



**Kingston must retain its character as a living country village.**

**Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Task Group (NPTG) Held on 8 November 2017 in Kingston Reading Room.**

**1. Present, apologies and declarations of interest.**

Present: Judy Alloway; Alan Coleman-Smith; Dick Dalley; Rae Musk; Flo Watts. (*Sally Richardson not in attendance*) There were no new declarations of interest from those in attendance.

**2. NP Questionnaire analysis (*Incorporating discussion and decisions taken after Dave had left the meeting*)**

**Note:** Dave Watts, who had undertaken the development of a spreadsheet to contain and analyse all the results from the recently issued Kingston NP Questionnaire, attended for this part of the meeting only. He referred to the document he had prepared, "*Summary of key points from the survey*". The spreadsheet did not include the primary school age children's questionnaire, which had been analysed separately (*Discussion of the children's questionnaire results is set out below*)

Dave highlighted the following points:-

- i. That there were some 8 -9 thousand data points entered on the spreadsheet. The size of this task demanded that the entries be audited to identify any errors, which were likely to have occurred. NPTG had previously agreed to ask an independent person to audit 10% of the questionnaires. Dave also requested a quality check to review the structure of the spread sheet and to ensure that the chosen ranges were complete and comprehensive.
- ii. That the structure of the spreadsheet and its equations were more important than any individual errors in entries made.
- iii. Entries in the spreadsheet were potentially traceable back to a household where the respondent profile within that property was recognisable. It was noted that distribution of the numbered questionnaires had been random and there was no record of which household received which number questionnaire. Removing the numbers did not affect the preceding issue.
- iv. The tables in his summary document represented the first level summary of the questionnaire results.

- v. 825 individual comments had been made across 235 topics, some generic; and some interpreted by Dave as the 'top 10', and had been presented with a table of frequency for each section.
- vi. Where any comment had covered more than one aspect (for example, parking **and** traffic) he had assigned the content to the relevant tables.
- vii. Inclusion of one form arriving after the closure of the collection box, would not alter any of the percentages shown in the tables. It was agreed that this questionnaire was too late for inclusion.
- viii. His summary document includes a summary table of the highest scored main issues under each section of the questionnaire, excluding personal and household data.
- ix. Of note, was the wish by older residents to retain the presence of young people in the village.

It was agreed that Dave would finalise the draft spreadsheet analysis as some sections were missing and re-submit it to NPTG. Judy thanked Dave, on everyone's behalf, for his work and presentation and he then left the meeting.

**Agreed:** That the information in the questionnaire responses should be presented in full but in as accessible form as possible, using pictorial format (*histograms; pie charts and graphs as appropriate*)

### **Key decisions/considerations**

- a) An independent audit to estimate the level of inevitable error during data transfer was good practice and Judy advised that Chris Franklin in Bigbury was willing to undertake an audit check based on a random 10% selection of completed questionnaires, checking data and the data base process, work of which he had experience from another NP. **Agreed:** NPTG would offer an honorarium to Chris for this work.
- b) **Agreed:** The spreadsheet ranges in the formulae used would be checked by Alan, and – if he were able to commit the time – by Bob Musk.
- c) **Agreed:** That no opinion should be excluded, on the basis that all votes are equal, regardless of age or gender.
- d) **Agreed:** Alan and Bob to be asked to check individually the spread sheet ranges in the formulae.
- e) **Consider:** Whether the use of averages might skew some findings.
- f) **Reaffirmed:** That the purpose of the questionnaire was to allow the development of the key themes which would inform the development of NP policies, reflective of the village residents'/property owners' wishes. The final analysis would also provide the crucial underpinning evidence in support of the final NP.
- g) **Agreed:** That Brian Mitchell should be asked to comment in respect of the Broad Band responses, particularly in respect of the misunderstanding that upgrading would lead to increased cost. **Action: Judy.**
- h) **Agreed:** The '*Questionnaire development, distribution, collection and analysis*' report should be put on the Website, once the process was complete. **Action:**

**Judy.** The 'Analysis of responses made to the Very Special Questionnaire for 4-11 years Primary school children', (including the pictures submitted and a smiley face pie chart) would also be pasted on the Website under a separate page, once the percentage response rate by the total of this group had been established; and any comments on the draft provided. **Action: NPTG** members to comment to on the latter by as soon as possible. Rae then to finalise document and provide to Alan in PDF format for the Website. **Action: Rae, Alan.**

