



## Kingston Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Kingston must retain its character as a living country village!

#### Minutes of the Neighbourhood Task Group (NPTG) held on 2 February 2017 in Kingston Reading Room.

##### 1. Present.

Judy Alloway; Alan Coleman-Smith; Dick Dalley; Rae Musk; Flo Watts.

##### 2. Apologies and declarations of interest.

Apologies had been received from Sally Richardson. Alan advised that he was joint owner of a private property (*Tewkesbury*) in Kingston; that he had no membership/involvement with any developer; and that he might, in the future, be submitting planning permission for house improvement. **Action:** JA to check whether AC-S needed to complete a Declaration of Interests Form for KPC purposes.

##### 3. Minutes of previous meeting.

These were agreed as a correct record by those, who had been present at the meeting.

##### 4. Matters arising.

###### 4.1 *New members.*

Whilst the NPTG itself had sufficient members, it was recognised that a wider support base would be needed to deliver aspects of the NP. The article in the February Parish Newsletter had sought volunteers to assist.

###### 4.2 *Conservation Areas Management Appraisal update.*

Dick reported in respect of the work being undertaken by Linda Watson, advising that she had developed a standard form for each farm in the village. That for Vicarage Farm had been completed with key information, including detail from a 19C census and other available documents. She had accessed KHLS records but might need to research further. If the Vicarage Farm prototype meets needs, then it would be extended to all other farms. **Agreed:** essential that each current owner of any farm shown on a pre 1840s schedule located by Linda be contacted individually to complete the prototype. Dick had obtained a copy of the OS 1967 map, which was almost complete in showing Kingston village boundary, albeit that new streets had been developed within the village envelope since that date. **Action RM:** large scale copies to be made (*for NPTG members and NPTG document archive*) to be used in a planned 'walk around' exercise to identify all potential building plots. Map to be added to NPTG Website and copy of an original tithe map for Kingston held on the Website to be provided to Dick. **Action: A C-S.** It was possible that this might

support Linda in extending the current conservation sites. Her report to NPTG would include this proposal. **Action: LW** Judy advised that it was probable that LW would need assistance to deliver this work.

## **5. Housing**

### **5.1. Housing needs survey report.**

This had been sent to Alex Rehaag of SHDC for comment but none had been received. However, the summary version was now available and the information, had been included in the Parish Newsletter. **Action: JA** to forward final copy to all NPTG and this to be included on NPTG Website.

### **4.2 Report of meeting with A and R Sanderson.**

The meeting had taken place 26 January as arranged and was attended by JA, DD, RM and FW. A draft summary record of the meeting had been produced for agreement and signature by A and R Sanderson (*A&R hereafter*) and JA respectively. This was tabled and noted, with minor amendments agreed. **Actions:** RM to add amendments send new version to JA; **JA** to forward to A and R, requesting signature or any amendments proposed. A copy of the final, signed record would be provided to KPC. Key points identified at the meeting related to A and R's having entered the pre planning process; that they now identified the need for them to realise a profit from the development, over and above the 25 – 30% a developer would require; that they would not consider a phased development; and that they did wish to participate in a VHI, as they did not believe that it would deliver appropriate quality. They did, however, express a willingness to work with NPTG. The consensus of NPTG was that A and R's plans, as they stood, did not accord with village need, albeit there was a clear recognition that there was a need to work with a developer and that some open market properties would be part of any development and that this could fit in with village housing needs. It was noted that a new fund (£1.8m) to support VHIs in South and West Devon was greater than expected.

Flo advised that she had undertaken significant research into options for home ownership, including Rent to Buy (*using a government Website*) and had identified some 13 schemes (*some specialist – disabled, armed forces*) She had concerns about the complexity of these for local need, in terms of financial appropriateness; viability and complex legal restrictions. It was clear from this that none of those in the village seeking home ownership through a Rent to Buy (*or similar*) would meet the 80% rental criteria. Also there was the key issue that, in event of a sale on a shared ownership house, the Housing Association would always have first refusal. It was noted that South Shropshire had piloted a successful single self house build scheme. **Action:** Flo to explore and report back to next meeting. Flo advised that the Rural Services Network document "*Landowners outline rural housing 'answers'*" sets out key actions points, which urge the government to:-

1. Review the definition of 'sustainable development' with regard to rural communities and villages.

2. Ensure provision for NPPF development is properly reflected at local plan and neighbourhood plan levels.
3. Implement Local Plan Expert Group recommendations to ensure every area has an up-to-date, effective local plan.
4. Strengthen Permitted Development Rights for converting redundant agricultural buildings into much-needed rural homes.
5. Encourage landowners to build and manage their own affordable houses.

She had noted that the Housing Association proposed as a partner by A and R had received poor reviews. **Agreed:** NPTG needs to seek expert advice from someone able to meet with the Group and needs also to be clear as to all Housing Associations for potential involvement (*via National Association of HAs*); clear as to who can access non open market new housing; and clear as to any impact on Yellands. **Action:** JA to forward to all a document received from Alex Rehaag.

