

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

The table below contains the comments submitted to the Regulation 14 Consultation Draft Neighbourhood Plan and how these comments have been considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Task Group (NPTG) and have informed the amendments made in the Regulation 15 Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Richard Jackson, Devon CC, Highways, Statutory Consultee	I have no objections to the plan.	Noted
Les Pym, Devon CC, Street lighting, Statutory Consultee	With Kingston parish, not at present having any street lighting, Devon County Street Lighting would not wish to see street lighting provided as part of any future developments in this parish as we have always regarded this as a dark parish.	Noted. Conforms with KNP11.
Historic Environment Team, Devon CC, Statutory Consultee	Generally well set out, easy to read with good photos.	Noted
Historic Environment Team	The following comments are made on the understanding that the Character Assessment, which includes a chapter on the history of the parish, will be signposted within the plan.	This is now referred to in the Plan
Historic Environment Team	2 Local Context, Vision and Objectives 2.1 Mention location of Kingston within South Hams and three miles southwest of Modbury.	See AONB map in section 2 which shows Modbury
Historic Environment Team	2.11 Protect the historic environment of the parish by conserving and enhancing heritage assets which are of special local and national interest	Noted
Historic Environment Team	5 Environment and Heritage Suggest Environment and Heritage be split into two separate chapters: Natural Environment (chapter 5) and Historic Environment (renumbered as chapter 6).	Kept together as they are intrinsically linked
Historic Environment Team	Suggest refer to NPPF (Feb 2019) section 16. Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.	See section 1.5 and the Basic Condition Statement for the NPPF references.
Historic Environment Team	5.9 You could refer to Historic Landscape Characterisation here which shows where remnants of medieval and post-medieval field systems, woodlands and orchards, may still survive. These can be considered when development is proposed. Further information on the Historic Landscape Characterisation can be followed via link https://new.devon.gov.uk/historicenvironment/the-devon-historic-environmentrecord/historic-landscape-characterisation/	See the Character Assessment, now referenced in The Plan.
Historic Environment Team	5.18 Photos of some of the listed buildings could be added.	Chapel Row, The Dolphin and the church are already included.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Historic Environment Team, Devon CC, Statutory consultee	<p>5.19 Please note that these sites and features are recorded on the Devon Historic Environment Record not Historic England. Suggest giving examples of the different archaeological sites, finds and other historic features.</p> <p>There appears to be some confusion between the Devon Historic Environment Record and Historic England. Historic England are responsible for the National Heritage List for England which lists those heritage assets which are officially designated and which enjoy statutory protection. The Monument UIDs which you refer to in both the plan and the Character Assessment (eg MDV36045) is the reference number on the Devon Historic Environment Record which is maintained by Devon County Council.</p> <p>Suggest rewording: A range of archaeological finds and other historic features and buildings, including both designated and undesignated heritage assets such as [give examples], is recorded on the Devon Historic Environment Record, hosted by Devon County Council.</p> <p>You could include a link to our website here which has a link to the Devon Environment Viewer https://www.devon.gov.uk/historicenvironment/</p>	Thank you for your suggestions, we have reworded section 5.19.
Historic Environment Team	5.20 In line 2, 'has' should be 'have'	Not changed as the subject is singular
Historic Environment Team	<p>6 Open Spaces: 6.8 You could add promoting public awareness of and enjoyment of the historic environment to this part. Many aspects of the parish could be emphasised using heritage trails. The trails can help connect the urban and rural settings. The trails could be in any form such as a guide book, signage, engraved stones and public art. The heritage trails bring together community participation, encourage 'ownership' of the area and adds to community development. Developers should be asked to include appropriate enhancement of trails within the design of new developments and/or through the contributions to developing the 'virtual' trail. This can also cross over into the Green Infrastructure of the Parish promoting walking and cycling routes. Cycle/walking trails can link up dispersed green spaces such as woodland, parkland areas and historic trails.</p>	Thank you for your comments, the parish is well provided with clearly signed paths and narrow lanes, especially the South West Coast path. These are well used by visitors and residents.
