



Kingston must retain its character as a Living country village

Minutes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Task Group (NPTG) held on 7 November 2019 in Kingston Reading Room

1. Present; apologies and declarations of interest

Present: Alan Coleman-Smith; Dick Dalley; Don Kelly; Rae Musk. Advance apologies had been received from Flo Watts. KPC Chair, Eve White and KPC Councillor, Merv Freeman were also in attendance. There were no new declarations of interest. All were aware of the Judy Alloway's resignation from the role of Chair of the NPTG committee. On that basis, Eve asked who was to take on the role of Chairman. In fact, the members present had already discussed this in advance of the meeting and explained their proposed way forward. No one wished to take on the role of Chair and the collective view of NPTG was that the work plan for completion of the NP process would rely on a new way of working in that good teamwork and team cohesion were in place and a clear work plan had been agreed. Eve accepted this proposal but advised that, in the absence of a formal Chairman post, it would be necessary to designate a '*Key Point of Contact*' for external parties. There was no volunteer for this and, recognising the need, Rae agreed to be that person. In order to facilitate subsequent discussion, NPTG had created a slide show (**Next Steps** below) of its proposed ongoing actions

Next Steps

1. Collate every consultation response in a table (*done*).
2. Consider each consultation response and modify the Plan where appropriate. (e.g. changes likely to be needed to Objectives; Settlement Boundary; Green Spaces, etc).
3. Draft a reply to every consultation response and record in the table (i.e. how the Plan has been amended or, if not, why).
4. Write a Consultation Statement.
 - How the Parish and other bodies have been consulted (e.g. Drop-Ins; Questionnaire; Housing Survey; Reg14 Consultation etc).
 - Summarise the main issues and concerns raised.
 - Describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and the Plan amended.
5. Formally submit the amended Plan to SHDC.
Must include:-
 - A map and statement which identify the Neighbourhood Plan area.

- The Consultation Statement.
- The proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- A basic conditions statement (showing how the plan conforms with regulations).

What happens then?

1. SHDC checks to ensure the proposed Neighbourhood Plan is technically compliant with the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.
2. SHDC undertakes a six week statutory consultation on the plan: -
 - Published on the Council's website.
 - Posters on Council noticeboards.
 - Hard copies made available in libraries and local facilities.
3. SHDC then appoints an independent Examiner, who:-
 - Considers all documents and consultation responses.
 - May liaise with the parish council on certain key points.
 - Publishes an examination report.
4. If the Examiner's report is favourable, SHDC will organise a Referendum to formally establish local community support for the plan
5. The Council's Electoral Services will organise the referendum as they would any other public election. Voting can take place in three ways:
 - in person at the local polling station
 - by post
 - by proxy
6. If more than 50% of people voting in the referendum support the Plan, SHDC must bring it into force and use the Plan to help to decide planning applications in the parish

An explanation of the proposed modus operandi of NPTG hereon was advised to KPC, including creation of the final stages work plan with tight but realistic stages and delivery dates; and adoption of the Nolan Principles, which apply to all in public office. This was felt to be appropriate to a subcommittee (NPTG) of KPC. Dick proposed a vote of thanks to Judy and this was duly recorded in recognition of her extensive '*behind the scenes*' work in leading the development of the Plan to its current stage. **Action: KPC** to send a letter of thanks to Judy in recognition of her contribution to what were a plan and a formal consultation process legally owned by the KPC, not NPTG. Dick emphasised that the NP belonged to KPC and that they had responsibility for its final delivery. **Action: Dick** to meet with Judy to accept handover of the substantial evidence collected by NPTG and held by her, as this would be a crucial component of the Independent Examination process for the final draft plan.

KPC representatives supported the proposed way forward and were advised that the overall concluding work plan would be agreed at an early extraordinary meeting of NPTG, which would take account of related responses to the consultation version of the NP and would be copied to KPC for information. **Action: NPTG in due course.**

2. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting of 3 October 2019 were agreed.

3. Matters arising

a. SHDC invoice for printing.

