



Kingston must retain its character as a Living country village

Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Task Group (NPTG) held on 15 January 2018 in Kingston Reading Room

1. Present; apologies and declarations of interest.

Present: Judy Alloway; Alan Coleman-Smith; Dick Dalley; Sally Richardson; Rae Wallin; Flo Watts. There were no new declarations of interest. Confirmation had been received from Kingston Parish Clerk that it was fully in line with the PC Code of Conduct that members of KPC and NPTG were able to submit responses to Planning Applications in their own right as individual residents. The Parish Clerk had also confirmed that SHDC had agreed an extension to 31 January 2018 for responses to the three planning applications listed.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

Flo explained that she was concerned that the minutes of the December meeting were not complete as written comments made by her in advance of that meeting (*which she was unable to attend*) had not been included per se; and that the minutes had thereby not adequately represented her concerns, which related to robustness of the external Site Assessments in that they were not sufficient enough to allow NPTG to make site allocations and that further advice was, therefore, needed from agencies such as SHDC NP team; Natural England; and the Highways Agency. Judy explained that Flo's e mail had been reviewed and fully discussed by those present at the December meeting but that the purpose of the minutes of NPTG meetings was primarily to reflect outcomes of complex discussions and agreed actions. In addition, NPTG (*as a working group*) did not have a correspondence section in its agenda as required of the KPC. NPTG had already determined the need to seek advice as proposed by Flo, given that the Sites Assessment was just one aspect of the NP development process, albeit undertaken by a very experienced and well regarded professional adviser. Dick commented that the adviser and his conclusions were completely independent and that, in fact, the allocation of sites was not an NPTG decision but to be determined through the agreement of the final NP, following extensive consultation. Flo accepted these explanations and those, who had been present at the meeting, therefore agreed the minutes as a correct record.

3. Matters arising

3.1 'Significance of Place' meeting

A list of attendees at this session had not been provided but the key organisations presenting were recorded. It was important that NPTG identified these agencies so that they could be added to its NP consultation list. **Action, Dick.**

3.2 Glimpsed views

Contact to seek contributions/views on this had not yet been made with relevant Kingston groups as agreed in the December minutes. Agreed that this should now proceed. **Action: Judy**

3.3 Prospect Cottage Planning proposal.

Merv Freeman had raised concerns about drainage for this development and these had been forwarded to the developer and his architect for comment. Their response by e-mail was: -

a) *From Jon Hardy:-*

".... just because there are houses they will not increase the amount of rainwater that falls on that space, but obviously it will affect how that water behaves. I must also add that it makes me far more interested in having a bio digester in order to minimise, or eliminate the impact on the existing sewage system. I am going to contact South West Water to try to find out where the mains sewers run, in the locality of our site, so I we can then come to a firmer conclusion about what may or may not be possible."

b) *From Andy Coughlin architect*

"For storm water we would have a buffer tank underground for slow release, which is normal practice. And at the meeting I said the road would be block paved or something permeable, which uses the ground mass to slowly release rainwater, and probably be better than the surface water run off you have now. The foul goes into the mains, or as suggested at the meeting a Klargestor Biodisc unit, which is a small treatment plant and as such slowly releases the 95% pure water into the watercourse. Best to tell them soon, I have already taken that on board as we have to make a substantiated statement to that effect with the planning application these days."

4. Grant Tracking and new application

The first grant tranche record had been submitted, including the return by KPC of £1211.43 as this sum remained unspent/invoiced at 31 12 2017. However, Judy had received confirmation that this sum could be carried forward as long as kept within the *overall* grant total available of £9,000. She had submitted a new application for £4,397.00 for the period to 31 3 18.

5. NP Questionnaire

5.1 The questionnaire report was now on the Website. It was agreed that the report of the Children's questionnaire should be added to the Website, after any surnames included on pictures had been removed. **Action: Alan.**

5.2 Comments section

The record of all the '*text responses*' related to the Questionnaire questions themselves had been collated in an Excel spreadsheet. All returned

questionnaires had been included, with the questionnaire number shown (in red where there had been no free response(s) made.) Red typeface had also been used to convey (*logically*) presumed word(s) where a response was not fully legible; and one aspect of blue typeface reflected an apparent contradiction in the respondent's answer. Overall, the recorded information would provide significant information for the formulation of draft policies for later consultation as part of the NP. Judy thanked Rae for what had been hours of work recording the full text in context with the questions. **Agreed:** That the related question should be added to the header for each of the columns. **Action: Alan.**

5.3 Further analysis/action

Agreed: a detailed review by NPTG and further discussion were needed, including determination of how the information would be used to underpin evidence to formulate NP policies. It was agreed that the needs of those with sight problems or other impairment might need a special copy of the NP Questionnaire and the subsequent Draft NP in different formats and that it was necessary to provide wording to cover all eventualities in accordance with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 which incorporated the 1995 *Disability Discrimination Act*. **Actions:** 1. to research and report back **Sally**; 2. to alert KPC that a cost might be involved (*part of the grant provision*) **Flo**. In terms of the NP overall Vision Statement, this was confirmed as being use of Lonesome Pine logo and 'strap line' (*Living country village etc*) as prefaces all NPTG minutes. (*See above*) The process for development of the plan sections would be based on Vision; Themes (*arising from the November 2026 Drop In event*) Objectives and Policies. It was agreed that members would each take a theme and work on that section of the questionnaire to identify issues for further discussion. Allocation of themes group leads agreed as follows:-

Traffic, parking and Transport – **Sally**.

