



Kingston must retain its character as a Living country village

Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Task Group (NPTG) held on 6 December 2017 in Kingston Reading Room

1. Present; apologies and declarations of interest.

Present: Judy Alloway; Alan Coleman-Smith; Dick Dalley; Sally Richardson; Rae Wallin. Advance apologies had been received from Flo Watts. There were no new declarations of interest.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

These were agreed as a correct record.

3. Matters arising

Dick and Alan reported back on the “*Significance of Place: Understanding the heritage of Devon’s villages*” workshop, held on 20 November 2017. They considered it to have been a good workshop, involving the right people to advise on putting together Landscape Assessments for a Neighbourhood Plan (*NP hereafter*). There had been representation, from, inter alia, AONB; Devon County Council County Archaeologists; National Archive; Mandy Goddard, SHDC Specialist in Place Making; and Historic England, allowing access to useful information. It was agreed that these contacts should be added to the circulation list of NPTG consultees. **Actions: Dick and Alan to provide Judy with a copy of the Workshop attendance list. Judy to add as appropriate to NPTG list.** Key messages included need for a Landscape Assessment to be proportionate rather than a ‘*massive document*.’ Salcombe advised that they had included sketches by their local art group of views which people liked as representative of their NP area and Dick had since mentioned this to Andrew Kinder as a possibility for Kingston. Heartlands also shared a good idea, where they had balanced full pictures of views with ‘*glimpsed*’ views. It was considered that the ‘*glimpsed*’ view of Eddystone Light as one approaches Kingston would be appropriate for NPTG use; also, that an approach should be made to KLHS and the Art, Gardening and the Craft Groups. **Action: Judy.** A key point made at the Workshop is that there should be a good evidence base for any policy developed for the NP.

4. Grant tracking and new application.

Alan confirmed that there had been no new receipts or expenditure since his report to the November meeting. Invoices for the current grant were required to be submitted by 31 December 2017. The next application, to be submitted by 15 December 2017, would be for a three-month period only to coincide with the end of the public sector fiscal year but the third application would be for a period of 6 months. **Actions: Judy.**

5. Prospect Cottage site presentation

Attendance by John and Rachel Hardy and Andy Coughlin (their architect). Andy tabled copies of initial drawings (*ground and first floor*) for the proposed 2 house development (*each with 3 bedrooms, garage and two additional parking spaces*), demonstrating that the site was adequate for two houses of that size. He provided information about proposed building materials; design features to align with the site and nearby buildings; (*including the Reading Room*); orientation of the buildings so that the visual aspect was aligned mostly to Prospect Cottage; retention of the existing hedge and trees on/adjoining the site; incorporation of 'eco' materials, one of which was a new form of 'solar panels' discretely beneath the roof tiles; and provision of a small treatment plant for sewage disposal. At this stage, he had not committed to involvement of the Community Housing Fund. He stressed that the land for building was provided at a lower rate than would usually apply and there could be binding agreements about allocation of the houses to existing villagers. The proposal was also flexible in terms of 'self-build' once the infrastructure had been completed; and/or a smaller initial house with potential to extend in the future, which would reduce the initial purchase cost. Andy advised that potential cost of the houses to buyers would be c. £190,000 or c. £100,000 if they were built as smaller, genuinely affordable properties. He recommended that the NP contains agreed terms for future sale/disposal of the properties.

For the Hardys, the next step would be to seek Parish support for the plans; to have a copy of the Site Assessment when available; to be advised of any advice/comments from NP; and then to submit a planning application. Judy thanked them for their presentation. **Actions: Judy** to discuss with Mandy Goddard, SHDC, to clarify the Community Housing issues on the basis of data available. **Sally** to obtain further information on the current *Right to Buy* system.

