



## Kingston must retain its character as a Living country village

### Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Task Group (NPTG) held on 22 February 2018 in Kingston Reading Room

#### 1. Present; apologies and declarations of interest.

Present: Judy Alloway; Alan Coleman-Smith; Dick Dalley; Rae Musk; Flo Watts.  
In attendance: Lee Bray, independent planning consultant. Apologies for absence: Sally Richardson. There were no changes to declarations of interest.

#### 2. Minutes of previous meeting

These were agreed as a correct record.

#### 3. Matters arising

##### 3.1 NP Consultation List

In preparation.

##### 3.2 Glimpsed Views

No responses to Newsletter and Facebook invitations to date.

##### 3.3 Grant

Grant of £4397.00 received.

##### 3.4 Very Special Questionnaire Report.

Now on the Website, including pictures with respondent names removed.

##### 3.5 Comments list

Alan had added to the schedule the full questions and circulated it to NPTG members. **Agreed:** That this should not be published pending outcome of work by Jim Dewar on the relational database (*which had identified to date some duplication and some contradictions*), at which point the decision on any mode of publication would be made. **Action: Alan/Judy.**

##### 3.6 Accessibility Statement

Sally had confirmed that a statement or policy is not required.

##### 3.7 SHDC Community Housing Initiative

The meeting with Rob Ellis was to take place on Wednesday 28 February at 4.00 p.m. Noted that Site 4 (*Hardy*) had been submitted for planning. Flo had circulated relevant information from Heritage England.

##### 3.8 Character assessments

Responses were still coming in.

#### 4. Drafting the Neighbourhood Plan

Lee was asked to lead this key aspect of the meeting and throughout this Agenda item contributed advice and commentary on process. Judy explained that since the last meeting, members of NPTG had undertaken individually some work on the key themes of Housing; Environment and Heritage; Transport (*including traffic and parking*); Employment; and Community Amenities. These aligned with the information received in the 2016 village 'Drop In' session and most importantly the responses to the NP questionnaire. Lee confirmed that this was satisfactory progress, which would help to substantiate the draft plan he had circulated, with the questionnaire providing the most important underpinning evidence. Key steps now for NPTG were:-

- i. Use the questionnaire results to determine the priority issues and objectives.
- ii. Review and filter other relevant evidence.
- iii. Draw on the Sites Assessments, taking account of subsequent responses and comments Here Lee noted that he had drafted a response for NPTG to VPL's comments on the site assessment for information, to be circulated. That had been assessed on the basis that an initial development could be followed by further development, as is common practice. With reference to VPL's assertion that they would gift the higher part of the site to KPC, he said that future use would depend upon the nature of gifting but that the *'in principal'* view of further development would remain a possibility. Lee acknowledged that there is inevitably some subjectivity in any site assessment (*a key document to inform the NP*) but that NPTG could amend the assessment as the process moves forward, particularly in respect of responses to the draft Plan. The site assessment is key evidence to inform development, but **not** the decision in itself. In addition, VPL (*and other developers*) can propose changes to their original proposals. Thus, site assessments are not fixed and may grow and change but should be used to inform decisions.
- iv. Focus on the Draft NP as a priority. In terms of process, consultation takes place at Regulation 14 stage, with NPTG submitting the draft NP to KPC and then to publishing the draft on KPC's behalf. At that point it goes to SHDC
- v. NP planning policies need to be workable in practice but kept as simple and succinct as possible. Where local detail is considered to be important in supporting policies, then this is best included in documents supporting the Plan (*cross referred to the relevant policy*) Judy and Flo noted that South Milton draft NP might be a good model for Kingston, particularly in respect of its accessibility.
- vi. Focus on the longer term need for the NP to work for Kingston; builders; investors, planners and planning committee when finally incorporated into the JLP.
- vii. The policies are likely to have a degree of generality and some replication of the Local Development Plan, but the emphasis should be

on Kingston (*cross referred to the Development Plan where appropriate*)  
Bullet list statements can be included as appendices to policies to identify things specific to the village (*ancient well, Vicarage Steps, unlisted buildings of significance, the latter cross-referred to the Listed Building regulations*). Green spaces should be identified and, dependent upon the outcome of the character assessment, any recommended extension of the Conservation Areas. 'Dark Skies' (*with a policy which prevents any street lighting in the Plan area*) can be included as this aspect is not included in the Joint Local Plan

- viii. NPTG should now develop its first draft of the Plan, using the work already provided by Lee and forward it to him for comment. The stages then are:
- a) When reasonably confident that the draft is ready for submission, NPTG to publish for Kingston residents to comment, then amend where necessary.
  - b) Draft then to SHDC for 6-week consultation.
  - c) Examination which will include any consultation responses. **Note:** NPTG to attach a summary of consultation responses (*Related policy and paragraph; and who said what.*)
  - d) If any plan changes are significant, then a new 6-week consultation will be necessary.
  - e) Consultation on any very contentious issues could be undertaken but this needs to be balanced against the sense that the village wants to see the process moving forward, albeit there has been a regular stream of information to parishioners on timescales, achievements and actions through the process to date.
  - f) Referendum.