- i) **Agreed:** That all members of NPTG would review the raw data and consider how it should be best presented in the final summary document for comment by the village before commencement of policy development. In order to facilitate and obtain comments, the Report would be put on the NPTG Website; provided in paper files located in key areas (Reading Room; Church; Dolphin inn), including one held by the Parish Clerk. **Action: Judy.**
- j) **Agreed:** essential that the analysis and the subsequent NP should reflect the wishes of the community and take account of all the measures.
- k) **Noted:** Rae holding all questionnaires and related evidence and documents for the final NP plan submission evidence draft.
- l) **Noted:** Dick had ascertained that the JLP would be reviewed every 5 years but that there was no information about the possible alignment of this/impact on NPs. **Action: Dick** to explore further and report back.
- m) **Noted:** Dick had reviewed Cornwall County Council NP Website, which is very helpful and could inform Kingston NP development. SHDC also has a Website but it appears not to be wholly up to date. One independent review of a NP from South Hams, had highlighted the importance of proper public consultation on the NP.

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

These were agreed as a correct record.

### 4. Matters arising

Alan confirmed that the aerial views of Kingston to be used on the Site Assessment Report had been duly attributed to Google Maps, as requested by Lee Bray. The final Assessment Report will be provided once Lee has seen the Questionnaire results.

### 5. Grant Tracking

The current grant covers payments made up to the end of December 31<sup>st</sup> 2017 and any unspent balance would be carried forward to the next tranche of grant. It was noted that the Parish Clerk has delegated authority to pay bills submitted to NPTG. The remaining balance of the current grant is sufficient to make payment to Lee Bray for the Site Assessment Report; the Basic Conditions Report for the NP; and advice on key issues for housing policies, all within the 2017 deadline; and any honorarium for the NP questionnaire audit check. **Action: Rae** to seek a quotation from SHDC for printing the NP itself, based on an estimate of 20 pages and 300 copies each for consultation on a) the first

draft of the NP and b) for the final amended NP following consultation. (one per household and copies for statutory and other consultees.) Payment to be made from the 2018 tranche of grant funding. Alan tabled a draft Grant Tracking report, which Judy will build upon for submission for 2018. **Noted:** the possibility that a formal 'single tender' process might be needed in respect of further work by Lee Bray. **Action:** Alan to seek clarification.

## 6. Questionnaire – report and next steps

**Agreed:** NPTG members individually to review through the data and how it should be presented to achieve the best mode of presentation, including pictorial, of the data for easy understanding by the community; to consider the consequent policy development.

## 7. Housing

### 7.1 New proposed site

Judy informed NPTG that Eve Jardine-Young had contacted her to advise that she intended to submit planning permission for land across the road from Robins Cottage, on the basis of '*most likely 1 or 2 dwellings compatible with nearby properties*'. NPTG noted that the site was wholly within the Conservation Area and was formally listed in the Local Plan as a Green Area. It is not clear whether this is referred to in the Joint Local Plan (JLP) Judy had already asked Lee Bray to undertake a formal site assessment and add it to his Report. **Action:** Alan will send an (*attributed*) Google Earth map of the proposed site to Lee Bray. SHDC has asked for the Site Assessment Report as soon as possible and the report will be posted on the Website.

### 7.2 VPL update

VPL had notified Judy that they intended to submit their planning application to SHDC in the near future and had offered KPC/NPTG the opportunity to meet with them to raise any questions. Judy has copied their communication to the Parish Clerk.

### 7.3. John Hardy proposal

John and his architect had undertaken significant pre-submission preparatory work and would like to update NPTG, following their discussions with SHDC about the Community Land Trust. **Action: Judy** to invite John and Rachel Hardy and their architect to attend the start of the next NPTG meeting, as the first agenda item.

## 8. Heritage and Planning Workshop

Dick will be attending the Workshop and Alan elected to take the place allocated to Judy as she could no longer attend. It was anticipated that the Workshop would be of interest rather than informative in a significantly relevant way in respect of NP development.

## 9. Any other business

### 9.1 Meeting with Holbeton NP representative

Judy and Rae had met with Sandi Marshal to advise on the process of development of a NP. They gave as much information and advice as they could, based on what we had done. Sandi noted the apparently advanced stage of developers' proposals in Holbeton.

#### **9.2 Department of Communities and Local Government**

Noted that consultation proposals in their publication, "*Planning for the right homes in the right places*" takes little account of AONB and Green Belt in determining approval for building sites.

#### **10. Dates of next meetings.**

December 6<sup>th</sup> 2017, 7.00 p.m. in Reading Room

January 15<sup>th</sup> 2018. 7.00 p.m. in the Reading Room basement. (*To be confirmed*)