6. Questionnaire

6.1 Monitoring checks report

This had been carried out independently by a member of Bigbury Neighbourhood Planning Group, and indicated that the error rate in the sample process was less than 0.5%, which was well within the acceptable range. **Agreed** to accept the report and that a brief resume should be provided within the process report which will go on the website with the questionnaire results. **Action:** Rae and Judy

6.2 Questionnaire process reports

There had been no amendments suggested for the report on the *Very Special Questionnaire for 4 to 11 years/primary school* (subject to inclusion of an additional sheet with a bar chart representation of the Smiley Face question) It was agreed that this report should be included with the posting of the main questionnaire. **Action: Rae** to circulate to group when completed with scanned copies of the drawings submitted.

The main process report will be completed when the questionnaire report is confirmed.

6.3 Publishing the data

As Dave Watts had requested, Alan advised that he had checked the formulae used in the questionnaire spreadsheet to ensure that all the data had been included and was correct. There were some inevitable errors in that some of the data had not been included before some percentage calculations had been made. **Action: Alan** to make corrections to the original analysis and to provide copy and typed versions of his handwritten notes to Rae for the evidence file; also, to correct the spreadsheet in discussion with Dave.

Agreed: That there should be an introduction section; that the full question asked should be included as a header to the related analysis, together with an explanatory note, where needed; that tables will be included per question showing the number of people who ticked each answer, to provide greater clarity. Bar charts will also be shown using percentages as is normal in this type of research report. **Action: Alan** to prepare the tables and liaise with Bob Musk re bar charts. **Action Judy** to provide the narrative aspects for inclusion. Sally expressed concerns about the colouring used, as red was seen by many people as indicating a positive outcome; and also advised that some people suffer from red/green colour blindness. **Action: Judy** to seek advice on this. **Agreed:** the final version should be headed with advice as to how people with a visual/other impairment can obtain a copy of the report appropriate to their needs **Action: Sally** to provide form of words. **Alan:** to liaise with Bob over changes over bar charts. **Agreed:** the final report only (*and not the spreadsheets*) to be posted on the Website, as individual households can be identified from the latter.

7. Housing

7.1 Site Assessments

Judy recorded thanks to Bob Musk for his work on the linkage of site maps into the final version of the sites assessment document. It was noted that some of the pictures supplied by Alan were only partially attributed to Google Maps and needed to be finalised. **Action:** Bob to be asked to complete the attribution for all pictures and then to send the revised document to Alan. On review of the Site Assessment Report, it was unanimously agreed that the approach and report by the expert specialist had been professional and impartial, providing considerable assistance for the formulation of NP policies. Also, that a) his advice and conclusions were based wholly on planning requirements; b) that he had listened very carefully to NPTG comments on the sites; and c) that he

had refused to accept some comments where they did not accord with planning policy and requirements. Once the google attribution in the sites assessment had been completed, then the document would be e-mailed to KPC, to review and comment before the document was posted on the Website and copied to SHDC.

8. Drafting the Plan – next steps

NPTG reviewed the outline plan format drafted by Lee Bray and acknowledged its relevance and quality, whilst recognising that it may be necessary to revisit and refine the vision section, which informs NP objectives. **Agreed:** that NPTG should set up sub working groups, each to consider and explore one of the 6 local objectives (*policy areas*), given the size of the task of developing the NP and the wish to ensure wider Parish involvement in the process. **Action:** NPTG members to suggest names of those, who might be willing to contribute to this process and which policy area they might best be allocated to. This will be publicised in the January Newsletter (**Action: Judy**) and each group will work to a tight time scale of 3-4 weeks from date of start. **Agreed:** A request will be made to the Art and Craft Clubs asking them to submit ideas for a cover for the NP. **Yet to confirm** whether the final version to be selected by NPTG or through a voting system on the Website.

9. Any other business

Judy had received a call from Staverton NP group asking for a verbal reference for Lee Bray. She had given a very positive personal view.

Dates of next meetings

Monday 15 January, Reading Room Basement

Wednesday 21 February in the Reading Room