Historic Environment Team	<p>Appendix I All officially designated heritage assets have statutory protection. Suggest rewording: Many of the heritage assets in the parish of Kingston are officially designated and have statutory protection. These designated heritage assets are recorded in the National Heritage List for England (see....</p>	Noted and amended
Historic Environment Team	<p>KNP10 There are other non-designated heritage assets within the parish, many of which are recorded on the Devon Historic Environment, which could also be included on a Local List. These include, for example, two caves thought to have been used by smugglers, which add to the cultural history of the parish.</p>	Noted, see the Character Assessment and referred to in The Plan.
Historic Environment Team, Devon CC,	<p>Further suggestions Many towns and villages around the country are reinstating some of their orchards and creating community orchards, which a parish such as Modbury could benefit from. The Orchard Project works in partnership with communities to plant, manage, restore and harvest orchards in community areas. This</p>	Noted.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	link provides further information http://www.theorchardproject.org.uk/	
Marcus Salmon, Environment Agency, Statutory Consultee	We are supportive of the neighbourhood plan's overarching vision/objectives and we welcome the range of environmental policies set out in the plan. In general we are supportive of the principles set out in policies KNP-3 (Flooding and sewerage), KNP-4 (Renewable energy), KNP-7 (Protecting the landscape and biodiversity), KNP-13 (Local green spaces).	Support welcomed
Marcus Salmon, Environment Agency	KNP3 However, whilst we are supportive of the principle of policy KNP-3 we are concerned that in its current wording the policy could be found to be unsound and could conflict with other regulatory or policy requirements. For example, proliferation of non-mains sewage systems is not supported by regulations or policy regardless of the status of the receiving public sewage treatment works. We recommend that the first sentence is instead amended along the following lines: "In light of issues regarding the capacity of the local sewage treatment works, new development must ensure that it does not cause a deterioration in the status of local water bodies nor exacerbate sewer flooding"	KNP3 (2) is amended to remove the reference to on site treatment and to change the emphasis to support an improvement of the sewerage system.
Marcus Salmon, Environment Agency	In the second sentence of the proposed policy, in respect of flooding, we recommend that the word 'stop' is replaced with 'reduce'.	This wording was only in the summary document and not the full version of the Reg 14 draft plan
Carol Reeder, Natural England, Statutory Consultee	The settlement boundary shown on page 10 includes some partially developed, large plots (e.g. south of Apple Barn and to the south of Park View Terrace). As policy KNP1 supports development within the settlement boundary you may wish to assess the landscape impact of developing these sites and include this within your supporting evidence. This will help make Plan policy more robust.	We have considered assessing the landscape impact and have decided against as we are not allocating any sites.
Carol Reeder, Natural England	The settlement boundary set out in the 'Site Assessment' document (in green) is slightly different from the settlement boundary shown in blue on page 10 of the draft Plan. In particular the former (shown in green) includes an undeveloped plot north east of Rock Cottages (possibly named Farthing Mead) and another to the south of 'the Granary'. To avoid confusion we advise that maps with the Plan and appendices are consistent.	The settlement/development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment
Carol Reeder, Natural England	We also refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted.
Adam Davison, South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Statutory Consultee	Vision <i>Kingston must maintain its character as a living country village nestled within the protected landscape the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. A vibrant living country village where the quality of life of its residents and the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment is paramount and where any development should be proportionate, balanced and sustainable in keeping with its designation within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</i> 2.10 Kingston is a place where residents of all ages can enjoy a good quality of life, within a beautiful iconic Devon village. This	Thank you for your suggestion. This strapline was set by the local community during the early stages of the plan process.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>quality of life, for both individuals and the community, will be maintained by ensuring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a mixed community in age, income and occupation • easily accessible services especially for the elderly and vulnerable • a range of groups and activities for all ages • a good mobile phone and internet system across the parish • a sufficient number of principal residences, more second homes will reduce the active population • more work opportunities for local people • good facilities in regular use • a safe environment without undue traffic impact and danger on our roads • good community spirit and care for individuals in time of need 	
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	The entire parish is located within the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This is important because the NPPF affords AONBs the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations.	Sections 2.5 and 2.6 and the Character Assessment already refer to the AONB in some detail as a context for the parish.
