

Questions asked by card at the AGM held on 28th February 2017 with replies from committee members (in blue)

General

To what extent - in the plan - is the development of community cohesion a priority?

The current proposed policies that related to this include:

- Improvements to shopping areas to include making the areas more attractive for walking and cycling with more space for shops and cafes to use the pavement and encourage local patronage and the opportunity to linger and socialise.
- Improving the infrastructure for walking and cycling to encourage local trips by these modes give more opportunity for social interaction.
- Improving local leisure and community facilities for local people.
- Encouraging a diversity of housing size and type to allow residents to stay in the area.

We would welcome further suggestions for policies that would support this aspiration.

When will see a difference to any of the ideas presented? Action would be good to keep people involved.

The current consultation period ends on 10 March and we will respond to the comments that have been made. The Plan then has to be approved by Richmond Council.

The Plan is already having influence as developers have to take account of the views expressed. As we move towards full approval of the Plan at a referendum next year, this influence will increase. We will be consulted about the distribution of CIL funds when these are available and we will respond using the views that we have gathered.

Roads and transport

Can the Ham Forum do anything to improve the coordination of road works between Ham and Richmond in particular?

This is not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan and we suggest you contact your local Councillors to discuss.

Improved traffic flow for cars and vans/also buses which are the main means of travel to work from Ham

The Plan aims to reduce congestion by supporting public transport, walking and cycling to reduce reliance on private motor transport and supporting the creation of good cycle routes to local town centres of Kingston and Richmond.

The Plan also supports the building of a pedestrian and cycle bridge to Twickenham, to offer an alternative route to local town centres and public transport on the Middlesex side of the river. However this project has a high capital cost and would require planning permission.

Is there anything that can be done about the crossroads at Lock Road/Ham Street and Ham Common? It is an area waiting for an accident to happen. Also coming along Back Lane into Lock Road is difficult as you do not get a clear view of people driving up Lock Road.

This junction is in Kingston borough, however the plan supports improvement to Ham Parade shopping area and the junction might be considered part of these improvements. Improvement to visibility Lock Road/ Back Lane might also be considered as part of improvement to the shopping area.

There have been initiatives by some residents to raise this issue with the council and we also suggest you contact local councillors about both of these issues.

Idea: have a 10-12noon parking restriction along Ham Common going towards Ham Gate Avenue

This is an interesting idea but the Plan does not currently include proposals for parking controls as it has not been an issue raised previously. From our perspective, many residents are opposed to these.

Speed camera on Riverside Drive!

Traffic filter at Ham Cross junction

Speed bumps approaching junction of Ham Common and Ham Street

The Neighbourhood Plan supports the reduction in traffic speeds to make the environment more pedestrian and cycle friendly. Implementation of any measures are the responsibility of LBRuT. You might contact your local councillors to discuss.

20mph speed limits

- are they enforceable when introduced?
- traffic speed on the Petersham Road does not adhere to the limit
- how many drivers have been fined for speeding since the 20mph limit was implemented?

If implemented, we would monitor the outcomes. Queries regarding statistical data would need to be directed to the Richmond police.

- 1 I agree that a bridge over the river will make Ham Street a car park. As residents we have opposed double yellow lines and pay machines (to urbanise the road and car park) but they will happen if there is a bridge. We would like to reduce the traffic inside Ham after all.

The Neighbourhood Plan aims to reduce traffic and to support travel by sustainable transport. If a bridge was proposed this would need to go hand in hand with a plan to prevent commuter parking.

- 2 The problem of landlords hiking up the rent will stop the creation of lively retail areas. John the Greengrocer had to leave as his landlord doubled the rent and took away the upstairs flat. I'm not sure how we can protect our shops.

Sadly, limiting rent increases by private landlords is not within the Neighbourhood Plan's gift. Some residents are looking into the creation of a community shop with investment from local residents. There could also be changes at regional or national policy level to encourage community shops e.g. business rates incentives. This could be discussed with local councillors and lobbied for at local and London level.

Concerns about Woodville Road - it is the main artery road from Wates Estate to Ham Street already and environmentally unhealthy and dangerous for pedestrians on the Common

The Neighbourhood Plan aims to reduce traffic and to support travel by sustainable transport. This particular issue might be something you could raise as part of the Ham Close consultation and with local councillors.

Concerns for the Grey Court School pupils crossing a busy road and queuing outside shops

Any suggestions to improve safety might be made to Grey Court School and local councillors.

Ham Close

How much influence does the neighbourhood plan have on the Ham Close development? Ham Close is going to be a major influence in the whole area. How much influence do you have in what RHP do? Can you do more with planning decisions?

If the planning application for Ham Close is submitted after our Neighbourhood Plan is adopted then RHP and Richmond planners will have to follow the policies set out in our plan. Our Neighbourhood Plan is the document Richmond planning officers must use to make planning decisions for Ham & Petersham.

