

North Kingston Forum responses to points raised at the AGM - 24th Feb 2021

The NKF AGM on Feb 24th 2021 was an online meeting and as such was not suitable for a full debate or even a lengthy question and answer session. It is hoped that when conditions allow, a full and open debate about the merits of the draft plan will be possible. In the meantime the final draft is being prepared and is passing through the required steps to make it ready for publication. When that happens everyone affected by the plan will have the chance to feedback their thoughts and comments via the consultation exercise.

It was felt at the meeting that the line of questioning adopted by some of the attendees reflected a lack of trust and representation in the Forum Committee. It is worth stating here that the NKF came together as a response to repeated poor developments in North Kingston, a piecemeal approach to objections combined with a lack of proper understanding about the rights to object, but mainly because there was no detailed local plan for this beautiful part of South West London.

Each and every member of this committee is working for the very best interests of the forum area and is doing so on an entirely voluntary basis, and has done so now for many years. Many thousands of man/woman hours have gone into the production of this plan and we have sought feedback and opinion at every step. Over the years, with thanks to the expertise on the committee and the learning that has taken place, we have all come to understand Kingston's place in the wider national and regional planning context and how this cannot be ignored when producing a document such as this. To do so would mean publication and consultation will be refused. ***Just saying no is not an option.***

Putting together the answers to these questions has been a very useful exercise for the forum committee and we appreciate the opportunity to have the plan scrutinised in detail when it is published in draft form. It is only by doing so that we can be sure that it is representative of the whole community that it is supposed to represent. We will not avoid difficult questions but we will take time to find out the facts and answer with the appropriate legislation where it exists.

These questions and answers will also be uploaded to the NKF website in the form of de-identified FAQs. We thank the questioners for taking the time to attend the AGM and their ongoing interest in the work of the Forum.

NKF AGM Chat transcript extracts - Some items have been removed for privacy. The full transcript is available on request.

1. 19:44:07 From Caroline Shah : Kingston target will increase to the level mentioned unless we manage to challenge the target and "opportunity area" at judicial review.

a. *The Opportunity Area for Kingston was adopted in 2016 which is 5 years ago. The NKF has not been established or minded to 'challenge' this designation but is in a position to ensure that via a Neighbourhood Plan any adverse effects of an OA are minimised. The new London Plan 2020 shows the OA as covering the area to the very south of the forum area, much of which is already covered by the transition zone. The following extract regarding OA's is taken from the London Plan 2020.*

- i. *2.1.25 These areas are capable of supporting some development in the short and medium-term. However, once Crossrail 2 is operational, the borough will benefit from more Crossrail 2 stations than any other and the arrival of the new, higher frequency, higher capacity service will enable significant additional growth opportunities in these areas. It will improve Kingston's attractiveness as an office location and therefore support additional commercial growth in the town centre, building on links with Kingston University and Kingston College. The Local Plan and/or Planning Framework should set out how Crossrail 2 will support and deliver further growth and intensification in these areas. It should also explore how the use of industrial land can be intensified to make more efficient use of land. Kingston town centre, with its ancient market is rich in heritage and forms an important part of the setting of Hampton Court Palace, its gardens, the Thames and surrounding Royal Parks.*
- ii. *The NPlan, as will be seen upon publication and consultation takes account of the above and has visibility of the effects that Crossrail 2 may bring.*

2. 20:03:27 From Caroline Shah to Glen Keyword(Privately) : Can I just ask how the Committee ensures they represent the whole community?

a. *By the very nature of the open committee structure of the North Kingston Forum committee, nobody is excluded from attendance at meetings. Anyone can attend provided they have contacted the chair or secretary in advance, we have tried to encourage a wide and diverse committee at every opportunity. **The questioner was present at many early meetings of the forum and should be able to verify this.***

During the establishment of the forum area and the early formulation of the policies, the public were consulted with display exhibitions and invited by

discussion and questionnaires to pass comment. Also door to door summary flyers handed out advertising the exhibitions and leading to the NKF website for further information. All of the members of the committee are volunteers and have given up many days of their own time to this project and if anything the committee would have wished for more support over the previous five years.

In addition to the public consultation exercises, at all times properly constituted residents associations covering the whole NKF area (BRaG, Tarak, FoLAR and CARA) have all been kept informed of all proceedings. Members of all these organisations are either on one of the committees or attend the Forum. Each of these groups shares forum updates via their mailing lists. For example CARA has a mailing list of over 800 households and BRaG over 400 households. The NKF did contact all RA's across the forum area during the early stages of the process.