Overall, the process could take well over 6 months (*taking account of current staffing shortages within, and pressures on, SHDC planners*) and, on that basis, NPTG needs to commence development of the draft. Lee will remain available to advise and there should be early engagement with SHDC graphics department for mapping and desktop publication, unless NPTG believes that it has the capacity and expertise to develop a quality document itself. **Action: Rae/Judy** to liaise with Jason Elson re costs and timescales. Judy has already received costs from Jason for the grant application. When the Look at what Lee gave us early on to pad this next out. When Regulation 14 draft has been finalised by NPTG, it needs as supporting evidence a basic conditions statement; consultation statement/process; monitoring and sustainability statement. Lee can provide the two first but it is better for the community (NPTG) to produce the first draft of the last, using templates which Lee will provide and with subsequent review and editing by Lee. NPTG should use its Website to lodge all relevant information and documents (*Street, Somerset Website a good model*), the NP being the key document. Lee advised that some communities have produced a summary leaflet of the NP and then delivered to each household, which has proved very effective. **Agreed action: NPTG** to create a summary of the NP, cross referred to the Website; to display in this community buildings and locations and distribute

throughout the Parish. **Action: Judy** to ask SHDC whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), NPTG (*Lee recommended that £2,500 should be put aside for this*). NPTG needs to prepare a statement of consultation, which Lee will edit into final format. In terms of development of the draft main NP:-

1. NPTG creates reports based on its already identified themes. **ACTION ALL**
2. Lee will build these into a new draft.
3. A decision is made on the settlement boundary to align with the Plan, unless it is decided the proposed JLP boundary will stand.
4. NPTG prepares a schedule of development sites, setting out which are supported, together with any limitations on each development site.
5. NPTG determines the final adoption of any new green spaces.
6. NPTG creates a list of undesignated heritage assets.
7. NPTG to prepare the foreword to the draft NP; Lee to edit into final format.
8. In terms of local objectives (*for sustainability*) NPTG should build on the broad JLP broad sustainability objectives, as there is scope for each NP policy to align with them. If policies are too specific they are difficult to use to assess the plan policies so broad policies are the ideal approach. Objectives should be determined by NP themes and issues. *Noted* that planning requirements relate to new developments only so NPTG is advised to include specific constraints/requirements (*e.g. set parking space(s) for each new building*) so they will then become part of the new NP development regulations. **Action: NPTG** to consider the merits/drawbacks of decisions on speed control and general parking in the village. **Action: NPTG** to provide Lee with locally specific detail of its NP policies, together with local solutions.

Lee clarified some process points as follows: -

- i. That it was not necessary to reproduce related policies of other agencies, rather to list hyperlinks to support those policies as evidence.
- ii. Development of a list of clearly assets which are not formally designated but which the NP wishes to be so designated.
- iii. Include a map showing areas NPTG would wish to be considered as part of an extended CA. (information may be available in SHDC Listed grade 3 archives)

NPTG members reported back on the policy areas assigned to them, giving a brief overview, which would be further developed after the meeting:-

#### **Dick: Theme, Environment and Heritage.**

Dick expanded on his theme document, which he had circulated in advance of the meeting. Key issues:-

- a) Necessary to transfer questionnaire views into a robust policy, additional to that of SHDC.
- b) Some overlap between heritage assets and landscape (*also some community amenities*)
- c) NP should designate new statutory green spaces such as Churchyard and Dolphin Car Park.

- d) Both should be fully addressed by list with specific reference made and mapped to identified items, (e.g. *this tree/hedgerow etc.*) (Lee's draft refers)
- e) Wind turbines and solar panels were a contentious issue and the preference appeared to be for small scale, and non-profit making applications (e.g. *domestic and farming support use*). **Noted:** *South Milton policy on this useful.*

### **Judy Theme, Housing.**

Cross referral to South Milton, where there had been no new build for some 50 years, whereas there had been substantial development in Kingston to date, mostly within the built settlement boundary. Key issues:-

