

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KINGSTON UPON THAMES
CULTURE, HOUSING, ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING
COMMITTEE (CHEP)

17 MARCH 2021

19:30– 20:38

Councillor Emily Davey (Co-Chair)*
Councillor Hilary Gander (Co-Chair)
Councillor Rebekah Moll (Co-Chair)
Councillor Lesley Heap
Councillor Ian George
Councillor Liz Green**
Councillor Jason Hughes
Councillor Thay Thayalan
Councillor Olly Wehring**
Councillor Yogan Yoganathan
Councillor Sharon Young

*Chaired this Committee meeting
**Absent

1. Apologies for absence

Councillors Green and Wehring were unable to attend the meeting. Councillors Kerr and Beynon substituted respectively.

2. Declarations of interest

Councillors Gander and Yoganathan declared that due to previous public comments concerning agenda item no.6 and out of an abundance of caution, they would temporarily be withdrawing from the meeting during the deliberations and voting on that particular item.

3. Petitions

There were no petitions.

4. Public questions

The public questions received at the Committee as well as the response provided on the night are attached to the minutes at annex 1.

5. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2021 were confirmed as a correct record.

Voting: Unanimous.

6. Article 4 Direction for Seething Wells Filter Beds

Appendix A

The Committee considered a report to review the representations received following the recent public consultation on the making of an immediate Article 4 Direction on land at Seething Wells Filter Beds to remove nationally permitted development rights for the erection, construction, maintenance, improvement or alteration of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure and to determine whether or not to confirm the Direction.

RESOLVED that:

1. The representations received through the public consultation be considered
2. The confirmation of the Article 4 Direction, subject to minor modifications to the wording of the Direction in order to allow the repair, maintenance and 'like for like' replacement of any existing gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure is approved.

Voting:

For: Beynon, Davey, George, Heap, Hughes, Kerr, Moll, Thayalan, Young

Against: Zero (0)

Abstain: Zero (0)

Absent: Councillors Gander and Yoganathan

7. Further Engagement on the Local Plan

Appendix B

The Committee next considered a report which sought to agree to a revised Local Development Scheme, and the approach to engagement for the next phase of the Local Plan. The importance of resident's contributions toward the Local Plan was particularly highlighted.

Since the early engagement of the Local Plan in May 2019 there have been significant developments including the London Plan being adopted, the Government white paper and a new National Planning Policy Framework. There is an ambition to engage with as broad and diverse a group of residents as possible to ensure that the result is sufficiently representative.

Concerns were raised by members with regard to the accessibility of the language used in the consultation process and wished to ensure that communications were easily understood by residents.

RESOLVED that:

1. A revised Local Development Scheme (Annex 1) incorporating changes to the timetable for preparing the new Local Plan set out in this report be approved.
2. The undertaking of an additional stage of engagement in the Local Plan programme (to be known as Further Engagement on the Local Plan) - as set out in the revised Local Development Scheme - be approved. This will be carried out in conformity with relevant planning regulations.

3. Prior to the Further Engagement on the Local Plan , the Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Infrastructure, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders and opposition spokesperson(s) be given delegated authority to agree the materials for the Further Engagement on the Local Plan.

Voting:

For: Councillors Beynon, Davey, Gander, Heap, Ker, Moll, Thayalan, Yoganathan and Young (9)

Against: Zero (0)

Abstain: Councillors George and Hughes (2)

8. LIP Programme 21/22

Appendix C

The Committee next considered a report which sought to approve the proposed schemes for inclusion in the 2021/22 Local Implementation Plan (LIP) programme, subject to confirmation from Transport for London (TfL). Emphasis was placed on safer streets and sustainable travel.

An approximate figure of £1.2m TfL funding was proposed for the programme but this figure had not yet been confirmed due to the financial impact of the Covid pandemic. Late material was circulated to members of the Committee containing comments on the report from three of the four Neighbourhood Committees. Concerns were raised by some members of the Committee due to the Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee not having their comments considered at the meeting. This was due to the CHEP Committee meeting having to be brought forward due to the pre-election period commencing on 22 March 2021. It was confirmed that separate TfL funding would go towards the Cycleway scheme for the Kingston to New Malden Gocycle route.

RESOLVED that:

1. Any comments on Annex 1 from the Neighbourhood Committees be noted as set out in the report at paragraph 7, and
2. To further note that the Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee takes place on 24 March, so any additional comments from that Committee are considered by the Executive Director of Corporate and Communities in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.
3. The proposed schemes, as listed in the table in Annex 1 are approved, and confirmed to TfL as the LIP programme for 2021/22, noting the TfL submission criteria in paragraph F.
4. Should any adjustments be required to Annex 1, these will be delegated to the Executive Director of Corporate and Communities in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.

