HAM AND PETERSHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

**MEETING OF COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY 23RD FEBRUARY 2016**

**MINUTES (DRAFT)**

*Present*

Brian Willman (Chair)

Justine Glynn

Lisa Fairmaner

Danielle Coleman

David Williams

Stan Shaw

Geoff Bond

Penny Frost

John Goddard

Petra Braun

Anne Powell

Helen McNally

Jean Loveland

*In attendance*

Andy Rogers (Drafting Team)

Siriol Davies (Co-ordinator)

1. **Apologies for absence** were accepted from Sarah Tippett and Andree Frieze.

2. **Minutes of the committee meeting of 26th January 2016** were approved.

3. **Matters arising**:

1. The motion to agree to dedicate the Neighbourhood Plan to the memory of Andrew Beedham was proposed by DC and seconded by DW. The motion was passed unanimously.
2. The committee agreed to co-opt Chris Ruse of the drafting team to the committee, with the proviso that it was important to keep an eye on the cross-over of personnel, as the committee needs to retain its executive function. (LF and JG are also on the drafting team).
3. Re. finding a health representative to join the committee, DW had had no response from Dr Bradley and had not approached another pharmacist. PF suggested that perhaps a community nurse or health visitor would be a suitable person. It was noted that Ham clinic would be part of the Ham Close redevelopment and that perhaps a policy on health should be added; it already forms part of policies on transport and housing. Suggestions for a suitable candidate should be brought to the next meeting.
4. Re. Cassel Hospital, the Chair had received an email from Tor Barrett, of Nathaniel Lichfields & Partners, planners, who are working with WLMHT and wish to meet the Forum with a view to working together on our policy for the site. It was noted that any meeting would need to be carefully minuted and published to avoid any suggestion of undue influence. The committee would also need to be very sensitive to the concerns of local residents neighbouring the site. As the Trust has not yet achieved Foundation status, it cannot keep the proceeds of any sale of assets, which means that it is unlikely to sell in the near future; there is also the possibility that it will be merged with another Trust. BWn is to organise a meeting with Lichfields, to be attended by Brian Waters, Andy Rogers, Geoff Bond and possibly a case officer from the council if one has been assigned to the site. JL will find out if there is one. We would prefer a local venue.

4. **Updated policy for housing**

LF presented the latest version (circulated previously) and went through comments received and changes made, as follows:

Lack of large family houses- developers could be incentivised by, for example, counting a large family unit as 2 units.

Affordable housing - this legally requires a ‘sufficient discount on the market rate’ and can take the form of social housing, shared ownership (at market rate but with affordable payment options) or starter homes which have a 20% discount on the market rate (in London this is capped at £450k); the latter will come into being in the next 2 years. There are very few 1 bed or studio flats in the area, which is related in part to lack of transport.

After discussion it was decided that a) we want to retain a mixed community and need to ascertain the current mix of social/private housing; the actual detail of the product is immaterial b) we need to relate affordability to average incomes in the area and the minimum wage. Questions for the workshop could be - what proportion of social/private housing is desirable? What do you consider to be ‘affordable’?

Height of units: after discussion it was decided to specify 2-3 storeys, with 4 -storey only in appropriate contexts. It is also necessary to define ‘storey’. There is a restriction in line with the height of St Richard’s spire. However, should we consider 4 storeys acceptable if design is good, innovative and sustainable?

Cross-referencing - the housing policy needs to cross-refer to policies on sites and sustainability.

Retirement villages - DW suggested that the Cassel site (the grounds, rather than the old building) might be suitable for a retirement village including independent/sheltered and nursing provision. Such a development, with mixed affordable and market values, would solve a social problem in an area with a high proportion of elderly, without generating too much traffic. However, retirement villages can attract people from outside the area and also put pressure on local health services. Some retirement provision could also be included in Ham Close.

Car clubs and bike storage - these need to be specified.

Re. the number of housing units which will need to be accommodated in H&P - the exact figure is not known; the London plan has allocated 3500 for the borough of Richmond in the next 10 years, of which H&P will need to contribute a share. The term ‘units’ should be changed to ‘homes’.

The committee thanked LF, AR and Christian Bocci for their work on this policy.

5. **Sustainability workshop 11th February**

Attendance was not very high as this was a specialist interest. JG and Chas Warlow are in the process of typing and analysing all the comments; some have already been added to Dropbox. A fuller report will be made at the next meeting.

GB was concerned that policies had not been revised after comments at the last committee meeting. His comments will be logged with other workshop comments and the policy can be reviewed again.

Re. workshops in general, it is necessary to ask realistic questions and clearly distinguish between aspirational ideas and policies to be endorsed.

Progress on other policies -

Transport has been redrafted and can be circulated by email for comments outside the meeting.

Sites is in the process of redrafting.

Character and Heritage will be discussed at the next meeting - about 2/3 of the areas to be assessed have been done. SD to send out a reminder to those outstanding.

6. **NP material on the website**

To enable those who could not attend the workshops to comment, workshop material needs to go on the website. This has been hindered so far by the large size and number of photos. GB to explain to drafting team how to reduce the size of their files so that he can work with them.

The committee thanked GB for his work on the website and emails.

7. **Finance**

JGd gave an update on the financial position: there has been no spending since the last meeting which means there is c.£5k in the account. JGd and BWn will be meeting on Friday 26th February to discuss funding options. A total of £15k can be drawn from the ‘My Community’ fund, but this has to be used within 6 months, so timing is important. £3k is available from Richmond Council.

‘My Community’ may also provide access to technical consultants; BWn and JG to investigate so LF can look at options. LF will also ask a contact to see a successful application for funding.

8. **Ham Close update**

The meeting of NP committee and drafting team with Richmond Council and RHP went well. The committee thanked those involved in organising and presenting to such a high standard, particularly Justine Langford. The Council and RHP were impressed and have agreed to consult regularly with the Forum. While they are committed to the same firm of architects, they may use more senior staff.

HPA has a similar meeting on 3rd March.

9. **AOB**

1. Matthew Rees had enquired about where Ham Parade fitted into the Plan - it is in the sites section.
2. GB asked how the Plan could support home working e.g. by increasing broadband speeds and mobile phone reception. Given the poor public transport of the area, home working may increase and there needs to be a communications policy in the Plan.
3. The latest edition of H&P magazine missed out an article by Justine Langford; this could be put on the website. SD to ask JL to send to GB.
4. John Hatto feels that there needs to be a policy on light pollution, particularly with regard to the Riverside lands. LF to ask JH to write one.
5. DC asked for the website to be regularly updated to highlight upcoming workshops. Text for email reminders needs to be drafted by workshop leaders, while allowing GB time to make it enticing to the public.
6. AR has agreed to lead housing workshop, as LF cannot be present. SD to ask for volunteers to staff the workshop.

The meeting closed at 9pm.