



## Kingston Neighbourhood Development Plan

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

#### Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Task Group held on 2 March 2017.

##### 1. Present

Judy Alloway; Richard Dalley; Rae Musk; Sally Richardson.

In attendance at beginning of the meeting only: Kevin Shotter, village resident.

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

Apologies from Alan Carpenter-Smith and Flo Watts. No changes in interests were advised.

##### Pre-discussion with resident Kevin Shotter

Kevin explained that he would be happy to support NPTG in relation to his specific areas of expertise in architecture, which includes understanding of the role and process of Neighbourhood Planning, and that he would do so on a no fee basis and purely as a resident of Kingston. Kevin explained that he had no professional connection with the South Hams Council or the South Hams area. He gave a brief summary of his professional experience as an architect and endorsed the need for any development in the village to be of high quality and good design. He proposed that any development (*currently anticipated as being about 10 in total*) should be dispersed over more than one site and should not be in obviously exposed locations. Match of style of buildings should sit well with the historical buildings in the village and he agreed that any site(s) should be within the village boundary. He confirmed that he would be able to advise NPTG in relation, inter alia, to design. He endorsed the key issues previously considered by NPTG for design and building as:-

- ✓ Sustainability.
- ✓ Bio diversity.
- ✓ Drainage.
- ✓ Open space
- ✓ Construction traffic.
- ✓ Wheelchair access in some properties.
- ✓ 'Lifetime' homes – adaptable as people move through different stages of life.
- ✓ Farm style cluster building (*as at Scobbiscombe Farm*)
- ✓ Protection for owners of adjoining properties.
- ✓ Wild life and orientation of buildings. *And adding the new factor of :-*

- ✓ Domestic fuel options.

He confirmed that the NP can specify standards such as no 'overbearing' development; proper gardens etc.

Judy thanked Kevin for his attendance and said that NPTG expected to be in touch with him by e-mail in due course. Kevin then left the meeting.

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

Two minor amendments had been requested by Alan Coleman-Smith, viz:-

- a) Wrong assignment to him of an action to access the Tithe map.
- b) An unnecessary closing bracket after his name.

These were duly noted and minutes accepted thereby as a correct record.

### **4. Matters arising**

#### **4. (a) Management appraisal**

Dick Dalley provided an update on the Management Appraisal of Kingston's two Conservation Areas being undertaken by village resident, Linda Watson. Linda has developed a template (*now trialled on Vicarage Farm*) which could provide a pro forma for owners of farms and farmhouses in the village to update the history of the building(s) and land, the starting point being the Tithe map developed in the 1840s. This would help in designating areas for new build which do not compromise the structure of this unique settlement. **Agreed actions:** item in next Parish Newsletter, inviting relevant owners to become involved. **(DD)**; seek involvement/support of Kingston Local History Society. **(RM)**

#### **4.(b) Volunteers**

NPTG had asked for volunteers to become involved in its work, but to date Kevin Shotter was the only person to have committed.

#### **4.(c).Research into supported schemes for first time buyers.**

Flo Watts had undertaken considerable research into Rent to Buy and other schemes and was not able to endorse any fully. It was also clear that the Government's own view on the effectiveness of such schemes was changing.

### **5. Housing**

#### **5. (a) Kingston Housing Survey.**

The final version of the Report has now been agreed by Alex Rehaag of SHDC. The delay has been due to the pressure on SHDC to develop guidance for the use of the new Community Land funding. Following a final check by members this can now go onto the website. **Action: JA and** will then be posted on NPTG Website **Action: ASC. NPTG will not send information to specific developers. Key documents are available to the public through the website only.**

**5. (b) NPTG meeting (JA, DD, RM and FW) with Alison and Richard Sanderson re proposed development of housing on the 'Cricket Field'**

Alison and Richard had suggested amendments to the record of the meeting produced by NPTG. It was agreed these would be accepted as a report of their presentation of the proposal. Members did however express concerns over the proposal which, at this stage, does not accord with the Housing Needs Survey or the latest village sustainability assessment and whether the affordable housing would come under the Local Lettings Plan. It was noted that the NPTG now has a source of advice to challenge or endorse any advice given by developers as to building costs and profit.

**5. (c) NPTG (JA and DD) meeting with Robin and Lesley Littlewood re potential development on land owned by them. (Record of the meeting made Action: JA to circulate to NPTG members)**

Robin and Lesley have approached SHDC regarding a small development on land within the farmstead area, currently occupied by a large shed, but had not previously considered affordable housing on the site. They have considered different options on site, including building a new home for themselves on land they own further from the village and a larger development on the site of their farm itself. NPTG view is that a small development might be appropriate, expanding the farm settlement.

**5. (d) Other meetings with potential developers/landowners (In full recognition that a proposal may not accord with the NP, village wishes and the Housing Survey)**

- i. Tim Kingdom has confirmed that he and his family have decided that they do not wish to release any land for development.
- ii. Contact has been made by a couple who are from the area and wish to move back to Kingston with a view to a small development on land they own on the Ringmore side of the village. NPTG has agreed to meet with them on 8 March 2017, to hear the detail of their proposal.
- iii. Agreed that NPTG should actively engage with other owners of potential sites in the village to establish their position. **Action: JA to raise this in the next Parish Newsletter and there from to arrange meetings with interested parties (This includes owners of the 'Saturday field' when clarified)**

**6. NPTG Work plan**

**6. (a)** The draft questionnaire developed to support development of the policies underpinning the NP is based on the five key themes arising from the Village 'Drop In' day in November 2016. Considerable time was spent on review and adjustment of the draft, for clarity, relevance of the final questions set and removal of any overlap in the five sections. **Action: The drafter of each section to revise that section to reflect NPTG discussions, decisions and NP policies needed and forward to JA to collate for a final review and, possibly, a trial of the questionnaire to establish any further changes or refinements needed. (All NPTG members/JA)**

It was noted that Thurlstone NPTG had used external consultants (*known to JA*) to finalise and then analyse their questionnaire but that there was a significant cost involved, against the finite grant NPTG could draw down and there might be other more cost effective options. **Action: RM to establish whether Plymouth or Exeter University could assist in this. Agreed:** the final questionnaire might include three sets of Questions aimed at a) the householder (Part 1); b) personal questions about/for individual members of the family and c) questions for children (Both part 2). Key considerations by NPTG in respect of version 2 of the draft questionnaire were that housing type, numbers, distribution, location and aspirations for ownership should be included. **Action: draft version 2 to be considered at NPTG April meeting.** It was noted that recent decisions on the ban on development and purchase of second homes have yet to be supported by practical guidance as to how this would apply and be enforced in practice.

**6. (b) Grant application.**

**Action: JA and SR** to establish costings to inform the grant application. Judy has been in touch with a planning consultant who will send estimates.

**7. Any other business.**

None

**8. Date of next meeting**

13 April 2017, at 7 p.m.