

Ham Close Stakeholder Reference Group Meeting

12.10.21

Attendance list:

LBRuT: Cllr Jaeger, Millard, Frieze, Richards and Frost. Anna Sadler (Programme Manager) and Hakim Miiro (Project Officer)

RHP & Hill: Simon Cavanagh (Regeneration Manager), Tracey Elliott (Development Project Manager) Rob Cummins (Head of New Business and Regeneration), Kirsty Dougan (Hill – Senior Development Manager) and Sean Weston (WR-AP - Architect)

Stakeholders: Julia, David Williams, Justin Langford, Mandy Jenkins and Marco

Apologies: Chris and Simon Coupland

1. Consultation and engagement timeline (presented by KD)

RHP & Hill are taking all the feedback that residents have provided to ensure that it informs the proposal. As a result, they're redesigning the proposals which will also be further consulted on. To afford this process the necessary time, RHP & Hill have pushed the planning submission to next year, to ensure that the proposals reflect the feedback collected. Kirsty apologised for the inconveniences that these changes have made and reminded everyone that feedback/queries can still be sent to the ham close inbox.

2. Infrastructure updates (presented by AS)

Transport:

As discussed in the November 2020 SRG meeting, the Council are seeking opportunities to improve transport in Ham. Bids were made to TfL but due to the Covid 19 pandemic, TfL suspended those funds until further notice.

The Traffic Assessment (TA) Report and a Framework Travel Plan (FTP) will all be completed prior to the planning application submission. These documents will be made available to the public on the planning portal once the application has been submitted.

School:

All three-local state-funded primary schools have space for expansion from one to two forms of entry should additional places be required. However, at present, there is some spare capacity which would first need to be filled before expansion (either temporary or permanent) of any of the three schools could be justified. Once further details of the phasing and tenure/bedroom-size mix of the Ham Close development are available, further assessment will be undertaken to gauge the likely 'pupil yield', i.e., the numbers of children who would need a new school place within Ham and Petersham. That assessment will also consider the forecast availability of places in state-funded primary schools in North Kingston.

For secondary phase education, all children living in the Ham Close development would be living within the catchment of Grey Court School.

By the time the development gets completed, we should have the Mortlake Brewery secondary school, which would admit children from the North Richmond direction (as well as Kew, Mortlake, etc.).

David Williams requested a definitive statement to quill the suggestion that schools will be demolished as a result of the demand from the proposed regeneration

Cllr Frost and Cllr Frieze stated that the council is not of the position to demolish any schools.

Cllr Frieze accepts TfL has limited funds and enquired if there are alternative funding options that could be used to improve the areas public transport.

Cllr Frieze also asked about plans to encourage active travel within the area rather than accommodating car usage with the large parking facilities proposed?

Simon Cavanagh stated that there's currently 200 parking spaces and the proposals would need to account for the additional parking demand to reflect the development. Ongoing discussions with planners will also determine the extent of parking that will be provided. Simon also noted that parking will be provided through underground facilities to maintain the open green space within Ham.

David W stated that there are parking/transport pressures not only in Ham but across Richmond and suggested reduced parking provisions for the regeneration could have wider benefits for the wider community. Could we look at modal shift to encourage public transport.

Mandy Jenkins asked if the proposals are considering protected characteristics within the proposed parking provisions?

Marco stated that it was not only Ham residents currently parking in the area.

Anna Sadler observed that due to the lack of parking restrictions, many residents that may not live in Ham, did park in the area.

Kirsty Dougan stated that this is a low PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Levels) area but discussions with various groups will help inform the decision on parking requirements.

Actions:

- AS to provide a statement of reassurance to David regarding the demolition of school.
- HM & AS to investigate additional funding to improve the (public/active) transport facilities within Ham.

3. Proposals (presented by Sean)

Following the previous consultation, the community centre has been redesigned, including removing the cantilever, meaning the building has been set back. The design needed to create better links to the residential development. There's a new community lounge and office spaces. People will be able to walk around the building, while avoiding the green. Existing facilities in the youth centre will be re-provided including the ICT room. The building is set back from the green and designed to allow activation with the green. It will have a BREAM excellent rating and additional measures will be included to reduce water consumption and the overall carbon footprint. As this is a civic building, it won't necessarily need to be identical to the local buildings but will still reflect the context it sits within, through the use of timber frames and brick.

David Williams asked if the ground floor is largely pillars, could we possibly remove it to reduce the height of the building? He also stated that there would be a duplication by providing a small meeting room that's already provided at the Ham Library annexe. He then asked where is the Makerlabs space?

Sean Weston responded by stating that the pillars are necessary to support the building. The meeting room is re-providing the space within the youth centre, but we are looking at the option to provide a larger meeting room. Lastly, the Makerlabs will be provided in a separate building.

Anna also stated that the meeting room will be a flexible space that would be available for booking but ongoing discussions will guide the design.

Cllr Frost stated that we currently do not have the facilities for a large meeting room to accommodate social gatherings such as parties in the local area. We should also ensure that they are affordable. Also concerned about the storage being provided to TAG for their equipment.

Anna responded by stating that storage for TAG is being reviewed and there needs to be discussions regarding what equipment can be stored locally, while providing as much space for activities as needed.

Sean also stated that storage has been provided on every floor, including by the activity hall to ensure that enough space is provided in the hall for activities.

Cllr Frieze was concerned about safety for women/girls and asked that entrances are properly lit. Cllr Frieze asked if community centre presented any privacy concerns for neighbouring properties and was also concerned about the loss of ownership for the current users if the centre was opened to more users.

Sean agreed that all necessary safety measures to make all users, especially women/girls to be implemented. Also reassured members that there will be no overlooking as there'll be no windows directed to the neighbouring properties

Mandy asked if the parking facilities meet the demand.

Sean and Anna stated that they need to understand the parking requirements for the centre and provide for that need rather than for those that have used the available parking simply because it is there.

Cllr Frost stated that the nearby bus stop could help mitigate the need to drive to the centre.

Mandy stated that residents may not appreciate looking at a brick wall

Anna responded by stating they will look to introduce some art on the blank walls.

Cllr Frost asked if we could look at reclaiming the centre as a community centre with which the youth facilities are a crucial role.

Anna stated that they're certainly looking at opportunities to make the building as flexible as possible to meet existing and future needs.

Marco asked if we could utilise underground parking and what are the environmental measures for the wider development.

Kirsty noted the question regarding the environmental measures and stated that she would come back with a response for not only the community centre but also the wider development.

Actions:

- AS to continue discussions with AfC and TAG to identify a suitable space/location for storage.
- KD to provide a response describing the environmental measures for not only the community centre but also the wider development.

4. Social value fund (presented by Rob C)

RHP has secured a social fund from Hill of £250,000 per year, for eight years subject to achieving a viable planning permission for Ham Close.

Cllr Frieze asked if the fund is open to infrastructure developments?

Rob C stated that the Social Value fund will help to fund local initiatives that benefit all residents of Ham and there will be more details later in 2022.

Cllr Frost stated that before plans for the money are made, there needs to be a group of people that can review the best options.

Rob and Simon agreed, and stated that a board will include the three project partners (RHP, HILL and LBRuT) and Ham Close residents. RHP will also looking for a further board member from the local area and further details on the management of the Social Value fund will be provided later in 2022.

5. Next steps

N/A