During the last 5 years Councilors from both Tudor and Canbury Wards have attended forum meetings on numerous occasions and been kept abreast of proceedings. The Forum are grateful for their experience and advice over the years.

- 3. 20:11:08 From Caroline Shah : *Presumption in favour of sustainable development has just been successfully challenged in the courts. Kingston council officers use it as an excuse to allow anything to be approved. Following the judgement, this approach can be seen to be flawed.***
- a. *Please see below for an extract directly from the NPPF Feb 2019. Relevant sections are in bold. The plan must conform with the NPPF and from reading the extract below it is clear that a Neighbourhood plan is a significant benefit as a counterbalance to presumption than the absence of a plan. The assertion that this has been challenged in court has no bearing on the benefits of an NPlan for North Kingston, the NPlan would take precedence over the presumption.*

National Planning Policy Framework Feb 2019

The presumption in favour of sustainable development

11. Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For plan-making this means that:

- a) *plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change;*
- b) *strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless:*
- i. *the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area; or*

ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. For decision-taking this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

12. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

13. The application of the presumption has implications for the way communities engage in neighbourhood planning. Neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies.

14. In situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided all of the following apply:

a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made;

b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement;

c) the local planning authority has at least a three year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five year housing supply requirement, including the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73); and

d) the local planning authority's housing delivery was at least 45% of that required over the previous three years.

4. 20:14:49 From Caroline Shah : *How many Neighbourhood Plans cover areas in "Opportunity Areas"?*

- a. This document shows the current state of NPlans in London and their progress:
https://140d5992-3079-4eb8-bf8d-7a7c1aa9d1df.filesusr.com/ugd/95f6a3_0874c3561b9f409c9eb90977f3fb4bf3.pdf

5. 20:21:29 From Caroline Shah : *There are LASCs and Conservation Areas on Park Road. How will these be taken into account?*

- a. *This is correct. There are a number of LASCs and Conservation areas in the forum area, not just Park Road. These have all been annotated on the forum map and the committee is acutely aware of the status of these important and historic areas. When the plan is published and available for consultation readers will see how these areas are to be protected and preserved going forward however in many cases there is a boundary with an area that has no such status. The forum proposes to manage these boundaries with careful and exemplary design that enhances the conservation area.*

It is however worth noting that the existing arrangement of the Park road corridor towards the junction with the London road has been afforded no protection in recent years, the parade has seen many shops turned to poorly designed house frontages and many small industrial sites have been converted to housing. The NPlan will seek to guide this process sensitively and with design at the forefront.

6. 20:27:17 From Caroline Shah : *6 storeys will be highly visible from Richmond Park surely?*

- a. *This question (we think) relates to 6 storeys within the transition zone, to the south of the forum area.*
- i. *The key views to and from Richmond park are contained within the plan and will remain key to maximum height in those areas. It is worth noting that just across the railway line, outside the forum area there are many buildings in excess of 6 storeys and the purpose of the transition zone is to 'transition' towards the town centre where heights are considerably taller than 6 storeys.*
- ii. *In addition to this we already have many tall buildings in the forum area that have been constructed prior to the establishment of the plan. In each case the lack of a proper plan has hampered residents efforts to reduce height in each case.*

7. 20:28:14 From Caroline Shah : *So the growth corridor abuts the Liverpool Road Conservation Area?*

- a. **See Q 9 Answer**

8. 20:29:02 From Caroline Shah : *Do people in the Conservation Areas know about these plans?*

a. See Q 9 & 10 Answers

9. 20:29:52 From Caroline Shah : *How can you have a Growth Area right next to two Conservation Areas?*

a. The Park Road corridor has been identified as such due to it being one of two transport thoroughfares through the forum area. It is described as a 'development corridor' due to its existing layout and commercial nature especially at its junction with London Road. The NPlan when published will contain provision to 'enhance' and 'sensitively' respond to existing character. The development corridor is narrow and has been drawn so as it contains many existing potential commercial sites which could be sensitively developed. However the forum are aware of the southern areas proximity to Norbiton train station and the pressures this brings via the London Plan 2020.

10. 20:30:39 From Helen Hinton : *Liverpool and crescent road are not part of the NKF despite changes in ward boundaries due in 2022*

a. Correct. The North Kingston Forum Neighbourhood Area is already one of the largest in London with a population of ~25,000. We would not recommend increasing the population or area coverage, the Forum may become too large to manage. The amount of time spent on representations within the current neighbourhood boundary area is already more than significant, any increase runs the risk of overwhelming the highly experienced committee. It is important to remember that we are all volunteers. The CA5 Liverpool Road Conservation Area already has protection via that status, and planning applications submitted within are more than adequately assessed by the Kingston Town CAAC.

