



## Minutes of the meeting of the Kingston NPTG held on 5 December 2016.

### Kingston must retain its character as a Living County Village!

#### **1. Present**

Judy Alloway; Richard Dalley; Rae Musk; Flo Watts.

#### **2. Apologies for absence**

Carl Firminger.

#### **3. Declarations of interest.**

Judy, Richard, Rae and Flo advised that there were no changes.

#### **4. Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising**

Both deferred until after Alex's contribution. (See 6 and 7 below)

#### **5. Attendance by Alex Rehaag, SHDC.**

NPTG welcomed Alex, who was attending this part of the meeting to discuss the preliminary Kingston housing survey results and Village Housing Initiatives (VHIs)

Judy explained that, whilst the high percentage of survey responses of close to 70% was exceptional, this figure could increase once a list of all properties in the Parish had been completed, with holiday homes excluded (*second homes remaining on the list*) **Action:** final percentage to be determined and NPTG can quote this for its own activities. Alex expressed the view that the high level of response was due to the personal delivery and collection of the surveys. The survey format had been that provided by SHDC and the NPTG had not chosen to customise it in any way. Alex explained that her summary report was still in draft but it made clear that there was no significant unmet need for housing for young people, primarily due to the Local Lettings Plan, which had developed out of the previous survey in 2007 which indicated the need for a small development only. **Action:** Judy to provide Alex with a track changed version of the survey report to include comments/questions already submitted by her and new ones arising out of the meeting. It was also noted that further figures were needed. Alex advised that VPL had asked her for a copy of the survey outcome and she had made clear that it was the property of the NPTG to use as it saw fit and that it was not required to send the whole or a summary to any organisation. **Noted:** VPL itself had failed to undertake its own survey in accordance with the assurance (*in its timetable*) to the village that it would do so in autumn 2016. It was agreed that, once complete, a brief summary of the results would be produced for the Parish Newsletter and the new NPTG Website. In terms of numbers on the Housing Register, Alex agreed to check eligibility, including connection to the village, and advise any changes to confirm formally recognised housing needs. It was possible that some were already housed in village rented properties and saw this as an opportunity to 'upgrade'. Alex agreed also to confirm the relative numbers of owned and rented houses in Yellands. Alex provided copies of the SHDC Village

Housing Initiative (VHI) Guidance, explaining that there might be some minor changes arising from the new Joint Local Plan. A VHI could be based on a small development to meet local needs for Kingston. Alex was unaware of any VHI proposal for Kingston but would not necessarily know this. Self build was unlikely to be a viable solution to identified need. Key issues for the NP were AONB, SSI, and heritage including the Rural and Coastal Fund. SHDC Community Land Trust Officer is happy to speak to Kingston, Bigbury and other NP groups. **Action:** accepted and Alex will advise details. **Noted:** Flo providing a briefing on the survey for KPC.

## **6. Minutes of last meeting.**

Confirmed as a correct record.

## **7. Matters arising**

### 7.1 Area designation.

Formal confirmation of approval still outstanding.

### 7.2 Village sustainability.

The proposed Kingston score amendments by KPF had been submitted and those from NPTG and KFC would be submitted by Judy and Flo respectively by the close date.

### 7.3 Briefing on Thame NP

The briefing documents from Richard and Sally Richardson had been circulated in advance of the meeting and the following points were identified as relevant to Kingston NP:-

- a. Prior to the referendum vote, Thame organised a big marketing event, using an independent group (like KPF) and involving their MP and MEP (*there is a U tube video on their Website*)
- b. Transparency and communications.
- c. Policy development.
- d. Pitfalls include failing to monitor and deliver what needs to be done **after** the Plan is adopted.
- e. There are no provisions for costs to be awarded following injunctions and appeals; and wealthy developers use expensive barristers
- f. The statutory question which must be used caused some difficulty because of its wording but there is no option but to use it.
- g. The wording of policies to be included in the NP is crucial to avoid challenge. Notwithstanding, successful NPs provide useful models.
- h. Thame developed top level themes and a compelling Vision for their neighbourhood.

**Noted** that SHDC would run the Kingston referendum through its Returning Officer but that there may be a cost. **Action: Rae to establish the cost to the Parish, if any.**

### 7.6 NPTG Website set up

This is now in place and will be added to as the Plan develops. It will include, inter alia, photographs provided by Bob Musk and NPTG reports, evidence lists etc. Very many thanks to Alan Coleman-Smith for taking this on.

### 7.5. "Cricket Field" update

NPTG to meet with Richard and Alison Sanderson on 26 January 2016. **Action:** related information to be circulated by Judy, under the caveat that it is confidential to NPTG. Richard has advised that he would have to reduce the standard of building if the proposed development is provided under a VHI.

### 8. NPTG Workplan

8.1. The model adopted by NPTG is working well and is kept up to date by Judy.

8.2 The village **Drop In** event on 26 November 2016 was generally well attended although there was limited representation of children and young people and families. Zoe Walters had not been able to manage a children's event as she was unavailable but she has arranged a session on 19 December with the village's 5-10 year olds and will capture their responses to the 6 questions in words and pictures. Flo is working with a young person to obtain views from older children and young people. These will be added to the responses and demographic data obtained at the event. Additional responses have been received from others not available on the day and these will be incorporated into the final list of comments. It was noted that there was a strong element of commonality in responses, which supports the development of clear themes for NP development. The strongest issues related to:-

- i. There being no need for new houses above any factually identified need.
- ii. A housing estate would not be acceptable to the village.
- iii. A small development would be appropriate based on need and proportionate to the current size of the village.

NPTG identified the key strands from parishioner responses as being:-

- a. Character of the village, including a supportive and active community.
- b. Negative impact of a large development on the village.
- c. Impact of a large development on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in which Kingston is sited.
- c. Lack of public transport.
- d. Sewerage and drainage systems.
- e. Increase in already difficult traffic and parking problems.

For the NP, key themes were agreed as:-

- a. Housing.
- b. Transport and movement (*including farm vehicles and public transport*)
- c. Heritage.
- d. Environment (AONB); Infrastructure and practical safety and other aspects for concern from dog fouling to sewage and flooding.
- e. Community wellbeing.
- f. Enterprise and employment.

**Noted:** Linda Watson expected to be able to provide the drafts of Area Management Plans for Kingston prior to Christmas.

Some of the two sets of themes above might fall outside the remit of the NP and would, therefore, be assigned to other groups to consider the issues and possible solutions.

**Agreed action: Judy** to provide a short summary of the Drop In outcomes in the next Parish Newsletter.

NPTG agreed that its Strap Line should be:-

**Kingston must retain its character as a Living Country Village in an AONB.**

## 8.2 Grant applications

**Noted** that there are two levels of NP grant support, which could cover such issues as:-

- ✓ Site development.
- ✓ Project planning.
- ✓ Development of evidence base.
- ✓ Development and analysis of housing surveys.
- ✓ Legal specialist fees.
- ✓ Legal modification of the final NP.
- ✓ Facilitation of Community events.
- ✓ Technical advice on housing.
- ✓ Heritage issues.
- ✓ Site options and overall 'health check'

**Action:** Judy to develop first draft of funding application taking account of the above as they apply.

## 9. Any other business

### 10. Dates of future meetings

12 January 2017 at 7.30 p.m.

2 February 2017 at 7.30 p.m.