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	Most of the parish also lies within the Heritage Coast and the Undeveloped Coast, which are both non-statutory designations but nonetheless carry substantial weight when it comes to development proposals. The NPPF states that local planning authorities should: “maintain the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes, particularly in areas defined as Heritage Coast.	Sections 2.5 and 2.6 and the Character Assessment already refer to the AONB in some detail as a context for the parish.
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	<p>Objectives</p> <p>New development is in scale and keeping with the village and the locality/ its location in a nationally protected landscape;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for small scale housing development, which prioritises the needs of local people, is in keeping with the locality and landscape contributing to a sustainable future for the parish, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Open market housing for young families on lower/middle incomes to buy or rent, and ○ Affordable community housing for people with local connections, who cannot afford to buy or rent open market housing ○ Opportunities for existing business to flourish and provision of new employment for local people, which promotes sustainable growth in the local economy appropriate to the character and position of the parish within the South Devon AONB; ○ Respect, conserve and enhance the special qualities of Kingston’s natural environment for future generations, including protection of the exceptional view of the dark night sky; ○ Protect the historic environment of the parish by conserving and enhancing heritage assets which are of special local interest; 	Accepted

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Support for the delivery of appropriate small-scale technology for generating renewable energy for local use; ○ Promote a healthy, mixed community by enhancing and protecting Kingston’s green spaces, sport/recreational /leisure facilities and services which support community wellbeing and resilience ○ Seek opportunities to improve infrastructure to make the parish more sustainable for existing and future residents 	
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	KNP1 Additional text to place ‘sustainability’ in context would help clarify this widely used word.	Sustainable development is defined in the Glossary to the Plan in Appendix VI
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	At the heart of the planning system is the principle of sustainable development and in order to proceed to referendum, a neighbourhood plan must be able to demonstrate that it contributes towards the achievement of sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) describes sustainable development as: “about positive growth - making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations” and it identifies three roles for the planning system to perform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy • a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities • an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment 	Noted
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	The AONB Management Plan policies aim to protect the character of skylines and open views into, within and out of the AONB including protection against visually dominating buildings which are inconsistent with landscape character. Development must not have an adverse impact on the AONB, the Heritage Coast or the Undeveloped Coast.	Noted and widely referenced in the Plan
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	Please reference South Devon AONB Planning Guidance (Version 1)	noted
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	Consideration should be given if the plan supports/will not support caravan, campsites and chalet sites and recognises that if there is a proven demand for such facilities and provided there is no harmful visual impact upon the AONB, and road network, it may make a policy exception	We note that this is covered by The Management Plan for the South Devon AONB 2019-2024
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	Consideration should be given if the plan supports/will not support the development of an air ambulance night landing site as a permanent fixture to serve the parish. The citing of such a facility should have associated policy requirements.	Noted that this is supported by AONB policy
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	KNP5 Housing 4. 4.8 scope for a suitable rural exception site to be brought forward to provide up to 100% affordable housing will also need to comply with 3.6. This also should apply to 4.12.4	Noted, see KNP5 (1).
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	Any proposals should conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the South Devon AONB and should demonstrate that their impacts upon the AONB have been assessed, giving particular consideration to the natural beauty, special qualities, landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. Proposals should demonstrate that the mitigation hierarchy has been followed and applied	Noted and agreed

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	throughout the development process, with harm to the AONB avoided in the first instance.	