It would also require re-designation, a major and exhausting process.

However, proposed changes via the new Planning Reform System regarding Permitted Development Rights within CAs must be carefully reviewed by Government. We have already made representation to Government that full planning powers should be retained within CAs. We also recommended that Borough Conservation Area Advisory Committees (CAACs) respond accordingly, the Kingston Town CAAC followed our recommendation and submitted representation to the same effect. Whether all borough CAACs responded is unknown.

Should the Coombe Hill ward residents and councillors feel that neighbourhood planning would be beneficial to their area, they would be best served by creating a Coombe Hill Neighbourhood Plan, which could be better tailored to those communities local concerns and aspirations. We would be delighted to advise.

Some local authorities encourage neighbourhood planning and their boroughs are becoming covered with neighbourhood plan areas, Cheshire East being one of the more significant ones we are aware of with 119 active groups listed on the council website.

20:33:19 From Helen Hinton : the consultation & referendum must allow these residents to vote.

- b. *The steps involved in the referendum process can be found here in the Government legislation.*
 - i. *<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#the-neighbourhood-planning-referendum>*
 - ii. *Specifically: Who votes in a referendum?*
 - iii. *A person is entitled to vote if at the time of the referendum, they meet the eligibility criteria to vote in a local election for the area and if they live in the referendum area.*

Anyone who lives in the designated neighbourhood area and is eligible to vote in a local election at the time of the Referendum, is eligible to vote. The North Kingston Neighbourhood Area fully covers Canbury and Tudor wards. As this is not a business area, a business referendum will not be held. Postal votes are allowed.

11. 20:34:00 From Adrian Baker : Can you briefly explain Article 4 ?

- a. Article 4 Directives are explained here -
- b. <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/historic-environment/article4directions/#Section2Text>
- c. An [article 4 direction](#) is made by the [local planning authority](#). It restricts the scope of [permitted development rights](#) either in relation to a particular area or site, or a particular type of development anywhere in the authority's area. Where an article 4 direction is in effect, a planning application may be required for development that would otherwise have been permitted development. Article 4 directions are used to control works that could threaten the character of an area of acknowledged importance, such as a [conservation area](#).
- d. Article 4 directions can increase the public protection of [designated](#) and non-designated [heritage assets](#) and their settings. They are not necessary for

works to [listed buildings](#) and [scheduled monuments](#) as [listed building consent](#) and [scheduled monument consent](#) would cover all potentially harmful works that would otherwise be [permitted development](#) under the planning regime. However, article 4 directions might assist in the protection of all other heritage assets (particularly conservation areas) and help the protection of the [setting](#) of all heritage assets, including listed buildings.

- e. Article 4 directions may be used to require planning permission for the demolition of a non-designated heritage asset (such as a locally listed building outside of a conservation area), by removing the demolition rights under part 11 of the GPDO.
- f. Government guidance
- g. The government has issued guidance on when and how to make an article 4 direction [\(2\)](#). It says that local authorities should consider making article 4 directions only in those exceptional circumstances where the exercise of permitted development rights would harm local amenity, the historic environment or the proper planning of the area.
- h. The Neighbourhood Plan recommends Article 4 directions for all our local parades to be considered by the council, but this is not something the Plan itself can gift.

12. 20:42:27 From Ken Bryan : *Is the designation of an intensification zone dependent on the identification and development of additional and relevant infrastructure at the same time?*

- a. *Yes, it is essential that new development is supported by adequate infrastructure, social infrastructure such as health facilities and school places, and or transport infrastructure as necessary*
- b. *The Plan area contains an intensification zone within the Town Centre 'Key Area of Change'. It also contains a suburban transition zone and two development corridors, which align with the existing main transport thoroughfares through the forum area.*

13. 20:45:15 From Caroline Shah : *what do you mean by biodiversity?*

- a. *The forum is using the standard definitions for biodiversity. Biodiversity is the shortened form of two words "biological" and "diversity". It refers to all the variety of life that can be found on Earth (plants, animals, fungi and micro-organisms) as well as to the communities that they form and the habitats in which they live. Biodiversity, especially on larger or longer stretches of green, sustains the wildlife that we enjoy and can provide ecosystem services such as flood mitigation and carbon absorption.*

14. 20:45:51 From Adrian Baker : Any case for a biodiversity corridor crossing east-west to connect Thames to Richmond Park? Or too radical?

