

Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan

Questions from the Independent Examiner

Prepared by

JOHN SLATER BA(Hons), DMS, MRTPI

John Slater Planning Ltd

30th April 2018

Introduction

1. As you will be aware I have been appointed to carry out the examination of the Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan. I have carried out my initial review of the Plan and most of the accompanying documents that I have been sent. I carried out a site visit to familiarise myself with the plan area on Saturday 28th April 2018.
2. My initial view remains that I should be able to deal with the examination of this Plan by the consideration of the written material only, but I do reserve the right to call for a public hearing, if I consider that it will assist my examination. There are some questions that arise from my initial review of the plan. Most of these are directed at the Qualifying Body, Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Forum but there a number of questions are more appropriately directed to the planners at the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
3. In the interest of transparency, I would ask that this note and any response is placed on the appropriate web sites. Could I ask for a reply by the end of play on 8th May 2018, if possible, to allow me to speedily conclude this examination.

Questions for the Neighbourhood Forum

4. Should Policy H1 allow for infill plots on residential gardens which would not be classed as previously developed land and also allow for the conversion of existing buildings into small units?
5. Why are single aspect units not considered acceptable? Would any of the scheme shown in Figure 9.8 be classed as single aspect?
6. What local infrastructure, services and facilities would you expect to be assessed by an applicant, under the terms of Policy CF1?
7. In Policy R1, if I were to recommend a marketing period before a change of use were to be granted – do you think 12 months would be appropriate?
8. In Policy R2 should reference to Para 8.1 actually be to Para 8.6 of the Publication version of the emerging local plan?
9. I see that under Policy G1 Para 7.3.2 identifies the open spaces to be covered by the policy, which ties in with the public rather than private open spaces shown on Figure 7.1 but the text does not refer to King George V Playing Fields but includes The Avenues, which I presume are part of the Ham House grounds, which is one of the private open spaces which I presume is not to be covered by this policy? As these open spaces are already protected – is there actually a value in the neighbourhood plan having another policy to protect these public open spaces?
10. How does the Policy E1 comply with the Secretary of State policy set out in a Written Statement to the House of Commons dated 25th March 2015 that

neighbourhood plans should not be setting technical standards for new housing?

11. How does Policy E5 re SUDS sit against the Secretary of State policy that SUDS should only be sought on major schemes i.e. over 10 units?

Questions for the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

12. I will be proposing in my report that the neighbourhood plan policies are clearly demarcated in a box and that there be a clear numbering protocol. For example, the first policy C1 has three policies or elements to the policy in para 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 2.3.3. Should they be 3 separate policies c1 -1, C1-2 or should they all be part of the policy C1? My reason for asking is for clarity if used, in say, a planning decision notice. Some Neighbourhood Plans use a prefix to describe the neighbourhood plan e.g. HAM C1. I will be guided by the LPA as it needs to work as a system for you when dealing with development management decisions. Perhaps you could liaise with the Neighbourhood Forum and come up with agreed numbering.
13. Could I be sent the Conservation Appraisals for all the Conservation Areas in the plan area?
14. How would Policy CF1 work when the Borough is collecting CIL money towards improving local infrastructure? Would a developer be expected to contribute twice to local infrastructure?
15. When is the LPA expecting to receive the Inspectors Report on the Local Plan?
16. I understand that the emerging revised policy in the new London Plan is proposing a significant increase in housing numbers to be delivered in the Borough. In view of the poor accessibility of this part of the Borough is Ham and Petersham likely to be expected to significantly increase its housing delivery or is that increase likely to be directed to centres with better public transport links?

John Slater BA (Hons), DMS, MRTPI

John Slater Planning Ltd

Independent Examiner