Voting:

For: Councillors Beynon, Davey, Gander, Heap, Ker, Moll, Thayalan, Yoganathan and Young (9)

Against: Zero (0)

Abstain: Councillors George and Hughes (2)

9. Planned Highway and Street Lighting Capital Programme 2021/22 **Appendix D**

The Committee lastly considered a report that asked the Committee to detail highway (carriageway, footway and street lighting) planned maintenance works carried out during 2020/21 and present a proposed planned highway and street lighting maintenance programme for 2021/22.

RESOLVED that:

1. The current status of schemes from the 2020/21 planned highway works as detailed in Annex 1, be noted
2. Subject to any comments from the Neighbourhood Committees, the prioritised planned highway and street lighting capital maintenance programme for 2021/22, as detailed in Annex 2, be approved, with the Executive Director of Corporate and Communities delegated to deal with any in-year changes that may prove necessary in consultation with the Portfolio Holder and affected ward members.
3. To further note that the Maldens and Coombe Neighbourhood Committee takes place on 24 March, so any additional comments from that Committee are considered by the Executive Director of Corporate and Communities in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.

Voting:

For: Councillors Beynon, Davey, Gander, Heap, Ker, Moll, Thayalan, Yoganathan and Young (9)

Against: Zero (0)

Abstain: Councillors George and Hughes (2)

10. Urgent items authorised by the Chair

There were no urgent items.

11. Exclusion of the Press and Public

This item was not required.

Signed.....Date.....
Co Chair

Annex 1 – Public questions

Questions	Responses
<p>Dr. Liz Meerabeau, Chair NMRA</p> <p>1. The designation of Opportunity Areas in RBK in 2016 was heavily reliant on building Crossrail 2- there is no other improvement in public transport identified for RBK. Crossrail 2 is still in the published version of the London Plan, with a delivery date of the 2030s. Is this realistic and does Crossrail 2 have a funding stream identified.</p> <p>2. The LIP paper refers to the need to shift the predicted additional travel demand to walking, cycling and public transport but there is no mention of improvements in public transport in the document. What will these improvements be? And how robust are RBK’s post-covid assumptions?</p> <p>3. The Kingston Road cycle scheme will have floating bus stops. I had understood that the safety of existing bus stops of this type would be reviewed, but understandably that cannot be done during lockdown as many bus users are still shielding. When will this review take place?</p> <p>4. The LIP paper refers to implementing the 20 mph speed limit in the borough, but the data from the consultation has not been shared with the public. When will this take place, and will there be further consultation before any change in policy?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The New London Plan (2021) identifies the Kingston OA as an area capable of accommodating development and intensification to provide leisure, cultural and night-time activity, commercial and retail uses, as well as high density housing. The Kingston OA as it stands is premised on the delivery of Crossrail 2. Due to current national funding pressures the delivery of Crossrail 2 has been deprioritised and is now unlikely to come forward early in the current London Plan period. Discussions with GLA regarding the possibility of the reframing of an OA in support of different spatial strategy objectives for Kingston are being considered. 2. This report relates to RBK’s bid to TfL for funding for highway and street improvements. Public transport is provided by TfL and rail operators and is not relevant to this report. The report (Para 22) does identify that bus priority funding may become available at a future date but TfL is not currently seeking bids for this funding stream. 3. No floating bus stops are planned for Kingston Road since they require extra room for the cyclists to pass behind the bus stops, which we simply don’t have on the Kingston-New Malden carriageway. The bus stop bypasses which are planned have been working well on other Go Cycle routes. We are constantly in touch with TfL and other boroughs in case any new designs are put forward and an independent safety review is carried out at the end of each scheme completion. 4. The report indicates that it is anticipated that results of this consultation will be reported to committee in mid-2021. Any 20mph scheme would require a statutory consultation prior to implementation.
<p>Charles Deacon</p> <p>1) Will the council consider further Article 4 directions at Seething Wells to remove other Permitted Development rights that have been the subject of recent applications by the owners?</p> <p>2) Will Cllr Moll and other recipients respond to my letter of 15th February about the SINC status</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The permitted development rights (PDR) identified by the Article 4 direction are considered to present the main threat for wildlife and biodiversity at the present time. Further Article 4 directions may be applied if and where they are considered appropriate, proportionate, and necessary. 2. A response has now been sent. The recommendations in the SINC review are now being considered by the Site Selection Board

<p>at Seething Wells and will they ensure to lobby the Site Selection Board so that it is maintained?</p> <p>3) Have the council agreed a management plan with the owners of Seething Wells? If not, what steps are being taken to agree one?</p>	<p>following the process for confirming SINCs recommended by the London Wildlife Sites Board.</p> <p>3. The preparation of a management plan requires the agreement of the landowner, however they have no obligation to enter into a management plan with the Council. Officers have made numerous attempts to obtain ecology information from the landowner to ensure relevant works would not harm the site's biodiversity, they have declined the opportunity.</p>
---	--