- a. *There is every case of working together with RBK highways department and residents towards this objective but the opportunities within public sector ownership for continuous corridors are limited without road width reduction or full closure to vehicles. A new Green corridor is encouraged in Policy NK15 Green Infrastructure linking the existing ones along the railway line and Northbound along Skerne Road and Richmond Road. It is intended to link from the Southern riverside, diagonally across the neighbourhood and through to Ham via Latchmere Lane. We like being radical. Additionally, we would like to see the existing Green Corridors extended further towards the Ham border. We would like to see an increase in the number of pocket parks and tree planting provided along roads across the neighbourhood if the community prioritises this using CIL contributions.*

Similarly encouraging improvements to recreation grounds with additional planting and biodiversity whilst maintaining their primary function. Acre Road is intended to provide a new green link between Richmond Park and the river Thames via Kingsgate with more planting improvements. When new developments arise involving land in private ownership then inclusion of green spaces within new developments will be required and encouraged. Of course existing opportunities such as verges and parks are to be retained and protected with potential shared use of pavements with cyclists. When new developments are built homeowners will be encouraged to retain diverse gardens with links between gardens below fences for wildlife to transit. Hard paved areas and decking in lieu of planted garden areas will be discouraged in design guidance and use of cycles and walking alongside green routes encouraged.

15. 20:48:57 From Caroline Shah : What about the Tudor Drive library?

- a. *As with the 1st Kingston Hill Scout hut, Tudor Drive Library is included in the Neighbourhood Plan as a community asset to protect.*

The Community Facilities policy NK11 and Appendix A within the Neighbourhood Plan will help to ensure that these assets are protected, and seeks to resist their loss.

16. 20:50:50 From martin hislop : Disappointed that Dowler Court is not listed here.

- a. *The NPlan does contain a specific reference to Murray House due to its size and current instability. The forum considers Dowler court/sheltered accommodation to be an important asset and will look at adding some specific text within the draft NPlan prior to consultation.*

The draft plan does refer to Acre road in the following statement. The committee will consider extracting or referring directly to Dowler Court in this section.

” The re-development of all of the Council’s sites in the Acre Road and Elm Road area as a single development may offer particular public benefits and as such would be supported. However, their separate development may offer better opportunities for local house builders and enable earlier completion. “

It is important to note that the NPlan, when published, is a draft and will be available for consultation for the very questions such as this.

17. 20:51:46 From Caroline Shah : *Where is pride in Kingston's history? And in ability to have a community place for gatherings and children's activities and even for scouting?*

- a. *Of course we all do. Every person who logged into and joined in with the NKF AGM clearly has their own individual interest and pride in Kingston's architecture. This passion they hold for conservation, good management and careful planning of the built environment is shared in common but multiplied many times by the enthusiasm and professionalism of members of the NKF committee who strive to protect this character of our area that is special to all of us through the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. We too do not want this character spoiled, after all this is the reason for our group existing, it is why we chose to live here!*

The planning system controls the appearance, location and density of new development but our area must accommodate not only the needs of our own community but also the demands for change placed on our nation by the requirements of an ever growing population, environmental impacts of climate change and technological change. There is a need to plan for those future demands and to ensure the necessary changes do not adversely impact to degrade or lose the features of our area that we all love and cherish so much.

There is an identified need for new homes, upgrades and expansion to existing buildings and to infrastructure such as schools, medical facilities and modes of transport. Technological advances, climate change and now pandemic control necessitate alternatives to the way we go about our lives including maintaining our personal fitness and well-being but also these demands require consideration as to how we plan our built environment so as to minimise the adverse effects inadequate planning control can bring about. This planning for the future is the objective of NKF to add a further layer of local controls to our area that new development must meet to be regarded as being suitable for providing a good fit to the neighbourhood.

We cannot stop the setting of targets and demands on location set by higher national and regional authorities such as the Mayor of London’s plans for

opportunity areas close to our railway stations, nor the requirement for Kingston to build many new homes. However, just as the present planning system sets requirements in terms of controls and standards to be adhered to, we have the opportunity through a neighbourhood plan you contribute to, to add another layer of policies that must be met if developing within our neighbourhood.

NKF cannot list buildings, this is the duty of Historic England and RCHME, nor unlike RB Kingston council do we have duty and legal powers to create conservation areas but we do have the ability to identify and put forward areas and features identified as being of special interest to the character of our area and set policies for minimum standards necessary to be suitable for providing good fit to our area. If NKF's Neighbourhood Plan is approved by the planning inspector and the local support of residents at referendum then the policies developed from what you have asked for will become part of the planning controls for our neighbourhood. It still remains the decision of higher authorities to approve or reject a planning application but they are obliged to take into consideration the policies set by the Neighbourhood Plan. You can support or you can reject the additional layer of guidance the Neighbourhood Plan provides.

