



Minutes of the meeting of the Kingston NPTG held on 14 November 2016

1. Present

Judy Alloway; Richard Dalley; Carl Firminger; Rae Musk (*until 2.45*); Flo Watts.

2. Apologies for absence

None.

Declaration of Interests FW noted that her husband was now a member of Kingston Planning Forum. JA, RW, RD noted as members

3. Matters arising

3.1 Code of Conduct Dispensation Forms

RD confirmed that he had sent his Dispensation form to the Clerk

3.2 Area designation

The notice had been removed on 4 November 2016 and confirmation was awaited from SHDC.

3.3 Housing survey – progress report

The result had been good with a high percentage of responses, which reflects the level of support from the parish. The analysis from SHDC is expected on or near 18 November and it was agreed to follow Ugborough NPTG advice to check – and if necessary, discuss with SHDC – the findings and to check also the list of those on the Housing Register. **Action:** JA to remind Alex Rehaag that the crucial Housing Register information has not yet been provided. **Agreed:** NPTG to discuss results and numbers listed at its December meeting and then publicise the information throughout the Parish.

3.4. Issues to note from Ugborough visit.

This has been a very helpful session and JA would send thanks to the three members of that NPTG. Key points of note were:-

- Declaration of interests at each meeting – record no change or notified changes.
- Essential to develop a formal communications and engagement strategy (*Ugborough's strategy is a good baseline model*) **No action assigned. Carry forward to next meeting.**
- It would be necessary to widen the NPTG group and an invitation would be included in the next Newsletter. **Action:** JA.
- In terms of their Website it had not been easy to structure and, because it evolved over time, some documents had been removed or missed. On that basis the Kingston NPTG Website would need to be built with care.

3.5. Social media

Beth Lewis is being asked to support communication more widely through social media. JA had met with Alan Coleman-Smith in respect of the Website. He is willing to set up the NPTG Website but advised that anything included should have been contemporaneously recorded (*i.e. not retrospection as to what people think was done*) **Agreed:** . The cost was expected to be around £7 per month, this to be added to a line in the PC accounts. Agreed that the PC should be asked to approve at their next meeting the establishment of the Website and the creation of an associated e-mail for the account itself, this ideally to be held by the Parish Clerk for continuity but on a separate account from the KPC one already extant. **Action:** JA. Facebook was

identified as a helpful communications medium. JA advised that use of the KPF Drop Box was not easy and that someone needed authority to make changes. **Action:** Bob Musk to discuss with JA the establishment and functionality of a Drop Box specific to NPTG. 'Hits' on KEG should be recorded and assigned to each posting. *(Name and date of document/message)*

3.6. Cricket field

Following some discussion on the preliminary plans put forward by Richard Sanderson at the PC Open Forum meeting on 20th October, it was agreed to ask him to meet with the Group, to consider various issues of joint concern regarding the type and quantity of build envisaged and on ensuring full consultation with the village.

4. Workplan.

4.1. Village Meeting Saturday 26th November

Arrangements were confirmed for the use of display boards and purchase of necessary stationery. Set up time was agreed as 9 a.m. Judy noted thanks to Zoe Walters, who had agreed to help support the children's area. Posters were now up around the village and NPTG members agreed to put up more copies at strategic points. The event is also being publicised through the Parish website, Kingston Facebook Groups and by email. It was agreed that a house drop of fliers was necessary and areas were allocated. Judy noted thanks to Janet Gilbreath, Robert Beard, Nev Thomas as well as NPTG members for carrying out this task. It was agreed to meet and greet visitors and ensure the 'Visitor Profile' flip chart was completed. No names to be taken. It would be helpful to explain the purpose of the Drop in and the boards and encourage full use of post-its.

4.2. Current tasks

4.2.1. FW agreed to investigate funding for Neighbourhood Plans and has the appropriate web links to take this forward.

4.2.2. CF agreed to develop a list of businesses in the village as a starting point to a formal consultation of this sector.

5. Village sustainability criteria.

NPTG reviewed the documents and thanks offered to Bob Musk for providing more accessible versions. It was agreed the score should be challenged as it assumed a higher level of sustainability than Kingston actually had, which was very unhelpful. The final score would define the number of new houses which could be built in the village. It was noted that more houses than the rating allowed could be built but the rating could be used inappropriately to support inappropriate development. Key points related **a)** distance of village from nearest A road. Sustainability includes access to work which is very limited where the individual does not have access to own transport (*hazards and demands of walking 3.1 miles to the bus stop on a narrow single track and unlit road, heavily trafficked at peak times and without a pavement*) **b)** general challenge as to the relevance and viability of bus/similar services (*and related score assigned*). It was felt that a number of the listed sustainability criteria should not just be given a full score but should be considered in terms of the degree of amenity present. This has been done for 'commercial bus operator' for Kingston, but not for other equally low level amenities e.g. Ring and ride/community transport and cycle paths/PROWs (*Kingston has no cycle paths*) with potential for reduction of overall score by **at least** 2.5 points. The Group and the PC have been asked to respond to SHDC, but it was confirmed that individuals may also respond as well, with potential for reduction of overall score by 3 points, as set out

below. **Agreed:** NPTG would submit a response. **Action;** JA. Also KPC. **Action:** FW.

6. AoB

The High Court judgement confirming the legitimacy of a policy in the completed St Ives Neighbourhood Plan to allow new build only for principal homes, not second homes, was raised. The case was brought against Cornwall County Council by architects involved in design and development in the St Ives area, which has a high number of second homes. It was considered that a question relating to such a policy could be included in our main questionnaire if sufficient evidence of resident's views came forward. It was not yet known if other NPs in the South Hams would take this idea forward. JA confirmed she would circulate the full judgement. **Action:** JA

7. Dates of NPTG Meetings

2.00 p.m. Monday 5th December 2016.

7.30 p.m. Thursday 12th January 2016.

7.30.p.m. Thursday 2nd February 2016.