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	KNP7 Natural England is the principal statutory consultee on planning applications affecting AONBs; although under the Planning Protocol agreed with the local planning authorities, the South Devon AONB Unit is involved as a non-statutory consultee on any planning applications significantly affecting the AONB (whether sited inside the AONB or likely to affect it). The South Devon AONB Management Plan, including recently adopted Planning Guidance, is a material consideration in plan-making and decision-taking where there is the potential to affect the AONB	Support welcomed
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	The topography of the parish is typical of this part of South Devon with river valley slopes, rolling farmland, high Devon banks, arable and pasture land and includes a short stretch of the South West Coast Path. The long distance footpath leaves the parish to the west by crossing the Erme Estuary on foot by wading with care one hour each side of low tide from the Wonwell slipway	Noted as consistent with the Character Assessment
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	The South Devon AONB Management Plan also serves as a management plan for the South Devon Heritage Coast, since the South Devon AONB incorporates the South Devon Heritage Coast. Heritage Coasts are the finest stretches of undeveloped coastline in England and Wales. The boundary of the Heritage Coast stretches some 300m inland and 2km out to sea, and covers almost the whole of the parish.	Noted
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	South Hams district supports about 60% of the UK population of ciril buntings. Good numbers of breeding territories have been recorded in the parish and to protect them, it is important to retain mixed farming (pasture and arable) of the type that provides habitat for grasshoppers and plenty of seeds for birds in winter (e.g. from weedy winter stubbles).	Noted
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	KNP8 Para 5.12 references camp sites in respect to the Kingston (eastern) side of the estuary and promotes precluding development off the single-track lane from Blackpost Cross to Wonwell. This policy could be extended to the whole undeveloped coast boundary and also reference temporary campsites as having the potential to reduce levels of tranquillity.	Noted. Please see section 5.13
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	KNP11 5.25 The Management Plan for the South Devon AONB 2019-2024 notes a key policy objective to maintain and where practicable enhance levels of tranquillity throughout the AONB and specifically to protect against night time scenic intrusion from external lighting.	Supportive comment noted
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	KNP14 This Plan (The Management Plan for the South Devon AONB 2019-2024) supports the small-scale expansion of existing caravan and campsites and recognises that if there is a proven demand for such facilities and provided there is no significant harmful impact upon the AONB, particularly on the roads, it will make a policy exception. New caravan and campsites will not, however, be supported given the location of the parish within the South Devon AONB, the South Devon Heritage Coast and the Undeveloped Coast.	We note that this is covered by The Management Plan for the South Devon AONB 2019-2024

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	KNP12 The development of an air ambulance night landing site as a permanent fixture on agricultural or amenity land to serve the parish will be supported provided the proposal meets landscape policy requirements.	Noted that this is supported by AONB policy
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	Kingston Character Assessment A good account of baseline information that underpins many of the considerations cover in the plan. Referencing this piece of work throughout would improve the plan.	Now fully referenced
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	Please consider consistency throughout the document by referencing; South Devon AONB Management Plan (2019 – 2024); South Devon AONB Planning Guidance (Version1); South Devon Heritage Coast.	Added as suggested
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	The checklist for plan makers is worth visiting at this stage. http://www.southdevonaonb.org.uk/uploads/files/AONB_Planning_Guidance_version_1.pdf	Noted
Adam Davison, South Devon AONB	Specific points to include are to recognise the NPPFs position on sustainable development	Definition included as suggested in the Glossary in Appendix VI. The NPPF's position is referred to in sections 1.5 and 1.6
Martyn Dunn, South West Water, Statutory Consultee	Thank you for providing detail of the plan the content of which is noted. With specific reference to sewage treatment capacity it is not anticipated that there will be any difficulty is supporting the likely level of future housing growth over the plan period.	Noted
David Stuart, Historic England, Statutory Consultee	We have no comments we wish to make on specific provisions within the Plan other than to note the decision not to allocate sites for development.	Noted
David Stuart, Historic England	As a consequence we would want only to congratulate your community on its progress to date and to wish it well in the making of its Plan.	Support welcomed
Anne Jardine Young, Resident and landowner	KNP2 Policy Point 8 : There is a need to balance personal security, safety and risk against 'dark skies' objectives within the main village of Kingston. Given its small size and contained boundary within the whole Policy area, the relative contribution of security and external lighting is likely small compared to the safety and security benefits to householders, especially the elderly or infirm. The Policy should not be drawn or applied in a way that unduly presumes against adequate security and external lighting around dwellings	KNP2 and KNP11 do support appropriately fitted security and safety lighting.