Alan advised that Judy Alloway was chasing this up for submission to Sue Green. *(subsequently received in the sum of £1016.28 plus VAT)* He agreed that he would follow up on the SHDC invoice. *(Received at time of completion of these minutes, at the values in his presentation to NPTG.*

NPTG received £4091 from Groundworks and £1000 from DCC Locality Grant. NPTG has spent all of the DCC grant and have £830.50 of the Groundworks grant left which would not be enough to fund another Reg 14 consultation.

b. Responses to Consultation and NPTG actions to date.

SHDC responses were yet to follow but all other responses to the draft Plan had been logged and presented in a database to inform the next major stage of work, which was for NPTG to review all comments and collectively agree a response to each one and to propose any changes necessary to KNPs and the overall NP. This work would complete this stage of consultation as a piece of major evidence, given that there was no expectation of additional consultees/consultee responses, subject to a small number of statutory responses still outstanding. **Note:** response comments received varied in length and complexity and a small number referred to issues already addressed in the plan policies. Some statutory responses remained outstanding. The advice of Duncan Smith was noted. Merv pointed out that one of his two submissions was missing from the full list of responses that was presented to KPC. **Action: Alan** to add. It was noted that all of the hard copy submitted responses included in the schedule had been double checked by NPTG members.

c. Next steps

It was essential that KPC made its decision in relation to the preferred option for the allocation of sites. Option **(a)** would be that there would be no site allocation and that any development would be allowed provided it adhered fully to the acceptability criteria included in the NP. **Option (b)** would be the allocation of site(s) which would require a notice period of 6 weeks for potential developers to respond; a planning assessment and a new site assessment process, with all known potential developers invited to meet with NPTG to explain their proposals; and a 6 week restricted public Regulation 14 consultation on the proposed site(s). This option would incur further costs and delay. **Action: KPC** to consider this at their meeting on 21 November and to advise NPTG of their decision.

d. Next actions for NPTG

The consultation responses highlight two particular concerns. These are:-

3.4.1. Settlement boundary

Whilst responses to the proposed settlement boundary were mostly very positive, other responses were submitted – including by people whose property (*including land*) extends beyond the NP proposed adopted boundary. This appears to reflect a perception that the NP prohibits development outside the Settlement Boundary, which is not the case as KNP1 allows for such development, provided that development complies with the NP exception rules. However, although 77% of respondents supported the proposed settlement boundary, it was agreed that NPTG would set up small working groups to review the Settlement Boundary, in line with the properties/areas mentioned in consultation responses. **Action:** to be confirmed at December meeting. There was discussion about defining the Settlement Area and possibly a differing Development Area although the validity of this approach still needs to be confirmed. **Action: to be confirmed.** The review would cover those areas mentioned in the Reg14 comments. Merv agreed to provide a list of any other properties/related land which he believed should be incorporated into the Settlement Boundary.

3.4.2 .Green spaces

KNP13 had attracted some minor comments and these would be considered in the finalisation of NPTG responses to the original consultation comments, albeit it was not a requirement that every suggested change need be adopted.

3.4.3.Design and construction

KNP2 sets out the criteria for design and construction. **It was agreed** that Linda Watson be asked to advise on this, heritage and conservation and the historic setting of buildings and to provide an appendix to the plan. She had advised NPTG in the past and would be asked to comment professionally on KNP2, including issues of the impact of new build on historic settings. design principles; and an appendix to the NP in respect of the relationship of development to heritage and conservation.

Action: Dick to liaise with Linda, making clear what is needed for the NP and the required timetable.

5. Any other business

Initiating the new work plan.

It was agreed that NPTG team would set aside a whole day (*longer if required*) to deal with the schedule of responses and how each issue should be addressed, making proposed changes as necessary. **Action: Rae** Date to be confirmed. Given that this is a practical exercise rather than a diarised meeting for the NPTG team and that there is considerable pressure on the Reading Room, this session (*more if necessary*) would not be public and may take place **at the private home of one of the NPTG members.**

6. Dates and venue of next NPTG meetings.

Thursday 5 December 2019

Thursday 9 January 2020.

Other dates to be confirmed once any further existing RR bookings are known.

Action: Rae