The draft plan will be published in early March. Please do read this and comment. It will then be modified and finalised to be put to referendum later this year for you to choose whether to implement.

Whilst you may have concerns about change, these are concerns we share in common and upon reading the plan you will hopefully recognise that we are better off with the plan than without. Progress and change will occur under the planning system under higher authority whether or not you chose to adopt a plan for our neighbourhood. NKF encourage you to contribute to making your own decisions as to what will happen in your area by responding to the draft plan and by voting for the final version at referendum. Speed is of the essence as delay or rejection in producing a plan will increase opportunity for policies of higher authorities and schemes of developers to enter our area with inability to challenge.

In addition to the above response the following has been prepared by the NKF regarding the Scout Hut discussion:

The North Kingston Forum confirms that they are not advocating the loss of the 1st Kingston Hill Scout hut on Park Road, and have included measures within the Neighbourhood Plan to help prevent this from happening.

One of the four key objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan is “to ensure the long-term sustainability of North Kingston by protecting and improving its essential local retail, business and social facilities.”

*To achieve this objective, the Neighbourhood Plan has a specific Community Facilities policy in place, for the **protection and enhancement of existing community facilities**, as well as the upgrade and expansion of community assets to support future demand. The policy NK11 and Appendix A identifies existing community facilities that will be protected, and seeks to resist the loss of these facilities; the Scout Hut on Park Road is clearly identified as one of those assets and as such, is afforded protection via the Neighbourhood Plan.*

*The Neighbourhood Plan also seeks to **designate the associated Scout Hut field as a Local Green Space**, meaning that proposals for development will be considered inappropriate unless they are of a type that is exempted by national policy on the Green Belt.*

*However, as the **Scout Hut land is privately owned**, we cannot and should not assume that the landowner will not want to sell the land for its development potential at a future date. To address this risk, the Neighbourhood Plan includes a site-specific policy for the Scout hut site which confirms that a modest mixed residential and community facility scheme will only be supported if (amongst other criteria):*

- An upgraded scout hall of the same floorspace or greater is provided either on the site or in an alternative location that is conveniently located to serve North Kingston;*
- If the replacement facility is to be provided off-site, then it must be delivered and operational as a scout hall prior to the loss of the existing facility.*

The North Kingston Forum believes the Neighbourhood Plan, and specifically these referenced policies, are the best way to ensure the community benefit of the 1st Kingston Hill Scout hut is adequately protected.

18. 20:52:24 From Caroline Shah : Actually, what is happening to Barnfield and the Youth Centre site and the recreation area next to it?

- a. As with the 1st Kingston Hill Scout hut, Barnfield Riding School and the adjacent grassed area are both included in the Neighbourhood Plan as community assets to protect.*

The Community Facilities policy within the Neighbourhood Plan will help to ensure that these assets are protected, and seeks to resist their loss.

19. 20:57:04 From Caroline Shah : None of Canbury Ward is urban either according to Kingston Council's Borough Character Study - there are 5 areas - 3 are outer suburban character, 1 is inner suburban (area 5) and 1 is rural/open space in character. NK Fourm needs to ensure it is not describing what the area MIGHT become rather than what it IS. This is happening in Surbiton which has been described as a dense urban area

- a. *The London Plan 2020 has the following descriptions of Urban and Suburban.*
 - i. *Urban – areas with predominantly dense development such as, for example, terraced houses, mansion blocks, a mix of different uses, medium building footprints and typically buildings of two to four storeys, located within 800 metres walking distance of a District centre or, along main arterial routes*
 - ii. *Suburban – areas with predominantly lower density development such as, for example, detached and semi-detached houses, predominantly residential, small building footprints and typically buildings of two to three storeys.*
 - iii. *The Forum area is classified as 'Urban' based on the Rural-Urban Classification for Output Areas 2011. This website is produced by the ONS. - <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/20467878cc20410d961a3f71db356b6d>*

20. 20:57:12 From Helen Hinton : *The consultation should be open to other residents, not just NKF area people. The scout hut will affect people in Coombe hill & Norbiton.*

- a. *The details of the Reg 14 consultation will be sent to councilors in the adjacent Kingston Wards of Coombe Hill, Grove and Norbiton. It will be requested that the councillors inform those resident groups in their area who may have interest. The same details will also be sent to the Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Forum, and Ham and Petersham councillors. We aim to protect the amenity should the site come forward for redevelopment.*

21. 21:11:49 From Caroline Shah : **What facilities are there for young children?(In addition to this written question a verbal question was also asked regarding the consultation with Children specifically)**

- a. Although the Forum was criticised to not have focused on children in consulting on the draft Neighbourhood Plan the contrary is true.
 - i. Neighbourhood schools were approached during the initial stages of information gathering and consultation but of course this became more problematic during the last year.
 - ii. However all families across the Neighbourhood, including children, have been consulted over the last couple of years. It would not have been

appropriate for the Forum to have approached children directly although committee members are parents, including some with children of school age.