Environment and Heritage (linking in issues from the AONB Management Plan) – **Dick**

Housing and infrastructure – **Judy and Flo** (linking in Site Assessment Report)

Community amenities – **Rae**

Enterprise and employment – **Alan**.

5.4 Next steps

Only one person had responded to the invitation to join subgroups to formulate first drafts of NP Policies, but it was anticipated that others would come forward once they had sight of the Character Assessments and further information on the website. Jim Dewar had volunteered his expertise in development of relational data bases to allow references to all data, for research of combinations of data/linkages/views (*e.g. age range(s) in relation to traffic concerns*) **Agreed:** this offer should be followed up. **Action: Judy** to forward to Jim the database completed by Rae. Richard and Alan to meet with Jim to discuss his ideas and suggested applications

for the development and use of a relational database, in the context of NPTG/NP needs.

5.5 Ease of access to NP questionnaire analysis report

Flo raised concerns about the practicality of scrolling through the reports and histograms in the report (*example Q11*) but this had not otherwise been raised as an issue. All **agreed** that residents should have access to all the information provided by the questionnaire.

6. Housing

6.1 Site Assessments Report

e-mails received) (M Freeman and K Schotter).

Lee Bray had responded in respect of the former and this had been forwarded to Merv. In respect of the latter, Judy made clear that this was part of the starting point for a process, which would include wide consultation. Comments on the Report would extend the evidence base. It was agreed that the Sites Assessment should be assessed by external agencies involved in/as statutory consultees for planning so that they could add any additional guidance. The Site Assessment at this stage was the first major piece of evidence to inform development policies. The approach would be to agree the final NP criteria which any proposed site should meet together with relevant planning policy. It was noted that the Site Assessment Report (*now on the Website*) was part of the NP evidence base but not a policy in its own right. **Agreed:** Devon CC Highways; Historic England; AONB; Campaign for Rural England (*CPRE*); and Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (*RSPB*). **Action:** Judy in liaison with Dick. Flo to contact Natural England

Key points raised by Kevin included:-

- i. lack of clarity around affordable/rental properties.
- ii. Additional information not related to the Sites Assessment, which would need further discussion by NPTG.

NPTG thanks to Kevin were formally recorded.

6.2 SSHDC Community Housing Initiative (CHI)

Noted that Rob Ellis had been appointed to lead SHDC Community Housing Strategy which is intended to support the development of high quality homes that are accessible to those with local connections for whom the cost of market housing is beyond their reach. It was noted that :

“SHDC involvement in projects can be on different levels:

1. *Low input support to existing and emerging local housing projects where “hands on” community groups wish to progress housing schemes with limited direct involvement by South Hams. In these cases South Hams can allocate sums of CHF grant funding at distinct phases of a project, on a case by case basis, provided the expenditure and project meets community housing criteria.*
2. *South Hams to act as a development facilitator, directly managing and funding the development process in close collaboration with a community, to the point of a deliverable scheme.*

3. *South Hams to facilitate project construction*".

Agreed: that Rob should be invited to an extraordinary meeting with NPTG to explain the CHS in detail. Also, that the Jon and Rachel Hardy should be invited to attend as CHI was one of the options they were considering. **Action: Judy** to set up meeting.

7. Drafting the Plan – next steps.

Mostly covered earlier in agenda but Agreed:

7.1 Character Assessments to be issued for consultation to local residents in the first instance. **Action: Dick.** Proposed recipients: Thelma Rumsey; Wilf Walters, Scobbiscombe Farm; John and Kit Connor; John Wurr; Jennie Stanley - KLHS; Annie White. Jennie Ebsworth. Contact to be made individually; through KEG Facebook, Plan Website and in Parish Newsletter.

Action Judy and Alan

7.2 A further meeting should be arranged with Lee Bray to review what information NPTG holds to inform NP development, including his helpful outline guidance (*previously circulated*) and advice as to what NPTG should now move forward (*for example, Basic Conditions Statement*) Flo confirmed that she would be happy for NPTG to continue to work with Lee, as long as all members felt able to question and challenge his advice. **Action: Judy** to confirm date.

8. Any other business.

- a. Tom Jones, CoP Lead Place Making (SHDC Lead on JLP) had circulated information about the new '*Government Planning Delivery Fund*', inviting NPTGs to participate as this would release funds and extra staff to support the NP process. Only Sally from KPC had responded but Judy had sent an '*agree in principle*' message after e-mail consultation with NPTG. To date, 9 NPTGs had responded positively. **Action: Judy** to update NPTG on progress and involvement process.
- b. Proposed that NPTG might wish to set up a Facebook account as used for communication by Dittisham. After consideration, it was **agreed** that KEG Facebook (*and other Kingston/NPTG communications*) fulfilled this process and that a new account was not needed.

9. Date of next meeting

Thursday 22 February, 2.00 p.m. Reading Room.