#### **4.3. Site investigations.**

This would be achieved by NPTG members walking around the village and creating a database of possible sites which could then be followed up with the owners. JA and DD had already met with the owners of Beech Torr Farm in respect of a possible small development. Other potential sites were already known of and it appeared that there was a greater number than had been anticipated, subject to owner agreement and their willingness to work with NPTG.

#### **4.4 SHDC policy statement on second homes.**

It was noted that the decision of SHDC on second home ownership might also have a significant impact on developments, which would be clear once the detail was clarified. The decision will apply with immediate effect but SHDC had not as yet qualified what their policy will be and how it would apply in practice. It may be that there will be more support for Parish decisions on the basis of a local vote. **Action:** JA to check with SHDC what the process, will be; when it will apply; and whether decisions for Kingston, and any associated funding, can be delegated to KPC.

### **5. Workplan.**

#### **5.1. Village Drop In day, final report.**

The draft had been drawn up and JA would finalise on receipt of any comments from NPTG then pass to RM to format. **Agreed:** the cover page would contain a photograph, which would best demonstrate the location, attributes and unique character of the village. **Action:** JA to select from those provided by BM.

#### **5.2. Website update.**

It was noted that this was very professional in appearance and thanks were extended to AC-S for his work. There had been a minor error in the related entry in the February Parish Newsletter. Whilst it was agreed that this did not need to be corrected, all future references should be correct. There had been no comments on the Website to date and only one blog had been added. On that basis, AC-S would make a new blog entry to stimulate debate and ideas on a longer term basis. Noted that NPTG can use blog on a group basis. The Website also contains a contacts page, which is part of the overall communication method. For example, it could be

used to raise the idea of a referendum on second homes in the village. **Action:** JA, via AC-S.

### **5.3 Grant application.**

JA has completed an Expression of Interest document, which is different from that on the DEFRA 'My Community' site. If a grant is given, it will be payable from March 2017. Kingston is in the top 50 of rural deprivation but no grant will be enough to cover all necessary expenditure. Noted that some villagers have approached RM about the possibility of a 'fighting fund'. **Agreed:** NPTG needs to involve a planning consultant prior to completion of the application form. Noted that Modbury had found such assistance very helpful. Agreed that selection of expert should be based on quotes rather than a formal tendering process. Noted that K Schotter had volunteered to assist and should be approached. **Action:** FW to give KS information about the site review. It was also necessary to establish the costs of printing and publication of the final NP. Noted that SHDC had not responded to an enquiry as to whether there will be a cost for the final referendum on the NP. **Action:** RW to send follow up reminder.

### **5.4. Main questionnaire.**

Other NP questionnaires (including South Huish and Ugborough) provided examples and it was agreed that Thame questionnaire and questionnaires developed for small villages, especially Devon and Cornwall, would also be helpful. **Action:** DD to access Tamar and circulate; **JA** same re small villages, via Cornwall CC if possible. Agreed that the Kingston questionnaire would not be complex or overlong; there should be no leading questions; and broad topics from the Drop In will inform the 5 key topic themes, which would then be expanded in the questionnaire. Known and potential building sites could be included and AONB, environmental and heritage issues should feature, with emphasis on which cultural and historical aspects of the Parish should be preserved. The previous Parish Plan and Development Policy should be reviewed in context of development of the questionnaire. **Agreed:** 1. First drafts to be completed for consideration at the next NPTG meeting with view to final version before the end of May 2017. Consideration to be given to an open guidance event before the questionnaire is issued; and use of fliers before issue and after to remind people to complete. Some questions will be for family/unit completion and others individual completion. Allocation of topics for development:-

**Environment and heritage** (*Beauty of the countryside we live in, sewage and drainage, dog fouling and the need to protect the unique character of the village and the integrity of the AONB*): DD.

**Housing:** (*concerns over impact of large development; lack of affordable housing for young people/families; numbers of second homes/holiday lets - would new build just provide more of these?*) JA and FW.

**Community wellbeing:** (*Valuing our caring community and the range of facilities and activities we enjoy*) RM

**Transport and movement; infrastructure** (*Parking issues; concerns over large vehicles travelling through village; poor public transport*) SR

**Enterprise and employment:** *local businesses; farming; lack of employment/job opportunities; inc communications, recycling etc*) AC-S . (RM to provide A C-S) with list of know businesses)

**6. Any other business.**

**6.1 Ringmore development**

Reference was made to an article in the Ringmore Parish Newsletter, which questioned the integrity of the proposed development in Ringmore (*Copies circulated*)

**6.2: South Shropshire approach to single build.**

Worth reviewing as this appears to provide another approach to new build; and could be included in Housing section of the questionnaire.

**6.3: New UK Government paper on housing provision.**

Expected to be issued in week commencing 6 February but detail not known.

**6.4: Pre planning**

Bigbury and St Anne's Chapel Developments now at this stage.

**6.5: CPRE meeting 10 February 2017**

JA and RM attending and will report back to NPTG and KPC. Entitled "*New Housing and The Plymouth and South West Devon Plan*

**7. Dates of next meetings (To take place at revised time of 7.00 p.m.)**

Thursday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Thursday, April 13<sup>th</sup>.

Thursday, May 11<sup>th</sup>.