- iii. Our alternative approach is to work with community hubs like the Hawker who have a much larger knowledge base on the wants and needs of NKs children, to effectively inform the application of planning policy.
- iv. Additionally, we have supported the TGS proposal for a new sports hall, and encourage a greater and affordable community access of use of their proposed new gym facilities.
- v. It is also worth noting that all of the 'Live' consultation events that took place pre Covid 19 have been available to residents of all age groups. In fact the events at Canbury Gardens, Latchmere Recreation Ground, Sainsburys, Hawker Centre and outside Co-Op (Kings Road) were open access and positively invited all comers.
- vi. The Neighbourhood Plan has a specific Community Facilities policy in place, for the protection and enhancement of existing community facilities. The policy incorporates a comprehensive list of these existing assets, including a number used by children and young adults – recreation facilities, youth provision, community rooms, children's playgrounds, sports pitches. Examples include: Canbury Community Pavilion; the Hawker Centre; two Scout halls, a Sea Cadets group and Brownies; recreation grounds and Multi-Use Games Areas, to name just a few.

The policy also promotes the upgrade and expansion of community assets to support future demand, mandating that proposals for specific development sites should include the provision of community facilities commensurate with the size of the planned development.

The North Kingston Forum continues to actively support proposals for community resources, most recently with a formal letter of support to Tiffin Girls' School for their proposed new sports hall with community access, where we specifically encouraged a greater and affordable community access of use to the proposed new gym facilities.

22. To expand upon the above question and to respond to a verbal question regarding School places, the NKF has prepared the following response:

- a. The North Kingston Forum recognises that providing school places is a fundamental requirement which must be addressed when looking at population growth within North Kingston. In particular, we know that the current nearby secondary schools are already at capacity and therefore a new secondary school is required within the next few years to meet demand. The NK Forum recently submitted a letter supporting in principle, a new school in Norbiton ward, as we

believe this is our best (and currently only) opportunity to ensure a new secondary school is established which serves our North Kingston families.

The NK Forum notes that the proposed Kingston Church of England Secondary School will be a non-selective, co-educational inclusive school, open to all children from all backgrounds. Children from families of any faith or no faith will be able to gain admission - 120 of the 180 places per year group will be 'open' places with no reference to faith.

So far as the proposed secondary school remains predominantly non-selective and open to all children from all backgrounds and faiths, the North Kingston Neighbourhood Forum supports this school proposal. The NK Forum has not formally assessed the suitability of the proposed site, as this is outwith our remit. However, we have strongly urged the applicant to undertake a robust biodiversity assessment using locally-based consultants.

With regards to primary schools, the demand for places is also high and we confirm in the Neighbourhood Plan that: "the expectation is that an additional primary school will be required in line with the growing population."

Within the Neighbourhood Plan's site-specific policies, we state that: "consideration should be given to the need for additional healthcare and educational facilities to support the population growth in North Kingston."

The NK Forum will continue to actively engage with Achieving for Children, who manage school admissions for Kingston Council, on the requirements for North Kingston.

23. 21:13:57 From Fr Martin Hislop : *Would it be possible for NK Forum to provide an explanation at a later stage of the relationship between opportunity areas, local conservation areas and small site development to help us understand?*

a. *With pleasure. It is our intention to have a glossary on the website linked to the consultation.*

24. 21:15:09 From Caroline Shah : *It is possible for people to ask for the area of vote to be extended.*

a. *Presumably this implies voting at the Referendum, then unless the Independent Examiner recommends that, and it is not clear why that very rare event should happen, then no. It is important that residents in adjacent wards realise they can set up their own Neighbourhood Forum.*

25. 21:19:38 From Caroline Shah : *How can we vote on plans that are not clear,*
?

- a. As the draft Plan has not been published yet, the question is not relevant.

Additional Questions added to help attendees better understand the NPlan process post adoption.

Q. Can the Nplan be revised once it has passed referendum or is it set in stone until 2041? Will this require a new referendum for each and every change or clarification of interpretation?