We have set out requirements for all development and also specifically for Central Ham (Ham Close). The policy states :-

9.9 Policy 04a

- i) Any scheme for the redevelopment of all or part of Ham Close must have regard to the character of the surrounding area set out in the Ham Close Neighbourhood Character Study.
- ii) Any scheme which includes the redevelopment of existing community facilities forming part of a Ham Close must make provision for their equivalent replacement.
- iii) Any scheme for Ham Close which results in an increase of 10 or more residential units will be required to provide additional community facilities in line with policy CF1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy C3 - the proposed Ham Close development does not have regard to appropriate height of the buildings overlooking Ham Village Green. The proposal will change the semi-rural character of the Green to make it far more urban.

Assuming the Ham Close planning application is submitted after our plan is adopted then all development must follow the guidance in our Neighbourhood Plan. There is a Central Ham policy which includes Ham Close and also design guidance for all development. Policy H5 2 (page 34) in particular states that the design principles for all new housing development in the neighbourhood area are:

2) heights generally between 1 and 3 storeys, and 4 storeys in appropriate locations. Developments of more than 4 storeys will not normally be considered acceptable and will need to demonstrate exemplary design, architectural quality and environmental performance as well as positive benefits in terms of the townscape and local aesthetic quality and relate well to the local context

Road from Ham Street to Woodville Road is extremely dangerous with a blind corner. What will happen when Ham Close is developed and even more traffic is generated? RHP must submit a traffic survey along with their planning application so should pick up this dangerous hot spot and how they propose to manage it. However, it should be raised, if you haven't done so already, at the next consultation event they hold.

Ham Close - if this development goes ahead the Forum will need to keep a very close eye on transport routes. St Richards Square, Croft Way, Dukes Drive will be the most likely access route for lorries etc. The planners have only looked at Petersham Road and Sandy Lane junction. Ham Cross has not been considered at all at this point. Richmond planners must consider the impact of demolition, transport of materials and building the development as well as the final scheme in any new development. A full traffic survey should pick up the impact Ham Close development has beyond the immediate vicinity.

More than one area

Comments

- need to engage with young residents
- bridge would ruin the river views
- Option 5 - these are not the only green spaces - what about schools, woods in the area
- tart up the shop fronts

We have consulted with the students at three local schools to find out the views of younger people. They have remarkable similar views to their parents.

It has to be a joint effort to improve shop fronts. There's only so much that owners of private businesses can do. Probably the most power councils/neighbourhood bodies have is when new shops are opening and there are restrictions on lighting, signage and design, though its still limited. There were attempts for example before Sainsburys opened to encourage them to have a more heritage look rather than the one we got. Once businesses are up and running it might be contentious to force them to alter their profiles as there is considerable expense in carrying out a shop refurbishment especially for independent businesses.

Is it possible to control the use of bicycles towing a cart containing children? This must be unhealthy and dangerous. A horrible accident could happen

Supporting sustainable transport including walking and cycling is national, regional and local policy. This in intended to reduce traffic (including the school run), improve people's health and reduce pollution. The plan supports the creation of safe routes for walking and cycling.

The Fox and Duck needs to be tidied up and made attractive so that local residents will go there

This is a matter for the owner of the business. We have made proposals for enhancing the central Petersham area.

Path from Ham car park to Teddington Lock needs improvement

Thanks for this observation that may be included in the final Plan and is a possible project using CIL money.

Shops opposite Grey Court School - smarten up with cladding etc

It has to be a joint effort to improve shop fronts. There's only so much that owners of private businesses can do. Probably the most power councils/neighbourhood bodies have is when new shops are opening and there are restrictions on lighting, signage and design, though its still limited. There were attempts for example before Sainsburys'opened to encourage them to have a more heritage look rather than the one we got. Once businesses are up and running it might be contentious to force them to alter their profiles as there is considerable expense in carrying out a shop refurbishment especially for independent businesses.

Matters not mentioned/discussed:

1. environmental pollution Petersham Road/Richmond Road. Its rather like a valley below hills. The amount of pollution generated by vehicles is high (illegal?) and will get worse particularly with the quantity of new houses to be built

The plan supports the use of sustainable transport by improving the environment for walking and cycling. TFL recently issued pollution levels for areas near schools in the capital ($\text{NO}_2\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). The EU legal limit is $40\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (40 micrograms per cubic metre of

air). The German School 32.3, Russell School 33.7, Meadlands 31.9, Fern Hill School was 34.5 so all were lower than the EU maximum level of 40 but not good. The mayor's office are proposing to limit the use of higher polluting cars in the capital.

2. high rental, eg £30,000 a shop unit on Ham Parade, and the impact of the higher business rate will almost certainly accelerate the decline of Ham Parade

The realignment of business rates is an additional threat to the viability of Ham Parade. But the change in mix is also a sign of the times with traditional retail in many areas being replaced by online. It was common 20 years ago for a high street to have a travel agent, bookshop, and record shop but there is no role for these anymore unless they serve a particular niche. The demise of the grocer and butcher may be part of the same trend in the sense that they find it difficult to compete with supermarkets / home delivery unless they provide a greater choice, quality or knowledge in some specialism.

Our suggestions for the Parade include a change to the layout and the dominance of traffic over every other consideration. If the Parade were a more welcoming environment to visit it would provide more encouragement to start-ups. We also believe there is a role for a Parade manager.