

7.3.1 Policy G1 – Open Spaces

The value of Ham and Petersham’s green spaces will be conserved and enhanced by their protection from development and its adverse impacts and through site specific management plans.

- 7.3.2 This policy applies to open spaces at Ham Common, Ham Common Woods, Ham Village Green, the Avenues, Petersham Common, Petersham Copse, Petersham Lodge Woods, Petersham Meadows and the River Thames corridor. These large, publicly owned open/green spaces are considered fundamental to the character and setting of Ham and Petersham, *and development close to them should not be permitted to adversely affect them*. Their conservation and improvement in accordance with the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be facilitated through the preparation and regular review and implementation of management plans with local community involvement.

Additional 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?

HPNF Response

Thank you for identifying the need for clarification in the policy application text in 7.3.2. Perhaps it would help by explaining the evolution of the policy which was originally primarily directed towards ensuring ongoing review and implementation of management plans for the large public open spaces in Ham and Petersham. While this would not in itself really qualify as a development management policy, it would have a function of protecting from potential development by conserving and enhancing the open spaces, making them less likely to attract potential development interest than neglected land.

The King George V and Riverside Playing Fields were not included in the list of open spaces to which the policy applied because they are mown grassland with limited nature conservation interest requiring management plans. However, our response to your previous question suggested that they could be added to the list with a view to management plans to make the best of the natural potential around their fringes.

The private open spaces were not included in the list because it was considered unreasonable to require them to have management plans with community involvement.

In order to clarify the intention of the policy, it is suggested that the text of para 7.3.2 is amended to “~~The policy applies to open spaces at~~ green space management plans should cover Ham Common, ...

While the open spaces are already protected from development upon them, the policy seeks to maintain and enhance their value by protecting them from the adverse impacts of development which may impinge upon them and by, as the text explains, active and evolving management with continuing community involvement. It is because the open spaces are so important in the character of Ham and Petersham that, although there may be some element of policy overlap, the Plan would seem fundamentally lacking without a policy for them.

Perhaps an additional explanatory clause could be added to the text in the second sentence as follows: - *These large publicly owned open/green spaces are considered fundamental to the character and setting of Ham and Petersham, and development close to them should not be permitted to adversely affect them.*