Anne Jardine Young	KNP7 Policy Point 4 : such objectives are welcome, however in respect of green spaces the Policy tools applied should also be reasonable and proportionate, especially in circumstances where those Areas are already located in a Conservation Area. Use of policies in relation to area(s) under private ownership where there is no right of public access and/or inconsistent application of designation across relevant potential sites under private ownership where there is no right of public access presents a need for a particularly high hurdle of justification.	Noted. (Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan)
Anne Jardine Young	KNP13 A) Context	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>The Plan includes a private domestic garden within the list of sites described in Paragraph 6.9 on Page 35 of the Plan as being "one of the most important of the ..open spaces in the parish" and together with other criteria, it is put forward as being demonstrably special to the Community through its inclusion as a proposed Local Green Space ("LGS").</p> <p>This private domestic garden with no public access and situated with one of the village Conservation Areas is the Open Area to the South of Morgan's Row (SX 638479) included in Annex III. This proposed policy area site will be referred to below as the "Garden".</p> <p>The Garden is part of the property known as Robins Cottage that is situated on the opposite side of Vicarage Lane, to the West and is immediately adjacent to parking and garaging necessary for the servicing of both that house and the Garden itself. I am the present owner of the Garden.</p> <p>There are a number of problems associated with inclusion of the Garden in the list of Local Green Spaces which these comments seek to highlight</p> <p>B) LGS Policy- purpose and application</p> <p>By way of additional background to the Policy proposed, reference has been made to the guidance provided by Locality in their publication "Neighbourhood Planning Local Green Spaces- A toolkit for neighbourhood planners" referred to below as the "Toolkit". This is publically available to download here https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/making-local-green-space-designations-neighbourhood-plan/</p> <p>As a matter of general principle, the Toolkit reminds on Page 7 that "in addition to a robust and proportionate evidence base, it is necessary to engage with local communities and stakeholders. Care is required to ensure that green space policies are not misused, for example through making designations to stop development, rather than to ensure proper green space provision."</p> <p>In this context, whilst the term 'development' is poorly defined or undefined, development must be understood to include non-residential development, potentially including development necessary for the sustainable ongoing management, maintenance and utility value of the land to the landowner from time to time in the future.</p> <p>Restrictions on development, for example non-residential development, which might unduly prevent an owner of the land in question enjoying and maintaining the full amenity potential of their land must necessarily be subject to very convincing evidence being put forward by way of justification. In the current context, for example, this potentially could include certain garden facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>This is a particular problem in the context of the Garden when reference is made to the wording of the proposed Policy KPN13 itself, which is clearly directed at community areas enjoyed by the public. It states that :</p>	<p>and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.</p> <p>See above</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>"Any development that would result in the loss of any part of these green spaces or that results in any harm to their character, setting, accessibility, appearance, general quality or amenity value will not be permitted. Only minor non-residential development directly associated with and necessary for the public enjoyment of the green space will be permitted."</p> <p>This emphasis on "public" enjoyment of a green space, which in the context of the Garden (having no public access and largely not visible to surrounding areas) fails to proportionately acknowledge and protect the interests, rights and wishes of a private landowner in respect of their own domestic garden land. An enclosed private domestic garden being designated as a LGS is anomalous and in this context does not sit easily with the Policy provisions at all. The Garden already benefits from certain protections which have a material bearing on the shape of potential development. Being situated in a Conservation Area already affords any area of land a high degree of protection against unwelcome development, including residential development, and in practice a very high involvement and weighting in favour of the local Council to influence the outcome of any such hypothetical proposal(s). In Kingston, this is especially so in the context of the remainder of the Plan.