HAM AND PETERSHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

**Meeting of committee 13th December 2016**

**Minutes**

**Present**

Andree Frieze

Stan Shaw

Chris Ruse

John Goddard (JGd)

Danielle Coleman

Justine Glynn

Brian Willman (Chair)

David Williams

Helen McNally

**In attendance**

Brian Waters (BWs)

Andy Rogers

Siriol Davies

1. **Apologies** were received from Jean Loveland, Penny Frost, Anne Powell, Sarah Tippett
2. **The minutes of the last meeting** on 15th November were approved.
3. **Matters arising** None.
4. **Report on meeting with LBRuT**.

A note had been circulated about this. BW and CR met Andrea Kitzberger and Joanne Capper and had a helpful and supportive meeting. They agreed to provide informal comments on the revised plan by 16th January. CR/SD to send plan.

Re. Permission in Principle (PIP). There were three opinions available on this issue, from Andrea Kitzberger, BWs and AR and Sarah Gatehouse. AK and SG were of the opinion that this should not be included in the NP since the legislation was not yet in force and the mechanisms unclear; inclusion in the Register of Brownfield Land would be an alternative option at a later date. However, BWs and AR argued that incorporating mention of PIP (without referring to specific sites, which could be problematic) would show that the Plan was up-to-date and that when legislation does appear, we are in a good position. The data collected which identified suitable sites may be useful later. The revised section in ‘Opportunities for Change’ on this issue, had been circulated. The NP needs to provide ideas for additional housing on an incremental basis and take a positive stance. If not, big schemes will be proposed and we will have no defence.

There was concern that there should not be references to specific sites at this point as these could be included at a future date when proper consultation could take place.  The revised wording proposed by BWs and AR was accepted.

1. **Receive and discuss latest draft of NP**

It was confirmed that changes agreed at the last meeting had been incorporated.

AF had written a paragraph on Latchmere which she will forward to SD for the Character section.

JLvld had raised a point about Star and Garter. This is within the area but no CIL is available, since it is a conversion of an existing building. A new development at Ancaster Rd. is not in the area.

1. **CIL**

CR had rewritten this section which is now in an appendix. Projects are drawn from the long list and and all refer back to policies. Projects are listed with timescale indications but not priority. Priority of projects could be ascertained at the AGM, by asking for public comments and the committee will review the outcomes. This list is not part of the statutory plan and can be reviewed.

The question of clarity and having specific examples of general concepts (e.g. ‘expand community facilities’) was discussed.

GB, CR and BW will meet to consider the wording of choices; all options must derive from topics consulted on.

1. **To discuss additional material required, as outlined by Sarah Gatehouse**

SG had provided a note on the documents required to accompany the plan i.e.

Basic Condition Statement

Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening

Consultation statement

There was concern about the requirement to show how the Plan would contribute to sustainable development. While this appears to be a considerable amount of work, it is hoped that much of the assessment would not be required as long as the NP complies with the Local Plan. LBRut (see item 4. Above) had suggested engaging a consultant to complete the SEA (for any areas which are not in compliance) and indicated that funding might be available. This would be need to be confirmed. Research into how other NPs have responded to these issues and a check with Locality and other websites, e.g. Planning Aid would be useful.  CR would suggest a way forward that would not impose a heavy work load on drafters

Re. the Consultation statement, it was confirmed that all comments need to be included.

1. **AGM 28th February, Grey Court School**

JG volunteered to organise a task group for the administration of this meeting, to include SD. JG will invite DW, Jean Loveland, and Penny Frost.

AF had done a ‘poster’ for the magazine, which can be adapted – to be discussed in the New Year. DC volunteered to put up posters. The publicity policy had been circulated.

The CIL list will need to be prepared for the meeting.

There will be short presentations summarizing the policies. The focus needs to be kept on the Plan and not allowed to move to other local issues.

Supporting documents as mentioned in item 7. above, will need to be prepared for the May submission, but will not be required for the pre-submission consultation.

1. **Six-week pre-submission consultation**

There will be one hard copy of the NP placed in the library. For purposes of email, the document will need to be divided into sections, for reasons of size.

A template for comments needs to be devised;it may be possible to follow the Council’s template. The drafting team will assess/respond to comments. The Grey Court postal address can be used for hard copies.

The Plan needs to be summarized for the magazine and the mechanism for comments made clear. AF to confirm the deadline (early January). Extra copies of those pages could be printed off and distributed at the AGM.

AK had supplied a list of statutory consultees, which includes landowners etc. This is currently being revised but should be available in mid-January.

1. **Response to letter from Cassel developers**

The letter from Pauline Roberts had been circulated. It was agreed to send a letter thanking them for their comments and noting that we are going to public consultation. This correspondence will need to be included in the Consultation Statement.

1. **Finances**

JGd presented the financial situation: SG has been paid for her consultancy work and money has been set aside for the cost of illustrations and the next edition of the magazine. This leaves a balance of £4k made up of £1700 from the original LBRuT grant and £2300 from the Localities fund; the grant for the latter actually expired at the end of November, but can be extended to April. Another £10k may be available from LBRut, if required.

1. **The publication of the latest H&P magazine** was noted.
2. **AOB**

JG reported on a meeting re. **Ham Close** on 30th November. JG, DW and SS had attended. The last consultation had resulted in 104 responses from residents and 202 other. These will go to the Council in January.

CR reported on a meeting with RHP and LBRuT attended by BWs, AR, CW and others. This was a 90-minute meeting, of which they have notes. Justine Langford had noted that our main points were ignored.

SS asked that a phrase about leasehold flats selling quickly on the open market be deleted from the relevant character study. SS to send wording to SD.

BWs noted the plan to include ground level parking for hundreds of cars without considering the road capacity. There needs to be an emphasis on car clubs etc

From this point only SD should edit the Master copy of the Plan.

The north Kingston area have started the process of writing a NP.

1. **Next meeting** – 24th January, venue tbc.

The meeting closed at 8.50pm.