with Brentfield Road at its eastern end. At its western end it forms a junction with Harrow Road.

3.2 The application, submitted by the Temple, is for the re-naming of part of the eastern section of the road, from its junction with Brentfield Road up to the metal road closure gate as indicated on the site plan in Appendix 1. The western side of Meadow Garth would be unaffected by the proposal.

3.3 The Shri Swaminarayan Mandir Temple occupies much of the southern part of the road from the junction with Brentfield Road, up to Brentfield Primary School. Opposite the Temple are some residential and commercial properties. Beside the Temple, and to the eastern side of the road closure is the entrance to the nursery school part of the Brentfield primary school. The properties affected would therefore be:

- 54 Meadow Garth – Shayona Shop
- 56 Meadow Garth – Shayona Restaurants
- 62 Meadow Garth – Residential
- 64 Meadow Garth – Residential
- 66 Meadow Garth – Residential
- 68 Meadow Garth – Residential
- Brentfield Primary School (nursery entrance)

3.4 Although the Temple has a long frontage along the street with its entrance there, the postal address for the Temple is in Brentfield Road so would be unaffected.

3.5 Five letters of support from or representing three properties in Meadow Garth were submitted with the application (however one of these letters was superseded by a subsequent objection).

3.6 In one of the letters submitted with the application, the text states that BAPS (the Temple) will pay for all Royal Mail postal redirection costs for 12 months, and underwrite any costs incurred in informing agencies of change of road).

3.7 Consultations

3.8 Neighbour notifications

105, 121, 123, 125, 127 Brentfield Rd
54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68 Meadow Garth
Brentfield Primary School - Nursery, Primary School and the Out of Hours Club

3.9 Internal consultations

Property Data Team
Ward Councillors

3.10 External organisations

London Fire Service
London Ambulance Service
Royal Mail

3.11 Two site notices were placed at the Temple entrance and at the junction of Meadow Garth and Brentfield Road.

4 **Representations**

4.1 Including the letters of support submitted with the application and responses to the consultation exercise, comments were as follows:

From	Comment
Owner of business premises at Meadow Garth	30/09/2019 (submitted with application) Support – “We support the application...we are happy with the proposed new name....”
Proprietor of business premises at Meadow Garth	30/09/2019 (submitted with application) Support “We would be happy to support this application”
Owners of businesses and two residential properties at Meadow Garth	22/10/2018 (submitted with application) “We are happy to give consent to renaming Meadow Garth to Pramukh Way; we support the street naming application”.
Further letter from same owner as above, of one residential property at Meadow Garth (also covered by above letter)	29/10/2019 (submitted with application) “We are happy to give consent to renaming...support the application”

Resident of Meadow Garth	1) 15/10/2018(submitted with application) Confirming understanding of proposals and gives consent. BAPS to pay costs.
Resident of Meadow Garth (same resident as above)	2) 05/11/2019 Objection 'I am not in favour of this name change. Having lived at this property for over 20 years this would prove extremely disruptive and tedious for me'
Resident of Meadow Garth	18/10/2019 Objection – unnecessary inconvenience when not in good health, causing stress and anxiety, have lived here for 15 years and having to make changes...will be very stressful and expensive. Was previously advised that this would not go ahead if there were objections.
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA)	Objection – detailed below
Brentfield Primary School	07/11/2019 Objection - Will result in a split boundary - Have just re-branded showing current address - Does not reflect our community or the school community
Property Data Team	No objection
Royal Mail	No objection

- 4.2 The LFEPA commented on the initial consultation (14/10/2019) stating “We have the following objections or observations concerning this Consultation. We object to the name Pramukh Swami on the grounds of spelling and pronunciation. This could cause confusion and possible delay in the event of an emergency”.
- 4.3 Brent Building Control subsequently requested on 16/10/2019, from the LFEPA if there was any mitigation measures that would alleviate their concerns.

- 4.4 The LFEPA responded on 23/10/2019 stating *“The answer to this question is no. The proposed name is not the easiest to pronounce and could be received wrongly during call handling. It is always better to act on the side of precaution when choosing street or building names to minimise the risk of delay when attending an incident. We do object to the renaming of part of 'Meadow Garth Road' as it currently doesn't present any issues for us in terms of locating this address. The guideline states that renaming/renumbering existing streets and buildings is normally only considered when changes occur which give rise to problems for the occupiers, post office, emergency services etc”*
- 4.5 A further email was received from the LFEPA Borough Commander, stating that the above response *“was just advice from our national guidelines but you are free to make any decision you wish.”*