Yes, it can be revised. It will be important for a Forum committee to exist once the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made'. This ensures correct implementation of the policies contained within, other groups have shown this to be essential. Government recommends reviewing Plans every 5 years, and provides funding for this. This can be carried out by the committee. Should minor adjustments be required, then this can be voted on and approved within the Forum itself. However, major changes will likely require the provision of additional evidence base, environmental assessment reviews etc etc. The degree of that major change may require holding a new Referendum. This is dealt with on a case by case basis.

Interestingly, The Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Forum which operates in an Opportunity Area in Tower Hamlets with a massive housing target, has 2 Plans, 1st Phase and 2nd Phase. This will help address the changes an extended construction timeline will bring.

Q. Can the committee post clarifications to RB Kingston Council once the neighbourhood plan adopted if unintended exploitation or results occur via discovered loophole or misinterpretation and would such issued clarifications carry any weight with RBK whether or not the public pre-consulted by the Forum before issuing the clarification?

If I have understood the question correctly, should the Forum committee feel that the Plan policies are not being implemented in the way intended, and a loophole discovered, then they must of course take action. Any potential loopholes could presumably be addressed by bringing the Plan review forward. How much weight clarification would carry is unclear at this time. I imagine this scenario has already been tested, we will need to research case studies to learn more.

Questions submitted via email prior to the AGM

- **Dear North Kingston Forum I am attending your AGM on Wednesday 24 February 2021. I would like to ask the following question:**
 - 1. How can the North Kingston Forum ("NKF") justify a policy or objective that directs all development on North Kingston roads on to a few roads that it

considers to be "Key Corridors" when the people affected by such a policy or objective will have no voice in the matter as they are - by nature - a minority of the people eligible to vote on the NKF's policies and objectives? All of the roads that the NKF appears to consider "key corridors" are residential roads with character properties and are part of - or even the heart of or oldest part of (in the case of Park Road - long established residential neighbourhoods. The approach seems particularly unfair given that all residents living in the Liverpool Road Conservation Area which abuts Park Road and Kings Road south of Park Road - which are two of the "Key Corridors" - are EXCLUDED from having a vote on the matter as they have been excluded from the North Kingston Neighbourhood Area despite being part of Tudor Ward. In my opinion, the approach being taken by the North Kingston Forum is discriminatory and wrong.

Yours sincerely Caroline Shah

This question has been answered in some detail above. However to summarise the key points:

- *The NKF Policy is intending to manage development in two key corridors, and merely formalising the existing nature of the two main transport routes through the forum area. This is in response to the fact that the Local Plan may seek to include these routes into an extended Kingston Opportunity Area. These routes will still remain inappropriate for tall buildings. The areas in question already border these routes and the forum are not seeking to change the nature of this arrangement.*
 - *All residents of Tudor and Canbury wards as of 2020/21 if eligible to vote in a local election, will be eligible to vote on the Neighbourhood Plan as this is the designated Forum area.*
 - *The current boundary along Queens road was decided as it was a de facto ward boundary. Each forum area must have a boundary somewhere and as this proposed area is one of the largest in London it is not considered wise to make it any larger.*
- **Question 2 Dear NKF A number of residents have contacted me and given me the following questions:**
 - 1) CHILDREN: There seems to be very little consultation with schools or young people, even though young people/children make up more than 25% of the population of the NKF neighbourhood and is likely to increase with further development. Where will the extra school places come from, and how is it acceptable for the historic scout hut, one of the oldest in the country and a much loved community space mainly serving young people, being considered for development? The youth centre on Park Road shut some time ago and there is a severe shortage of facilities for young people. Canbury Ward does not have a

community centre, especially one with green space, and it is vital that the Scout hut and green space is protected.

- 2) REFERENDUM: The area that North Kingston Forum covers includes mainly Canbury and Tudor wards, although it does stretch as far as Manorgate Road which is Norbiton I believe. However some areas of Canbury are excluded such as the conservation areas surrounding Queens Road, Liverpool Road and the northern part of King's Road leading to Richmond Park. These areas have NO vote in the proposed referendum and may be adversely impacted by increased development in the area. Therefore surely the vote should be extended to the whole of north Kingston and the wards Canbury, Tudor and Coombe Hill, and also other wards adjoining the NKF neighbourhood. "The Localism Act requires that the independent examiner consider whether the area for any referendum should extend beyond the neighbourhood area to which the draft plan or order relates. If a recommendation is made to extend the area the independent examiner must make a recommendation as to what the extended area should be. The local planning authority is required to make a decision on the referendum area informed by the examiner's conclusions. If the authority decides to extend the referendum/s area they must publish a map of the area"
<https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/briefing-notereferendums-c75.pdf>

Yours sincerely Helen Hinton Kingston Independent Residents Group

These questions have been answered in some detail above.

