

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF DARTMOUTH PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT

Ben Castell
Chair of the Dartmouth Park Forum

Kate Goodman
London Borough of Camden

Examination Ref: 01/DH/DNP

Via email:

21 May 2019

Dear Mr Castell and Ms Goodman

DARTMOUTH PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINATION

Following the submission of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for examination, I would like to clarify several initial procedural matters. I also have a number of preliminary questions for the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum (NF) and these are attached in the Annex to this letter.

1. Examination Documentation

I can confirm that I am satisfied that I have received a complete submission of the draft Plan and accompanying documentation, including the Basic Conditions Statement, the Consultation Statement and the Regulation 16 representations, to enable me to undertake the examination.

Subject to my detailed assessment of the draft NP, I have not identified any very significant and obvious flaws that might lead me to advise that the examination should not proceed.

2. Site Visit

I intend to undertake a site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area during the week commencing 20 May 2019. This will assist in my assessment of the draft Plan, including the issues identified in the representations.

The site visit will be undertaken unaccompanied. It is very important that I am not approached to discuss any aspects of the Plan or the Neighbourhood Area, as this may be perceived to prejudice my independence and risk compromising the fairness of the examination process.

3. Written Representations

At this stage, I consider the examination can be conducted solely by the written representations procedure, without the need for a hearing. However, I will reserve the option to convene a hearing should a matter(s) come to light where I consider that a hearing is necessary to ensure the adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case.

4. Further Clarification

I have a number of initial questions seeking further clarification, which I have set out in the Annex to this letter. I would be grateful if you can seek to provide a written response within three weeks of receipt of this letter.

5. Examination Timetable

As you will be aware, the intention is to examine the NP (including conduct of the site visit) with a view to providing a draft report (for 'fact checking') within 4-6 weeks of submission of the draft Plan. However, as I have raised a number of questions I must provide the opportunity to reply. Consequently, the examination timetable will be extended but please be assured that I will aim to mitigate any delay as far as is practicable. The IPE team will seek to keep you updated on the anticipated delivery date of the draft Report.

If you have any process questions related to the conduct of the examination, which you would like me to address, please do not hesitate to contact the office team in the first instance.

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure that a copy of this letter and any subsequent response, are placed on the websites of Camden Council and the Neighbourhood Forum.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

David Hogger

Examiner

ANNEX

From my initial reading of the submission draft Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting evidence, I have a number of questions for the NF. I have requested the submission of a response within **three weeks** of receipt of this letter.

Questions for the NF (13)

1. Could the NF explain the relationship between the statement on page 66 of the NP which confirms that there are 32 ha of accessible open space and another 9 ha of 'other open spaces' within the NP area; and the comment in the second paragraph on page 21 which concludes that there is 'comparatively little space actually open to the public'. Has Camden Council adopted any open space standards and if so are they met within Dartmouth Park? (you may like to liaise with the Council to ascertain the situation with regard to open space provision within the area)
2. In the comments on the NP from Camden Council, reference is made to proposed areas of Local Green Space(LGS) which do not meet the criteria for LGS as set out in paragraph 77 of the 2012 NPPF. The concerns relate to LGS2 Highgate Enclosures; LGS4 Mortimer Terrace Nature Reserve; LGS5 York Rise Estate; and LGS8 Haddo House. Could the NF provide a response to those comments (perhaps in liaison with the Council) because on face value they appear to be particularly relevant?
3. What is the justification for the area of 'other' open space at Lissenden Gardens, which in the Council's response is numbered as 3? This appears to be a number of private back gardens?
4. Policy ES1 provides protection for other open spaces where possible – including land at William Ellis School. I understand from Camden Council (who own the land and lease it to the Schools Trust) that there are proposals to reconfigure the buildings and make other improvements. On that basis, what is the justification for providing all of this area with additional protection?
5. Similarly, what is the justification for including the protection of the private open space at La Sainte Union Des Sacrés Coeurs School (page 127)?
6. Could the NF confirm the location of the community gardens/allotments referred to in Policy ES1(c)?
7. Could the NF explain what types of traffic calming measures (policy TS1) would be acceptable (bearing in mind that speed bumps would not supported by the NF) and also how they would be delivered?
8. Policy TS3(c) refers to the provision of electric charging points for non-residential development. It is not clear to me what provision should be made with regard to charging points in residential development. Is this an issue addressed by the Local Plan?
9. Although the NP only includes aspirations with regard to a number of housing sites (as opposed to policies), it is nevertheless important that the basis of those aspirations is clear. To that end could the NF provide the justification for:
 - The figure of 500 homes on the Murphy's Yard site as referred to on page 95 (option 1 of the Masterplan suggests 676 homes).
 - The reference to a five storey building height limit within the Protected Corridor and possibly the Peripheral Corridor, as identified in the Kentish Town NP.

10. Can the NF demonstrate that the submission version of the NP has adequately taken into account the references to the Murphy site in policy SP2 (page 42) and in the text on page 47 of the made Kentish Town NP – a site that straddles the boundary between the two NP areas?
11. The boundary of the NP is identified on Figure 1A (page 6). However, this does not precisely tally with the boundary identified on plan 3A (page 17). For example, to the north of the Neighbourhood Area in the vicinity of Raydon Street and to the south-east, close to Churchill Road. Can the NF confirm which boundary is the correct one?
12. There is a very minor discrepancy between the boundary of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan and the NP just to the west of Acland Burghley School. A small 'island' of land (which appears to be in the vicinity of the railway line) is not covered by either Neighbourhood Plan. Is this intentional?
13. The NP correctly includes a chapter on Delivery, Monitoring and Review and Appendix 5 includes a list of projects that could contribute towards the achievement of the NP's objectives. Although the table on page 105 refers to the monitoring role of the NF, it is not clear to me how that role will evolve. Has the NF given any detailed consideration as to how the momentum it has achieved will be sustained in the future?