Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan

Additional Question from the Independent Examiner

Prepared by

JOHN SLATER BA(Hons), DMS, MRTPI

John Slater Planning Ltd

16th May 2018

Introduction

1. I would like to thank both the LPA and the Neighbourhood plan for the responses to my first set of questions. I am making good progress with the writing of my report.
2. One issue has arisen, which I have taken up directly with the LPA, namely that I was not satisfied that the screening of the HRA was carried out in accordance with the legal requirements. A new screening report is being prepared by LBRuT which will be referred to Natural England to ensure that they are satisfied with its conclusions. Once the screening report is published and the response from Natural England received, a copy needs to be placed on the appropriate web sites and of course shared with the Neighbourhood Forum.
3. I am also aware that the Inspectors report has been received by LBRuT and this should allow the Local Plan to be adopted in early July. I have therefore decided to delay issuing my report on this examination until I have received confirmation that the Council has resolved to adopt the Local Plan. Once the Plan is adopted, then it helps with the wording of policies that refer to what is currently an emerging Local Plan. This should only delay publication of the neighbourhood plan report a matter of a few weeks.

Addition Question for the Qualifying Body

4. I note from your response to my first set of questions, that it is the Forum's intention that Policy G1 to protect King George V and Riverside Playing fields and the Avenues which had been omitted from the supporting text. This has then raised in my mind, the question as to whether Policy G1 is intended to protect the *private* green spaces shown on Figure 7.1. The wording in the policy does not differentiate between public and private space, but the wording in Para 7.3.2 refers to "these large *publically owned* open/ green spaces". Can the Steering Group explicitly clarify whether the intention is for Policy G1 to be protecting the following green spaces?
    - Cassell Hospital Grounds
    - Douglas Meadow
    - Ham House Gardens
    - Ham Polo Club
    - Kew and Ham Sports Association
    - Richmond Golf Club
    - St Michaels Convent Garden
    - Thames Young Mariners
    - Plus, the 6 school playing fields shown

5. If the policy is to protect them all, would it be more appropriate to remove the distinction between public and private open space and just refer to *open space* and revise the wording of paragraph 7.3.2 which seems to limit the applicability of the policy?
6. I would appreciate a response to this question within 7 days if possible. Please send a copy to the Richmond planners so they can put a copy on the relevant websites.

John Slater BA (Hons), DMS, MRTPI

John Slater Planning Ltd

Independent Examiner