5 Considerations

- 5.1 In making the decision, the Council will need to give due regard to the representations received, which in this case demonstrated both support for, and objections to, the change of street name.
- 5.2 The main reference document regarding street naming and numbering and is the “LFEDA (LFEPA) Naming and Numbering of Streets and Buildings – Guidance Notes” and this should be taken into account when the Cabinet makes its decision.
- 5.3 The guidance states that renaming of streets should only occur where issues have given rise to problems for the occupiers, post office, emergency services etc (paragraph 6).
- 5.4 It states that ‘street names should not be difficult to pronounce or awkward to spell....words of more than three syllables should be avoided and this precludes the use of two words except in special cases’ (paragraph 4b).
- 5.5 The guidance sets out that the Authority should consider:
- Duplication (should be avoided)
 - Ease of pronunciation
 - Hierarchy (use of terrace, street, etc)
- 5.6 This guidance is noted; the request for the name change has not arisen because of any issues and problems with the existing street name, which is itself two words and three syllables long.
- 5.7 The Temple is an important asset to Brent, both for residents and as a visitor attraction; it provides valued facilities to many residents and visitors. Although the rationale for applying for the name change has not been clearly set out in the application, it is important to recognise the desire of the Temple to have a street presence which reflects its culture and that of its thousands of attendees and visitors.
- 5.8 The guidance states that names should not be difficult to pronounce or awkward to spell. However it is also the case that the diverse nature of Brent’s population

should be embraced, and that in order to reflect the culture of different parts of Brent's community, some street names should reflect different cultures and languages.

- 5.9 There is concern about the proposal from three other occupiers who would be impacted on by the change, concerned about inconvenience, stress and expensive of dealing with such a change. The school, which would then have a split address for the main school entrance and the nursery entrance, object to the impact it would have on them and question whether the proposed change reflects the school and local community.
- 5.10 The fire service, whilst recognising that their comments are advisory only, set out that the spelling and pronunciation of the proposed name could be received incorrectly during an emergency call, and that it is contrary to guidelines which only support name changes if the existing one is causing problems.
- 5.11 The LFEPA's response to the consultation, states that the name change could result in delays in the Fire Brigade attending an emergency. For the LFEPA attending an emergency even a few minutes can have serious life safety consequences for both occupiers and Fire Fighters. This point needs to be given serious consideration.
- 5.13 This is a finely balanced decision for members to make. Clearly the statutory responders and the school are not in favour of the name change along with some residents of Meadow Garth. On balance this would often lead to a rejection of the name change. However, given the need to reflect diversity in the borough and the significance of the Temple to the life of the Borough, Cabinet may well decide that this is a change which they would wish to support.

6 Legal Implications

- 6.1 The application is made under sections 5 and 6 of the London Building Acts (Amendment) 1939 and this legislation regarding street renaming only applies to London boroughs. There will be no right to appeal against the decision of the Cabinet regarding the application relating to the proposed street name change. Any subsequent challenge would have to be by way of judicial review.
- 6.2 As stated above in paragraphs 3.7 to 3.10 of this report, consultation has taken carried out by the Council with those occupiers and organisations based on the part of the street that is affected and with internal Council departments and external organisations regarding the proposal to change the name of the eastern part of Meadow Garth to Pramukh Swami Road. They have also been informed during the consultation process that the Council's Cabinet will make a decision on whether to change the name of the street in question and that the Cabinet will consider their submissions when it makes its decision.
- 6.3 If a decision is taken to agree the making of an order to change the name of the road, it will be subject to a legal agreement between the Council and the Applicant to ensure that the costs arising from the street name change to the Council are met by the applicant. The applicant has agreed to this.

6.4 Under section 93(1) of the Local Government Act 2003, a (best value) local authority may charge a person for providing a service if: (i) the local authority is authorised, but not required by an enactment, to provide the service to him; and (b) he has agreed to its provision.

6.5 The Council would notify statutory authorities of the change, if an order is made.

7 Equality Implications

7.1 The council, as a public authority exercising public functions, is subject to a general public sector equality duty (PSED) under section 149 Equality Act 2010. The PSED requires public authorities to have 'due regard' to:

- the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited under the Act
- the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This involves having due regard to the need to:
 - remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;
 - take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it; and
 - encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- the need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant characteristic and those who do not share it. This includes having due regard to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

7.2 Use of street names with local significance may increase community cohesion and the sense of culture, tradition and heritage in a local area. In this case, the renaming may have a positive impact on people of certain faiths and/or ethnic groups.

7.3 Issues were raised in the consultation, with some respondents indicating that the change did not reflect the community. There may also be negative impacts in terms of age –two objectors are elderly and not in good health, and indicated that the change would cause stress and anxiety.

8 Financial Implications

8.1 The costs to the Council relate to changes to street name plates, amending records as owner of two of the properties, and updating Council Tax and other databases.

8.2 It is estimated that the costs of changing the street name plates is £150 each. The costs of amending databases are officer time.

9 Any Other Implications (HR, Property, Environmental Sustainability - where necessary)

9.1 Officer time would be required to implement the changes if agreed.

10 Proposed Consultation with Ward Members and Stakeholders

10.1 Consultation with Members and Stakeholders is as set out above.

Related Documents:

- London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority Naming and Numbering of Streets and Buildings – Guidance
- Application form and accompanying letters
- Copies of Representations

Report sign off:

ALAN LUNT

Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment