

## **Minutes of the North Kingston Forum Meeting Wednesday 15th November 2017 at the Hawker Centre 7:30pm**

### I Apologies.

Apologies were received from Matthew, Glen, John and Maria.

### II. Agree and sign amended minutes from the last meeting

They have been amended to include comments about the logo letter. The amended minutes were signed.

### III. Review of Action points from the last meeting

Issues were included in the agenda.

### IV. Canbury Business Park (see Howard's notes attached)

Di report she had received an update to the proposed application and that we now have a further 21 days to comment from the 15 November. Howard outlined the key points from his note. He listed the issues we could use to object. The recommendation was to respond with a holding objection listing the issues whilst we review the further information. Nicola mentioned an online poll.

Concern was raised over the lack of public consultation.

### V. 84 Lower Ham Road – The Coigne

Di directed the meeting to Howards notes which were collated comments. The main concern appeared to be the double basement. The development may also be contrary to the style of the area which is in a conservation area. Concern was expressed around the need for more affordable accommodation. Agreed that Di would liaise with CARA and make a submission.

### VI. Update from Work Groups – are there any issues or problems?

Jonathan updated on the business group. He said the main issues were broadband, public transport, availability of space, property rents, road congestion, parking costs and signage. Concerns were raised over the viability of the Tudor parade.

Marilyn updated on the environment group. They have created a wish list and reviewing data. They are working on a survey.

Sadly John is stepping down as heritage and design group leader. They are

meeting next week to resolve issues and move forward. They have drafted guidance notes and moving forward. David raised the issue of the lower part of Richmond Road and suggested the group look at how the design of the area could be improved.

Matthew's update on the community group was delivered by Sarah. They are in the progress of undertaking an audit of what is available. The key areas include arts and culture, sports and recreation ground, leisure facilities, public services and youth. They are consulting with a view to deciding what needs enhancement, improving or introducing. Allotments need to be included.

Di said we needed to construct a residents survey asking their views. Sarah offered to be the lead group on the survey construction.

VII. Proposed meeting date with the council to discuss our NPlan – January suggested by Neil.

Are we at a stage to consider this?

It was agreed that the end of January 2018 would be a good target date.

VIII. Proposal to hold the next scheduled committee meeting as a work group leaders meeting on the 6th Dec.

Agreed it would be a team leaders meeting at 10 Lower Kings road KT2 5HR at 6.30 pm.

IX. New meeting dates for 2018

Wed 3rd Jan (Howard and Jonathan not available)

Wed 7th Feb

Wed 7th March

Wed 7th April (Diane not available)

Wed 2nd May

Wed 6th June

Wed 4th July

Wed 1st Aug

Wed 5th September

Wed 3rd Oct

X. UCL student brief – proposal to get them to 'test' our direction of travel.

Di updated the group and asked for a paragraph from each group on what they would like them to do. Could they identify potential sites for development. David asked members to respond to the councils call for sites.

## XI. Local surveys

- a. Series of questions from each work group – by the next meeting on 6th December
- b. Survey Monkey subscription costs around £300 a year. It was agreed.

## XII. AOB

Jonathan. Asked if the list of questions sent to the council could be chased.

## XIII. Date of next meeting

3<sup>rd</sup> January 2018

Many thanks to Jonathan for meeting minutes.

### **Attendees**

Howard Sheppard  
Jonathan Rollason  
Vincenzo Calenzo  
Filippo Selini  
Diane Lees  
Marilyn Mason  
Sarah Olney  
Mike Frain  
Asa Backman  
Nicola Duffey  
Diane Watling  
Cllr David Cunningham

**North Kingston Forum Meeting  
Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> November 2017  
Hawker Centre 7:30pm**

**Agenda**

- I. Apologies
- II. Agree and sign amended minutes from the last meeting
- III. Review Action points from last meeting
- IV. Canbury Business Park (see Howard's notes attached)
- V. 84 Lower Ham Road – The Coigne
- VI. Update from Work Groups – are there any issues or problems?
- VII. Proposed meeting date with the council to discuss our NPlan – January suggested by Neil. Are we at a stage to consider this?
- VIII. Proposal to hold the next scheduled committee meeting as a work group leaders meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup> Dec.
- IX. New meeting dates for 2018 (See below)
- X. UCL student brief – proposal to get them to 'test' our direction of travel.
- XI. Local surveys
  - a. Series of questions from each work group – by the next meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> December
  - b. Survey Monkey subscription
- XII. AOB
- XIII. Date of next meeting

**Proposed meeting dates for 2018**

Either Hawker Centre as usual or the new Tudor Library - *Cunningham Wing*

Wed 3<sup>rd</sup> Jan  
Wed 7<sup>th</sup> Feb  
Wed 7<sup>th</sup> March  
Wed 7<sup>th</sup> April (Diane not available)  
Wed 2<sup>nd</sup> May  
Wed 6<sup>th</sup> June  
Wed 4<sup>th</sup> July  
Wed 1<sup>st</sup> Aug  
Wed 5<sup>th</sup> September  
Wed 3<sup>rd</sup> Oct

**17/12877: Development Site at, Canbury Business Park, Canbury Park Road. Full Application.**

Details: Comprehensive redevelopment comprising: Demolition of all existing buildings; erection of part six/part seven storey building comprising 5,940spm B1(a) office accommodation (Grade

A quality) on ground, first, second & third floors, 13 residential apartments above; erection of part- four/part-five/part-six/part-seven/ part ten / part-14 storey building, comprising: 938 sqm of business incubator space (Class B1), 318 sqm medical centre (Class D1), 235 sqm of A3 space and 302 residential apartments; two levels of basement accommodation to provide centralised energy centre, car parking, cycle parking, plant and refuse storage; and associated landscaping treatments including new public pedestrian street, courtyard amenity areas and associated public realm improvements. There is a listed building present on this site. This is a large and important application that requires further study however the key points that arise from the application form are that while 246 flats are proposed (replacing 69 existing “intermediate” housing units) no “social” or “affordable” housing is indicated. There will be 978sqm (about +15%) more “employment” space, including 5,940sqm “Grade A” and 938sqm “business incubator space” also 978sqm of A2 space for “professional and financial services” is included, with potentially 8% more jobs overall. The applicant states “The proposed development will provide an exciting and truly mixed use regeneration of the site which will deliver qualitative and quantitative improvements to the site’s employment provision, much needed new housing of various types and tenures, and high quality public realm improvements” however the application form makes no reference to housing of “various types of tenures” although the Planning Statement refers to private rented and “Pocket Living” type housing as well as “market” housing. The height of the development is justified as it “broadly aligns with the prevailing character of the area...” citing the Power Station site (12 storeys) and the Gas Holders development (9 storeys) They also argue that the proposed landscaping and public realm “will have a dramatically positive affect on the surrounding area” however the benefits seem to accrue mainly to the new development itself with few benefits beyond the site. Finally the applicant refers to “an extensive programme of consultation with the local community, key stakeholders and statutory bodies” however they don’t add that they have taken any notice! Planning policy at national and local level generally supports such dense, mixed use schemes in town centres near stations. However the site lies just outside of (although adjacent to) the Town Centre and the council’s “Key Area of Change” and is a “Locally Significant Industrial Site” (although much of the space is now apparently offices). The NPPF advises that local planning authorities should focus on “...guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally” which might offer some comfort to those concerned about over-development. Also Policy 7.7 of the London Plan states that tall and large buildings should “...only be considered in areas whose character would not be affected adversely by the scale, mass or bulk of a tall or large building.” This is supported by Kingston’s “Core Strategy”, Policy DM10 “Design Requirements for new Developments” which expects new development to contribute “...to the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area which should be respected, maintained or enhanced.” And Policy KT1 “Kingston Town Neighbourhood”

requires new development to “protect the quality, character, scale and skylines of sensitive areas and safeguard strategic and local views.” The design is by Carey Jones Chapman Tolcher, a commercial practice based in London and Leeds. **Recommendation: Committee to advise.**

**7/12947; The Coigne 84 Lower Ham Road, KT2 5BB.** Full Application. Details: Demolition of the existing 3- storey building, previously converted into 2 flats, and the erection of a 4-storey building comprising 9 flats with associated basement accommodation and car parking and reconfigured access. Within the Riverside North conservation area. The existing house is of no particular merit, also the adjoining developments are recent and similarly of modest architectural quality. Although four storeys tall, like the adjoining buildings, the proposal’s additional elevation, to accommodate an underground car park, raises it above its neighbours. Furthermore the access in and out of the car park causes safety concerns. Nevertheless architecturally the design is well ordered. Recommendation - the NKF wish to object to this proposal which is considered to be overdevelopment of a relatively constrained riverside site. While only marginally taller than its immediate neighbours it is significantly larger than many of the other buildings in the conservation area. The proposed car park access also raises concerns of public safety along the footway. We conclude therefore that the proposal would not enhance the character of the Riverside North conservation area and regarding its scale and proposed vehicular access arrangements, which raise concerns of public safety, should be refused.

## **UCL Project**

Each team of students will develop a project in two stages

Stage 1: Vision development (to be completed by 8 February) Using information drawn from site visits, community consultations carried out by the neighbourhood forum, and communication with forum representatives, each group will propose a vision statement and strategic objectives that respond and represent the forum’s ideals. Proposed output: - summary of information collected; - map of vision covering the neighbourhood area; - concept map of objectives and key sites of transformation;

We would like the forum to attend the presentation of this first stage on Thursday 8 February. We will also encourage students to seek further input from the neighbourhood forum before developing stage 2 of the project

Stage 2: Evidence and outline for a neighbourhood plan (to be completed by 22 March) Using the vision and objectives identified in stage 1 and feedback from the neighbourhood forum

representatives, students will identify a policy theme (i.e. housing, green space, local economy, character, etc), collect and analyse evidence in relation to the selected theme, outline a neighbourhood development plan, key sites and policy recommendations for the area Proposed output: - map outlining the future development of the neighbourhood area and key sites - analysis of the current condition and key trends for the selected theme including changes arising from existing local plan policies and proposed developments - policy recommendations for implementing the proposed objectives and plan

The students will make a final presentation of their project on 22 March and we would like the forums to attend.