- a) The history of '*Right to buy*'.
- b) Concerns about the number of 1 bed houses reported to be needed.
- c) Housing turnover levels in the village
- d) Kingston Housing Survey.
- e) The identification of the large (11) number of potential sites, of which only 3 were deemed to be suitable in terms of planning regulations.
- f) Consideration could be given to '*pinning down*' the total number of developments by site but this was unlikely to succeed in practice.
- g) In terms of the impact of single developments, the NP should use the questionnaire and Sites Assessment to '*tell the story*'.
- h) The final development line must be precise.
- i) JLP figure of around 10 houses is indicative, not a conclusive cap.
- j) In terms of small developments (*circa 3 dwellings*). there could be an issue of practicality and if a developer can deliver a larger development than the JLP number and demonstrate that, in doing so, it would not breach any major planning issues, then it could succeed.
- k) The relevance of the Village Housing Initiative, which would basically incentivise exception sites; and the issue of '*eco build*' and sheltered housing.
- l) Ideally, a traditional building style commensurate with the vernacular of Kingston should be ensured. There are slightly contradictory opinions in the Questionnaire as '*eco build*' is modern but compatible materials are possible.
- m) In terms of second homes, the majority village view was against these and the NP could include that (*for new build*) none should be second homes and this in perpetuity, albeit difficult to police and implement.
- n) Adopt JLP number as definitive.
- o) Necessary to consider carefully the issue of sheltered housing as Kingston infrastructure, the local labour market and the issue of scale needed to make such a development viable, would probably be unable to support this.

### **Flo – infrastructure:**

- a) Necessary to have clear action on flood prevention and sewage issues.
- b) Adopt South Milton approach on renewable energy.

### **Alan: Theme, Enterprise and employment.**

Alan spoke to the document circulated in advance of the meeting. *Key points:-*

- a) 40% support for new employment opportunities in the village, including homeworking.

- b) 33 respondents ran (a) business(s)
- c) Suggestions made for employment premises and their location, with reference to available grants.

**Rae: Theme: Community amenities.**

Key issues:-

- a) Whilst it was relatively easy to identify the main existing amenities as well as new ones suggested in response to the NP questionnaire, it was clear that some of the latter were not practicable (*for valid reasons, including not viable financially*) and the balance would primarily require management by the village itself, (*including KPC*), addressing management of and response to the actions of visitors and holiday makers. (*Lee's advice was to create a Parish Action Plan for these as an addendum to the Policy*)
- b) Key main **positive themes** which emerged, related to value of the pub, Reading Room, Church, Recreation ground, natural features/green spaces; flora and fauna/village features: coast, estuary, footpaths and cliffs; sense of safety; village organised events and entertainments; sense of community.
- c) Key main **Negative themes** were concerned with: dog mess and litter; light and noise pollution; need for shop/PO; fly tipping; lack of organised activities for young people, including youth clubs; damage to natural hedgerows by flailing; lack of sufficient organised activities for younger children; and some concerns about failure by property owners/residents to maintain hedges, gardens and land. **NPTG action:** to consider the option of making the Reading Room a non-listed heritage item and a community asset (*Lee to advise further on this*); and to future proof/protect the churchyard as a green space.

**OVERALL ACTIONS, all NPTG:** each to develop own area for further consideration at the next meeting following which Lee will advise further on this next level of detail; also, all policies would be specific to Kingston and in terms of the level of detail included. **ACTION ALL**

**5. Any other business**

**5.1 Draft guidance on Heritage and NPs**

Linda Watson had sent copy of the draft guidance, which had been circulated to NPTG.

**5.2 CPRE News**

CPRE Devon had commissioned independent research to assist analysis of Devon's housing needs. (*Report expected spring 2018*)

**5.3 Relational database**

Noted that this could show links and insights into the NP questionnaire responses, which might – or might not – be useful. Jim Dewar has developed a pro forma '*input*' form for a group of volunteers to complete to create the database. **Agreed:** That NPTG might need relational information at the stage when all proposed policies had been clarified. Pending this:-

- a) Jim to finalise his review of duplication in individual household free text comments. **Action: Alan** to discuss with Jim.
- b) thanks to be extended to Jim for his work to date.
- c) In due course, NPTG to decide whether to publish any spreadsheets created by the relational database.

#### **5.4 Saturday Field**

Dave Watts had advised that there was a covenant on the Saturday Field, which said that it should remain as agricultural land, thereby precluding housing development. It has been established that this is a legal issue, rather than a planning one. **Action: Judy** to respond to Dave.

#### **5.5 Holbeton NP**

Judy and Rae would be attending the second meeting of the new Holbeton NP group on 26 February to talk about what we have done.

### **6. Dates of next meetings**

Thursday 29 March 2018; 18 April 2018, both at 7 p.m. and in the Reading Room.