- **Question 3 What would happen regarding development in N Kingston if there was no North Kingston Neighbourhood Plan, or if the proposed Plan was rejected at referendum? With thanks Peter**

Without the Neighbourhood Plan, local residents will have to rely on the London Plan (which was not liked) and the borough's Local Plan to manage new development. There would be no site specific controls nor indeed a general presumption against intrusive development. If an "opportunity area" is declared it would cover a much wider area than the Forum's proposed "area of intensification". The Plan's site specific policies operating within the Intensification Zone or possibly a future Opportunity Area would still apply.

Should the NPlan fail at Referendum:

- *There would be no North Kingston Neighbourhood Area*
- *There would be no North Kingston Forum or Steering Committee.*
- *There would be no Committee responding to major planning applications*

- *There would be no site specific policies to guide development and ensure they are not too tall*
- *There would be no policy identifying where taller buildings could be located or how tall they should be*
- *There would no policy guiding the transition of development from the Town Centre, to protect the more residential areas where tall buildings would not be appropriate*
- *There would be no policy outlining Sustainable Design Standards*
- *There would be no policy managing the likely development along the 2 key Transportation Corridors to ensure buildings do not get too tall or encroach into surrounding character areas*
- *There would be no nominated Local Green Space designations to protect those spaces we cherish, including allotments*
- *There would be no policies to protect the environment by promoting sustainable movement, ecological connectivity, climate resilience or climate change mitigation by incentivising Passivhaus standards*
- *There would be no Policy identifying those community facilities we wish to protect and enhance*
- *There would be no Policy identifying those Pubs we do not want to lose*
- *There would be no policy identifying the local parades and businesses for protection*
- *There would be no policies identifying Public Realm improvements and new pocket parks*
- *There would be no policies preserving and enhancing our heritage areas and buildings*
- *There would be limited community influence over priorities for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) list*

- **Question 4 The London mayor sets property targets for each borough. What is the target for Kingston and what could happen if we don't achieve that target. Jacqui Rollason**

The borough housing target indicated in the new London Plan is ~1000 new homes per year for the next 10 years. Kingston has failed to meet its target for a few years now. In the event the target continues not to be met, Central Government has the power to intervene to ensure those targets are met.

In our opinion, total opposition would be counter productive and it would be better to engage with the council to ensure that the impact of new development is not only fully mitigated but that it is accompanied by a full range of amenities and infrastructure for the benefit of both current and future residents.

- **Question 5 Thank you very much for the first 2021 newsletter. Very helpful. A couple of questions about growth numbers:**
 - **1. You say London will be 'the highest at 35%'. Could you clarify ? What is an 'uplift' ? Is this a new % increase over the last targets which in 2019 (for the period 2019 to 2041) were ca +20% for Kingston ? That would mean a new Kingston population growth (or housing increase) of 20% plus '35% of 20%' ie 27% ?**
 - **2. Given what you say about Kingston Borough being behind the times when it comes to housing forecasts and, encouragingly, what you say: "So far, NPlans are being judged favourably at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate" does NKF have forecasts for N Kingston ?**

A1: As part of the proposed new reformed planning system, the UK Government is looking to change the Standard Methodology (SM). This calculation helps determine whether Local Authorities have been delivering sufficient new homes and have either passed or failed the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) . Local Authorities now have an annual audit on the delivery of new housing, not what they think might be in the pipeline.

The new Standard Methodology indicates most of the country will stay as they were, but the 20 largest cities will see their requirements increase and London's by 35%. London represents the biggest increase because the methodology applies to all boroughs. For London, the figures are:

<i>Standard Methodology</i>	<i>69,000 homes/ year</i>
<i>SM plus 35% uplift</i>	<i>93,000 homes/year (2.6% Growth Rate)</i>

The London borough Indicative Local Housing Need figures can be found in the Government spreadsheet:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-current-planning-system>

A2: The Neighbourhood Plan is not directly allocating sites, we merely wish to have something to say about sites should development be proposed. There is no guarantee that any site will or will not be developed, and on that basis it is difficult to forecast and we have certainly not been given a target figure from the council. However, should all the sites come forward for development, we might expect at least 1,000 new homes over the lifetime of the Neighbourhood Plan and out to 2041. Each of our sites policies indicates the maximum acceptable level of housing for that site.