</p> <p>Any such hypothetical proposal(s) would need to "enhance" rather than merely fail to harm the character of the Conservation Area as a whole and that necessarily includes a consideration of the green spaces it contains. It is beyond reasonable doubt that careful consideration of the amenity value of the Garden as a green or other open space in the context of both the Conservation Area and the village as a whole would form a central part of any hypothetical planning proposal(s).</p> <p>Local Green Space designation of the Garden therefore appears to be a potential misdirection of the primary purpose and spirit of the LGS Policy.</p> <p>In other words, it may be construed as an attempt to avoid any discussion or consideration of potentially beneficial or necessary development of private land in future rather than a robust, convincing, proportionate and well-evidenced measure to secure the appropriate balance of relevant green spaces in the village. There are other gardens of similar size and arguably even greater importance and amenity in the near vicinity that are not proposed as being subject to LGS designation. It appears arbitrary and subjective to single out only one such private garden (without public access) for designation as a Local Green Space in this way. This is especially so when considered in the context of both the present Conservation Area, which may be expanded, and the village as a whole. The responsibility for maintenance and provision of a healthy network of green spaces in the village needs to fall on all of its residents in relation to their homes and gardens, and not be concentrated formally or informally in one enclosed private Garden singled out in the manner of a 'trade-off' or 'offset' for loss of green space elsewhere. That, on balance, is what appears to be happening here.</p>	<p>See above</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>It is vitally important to the future sustainability and management of the Garden beyond the JLP or Neighbourhood Plan Period that Policy instruments are not imposed which discourage or unduly constrain the responsible and beneficial management and evolution of the Garden by its owners.</p> <p>Without the active support of its private owners, the Garden will not be capable of lasting beyond the Joint Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan period, which it must be to comply with NPPF Section 100. As such, the owners must surely be regarded as key stakeholders whose views ought to be given considerable weight when considering whether LGS designation is an appropriate, desirable and proportionate measure to adopt.</p> <p>C) Geographical Definition of proposed LGS 4.:Open area to the south of Morgan's Row (SX 638479)</p> <p>A map of proposed Local Green Spaces numbered 1- 5, each shaded green, appears in Appendix III on Page 46 of the Plan. This I am calling the "LGS Map". A smaller scale map is provided indicating the extent of the South Hams Policy Area to the south of Morgan's Row and entrance to Westentown respectively in Appendix III on Page 47 of the Plan. The Garden is the area with a dark black dashed outline on this map, which I will call the "Policy Area Plan".</p> <p>A close examination of the LGS Map indicates that the area numbered 4. on this map does not align with the Policy Area Plan. As previously explained in comments responding to the invitation to comment on the identification .. of Local Green Spaces published within the Kingston Parish Newsletter August 2018,Number 412 (in the following called "Previous Comments"), part of the land shaded green on the LGS Map is the site of permanent garaging and associated construction and servicing areas that is clearly not Green Space and has never been subject to any Open Space policy in the past. This was acknowledged and the Policy Area Plan was supplied to me by way of clarification of the area which the Committee proposed be subject to LGS provisions instead.</p> <p>It is material that for the avoidance of future ambiguity and by way of accurate reference that in the event these proposals are put forward for further review and consideration without retraction of LGS proposals in relation to the Garden, that this identified discrepancy is addressed.</p> <p>The LGS Map requires amendment so as to reflect the Policy Area Plan area on Page 47 and not some other redefined area encroaching on developed land through drafting error</p> <p>D) Roads, driveways and parking areas within proposed LGS 4.:Open area to the south of Morgan's Row (SX 638479) and proposed LGS 5.:Entrance to Westentown (SX 639479)</p> <p>It is noted that proposed LGS 5. includes the public road known as Westentown and also the access driveway area that serves to facilitate existing and established rights of access (with or without vehicles) through the entrance gate leading in to the adjacent Garden (proposed LGS 4.) from Westentown. This driveway area is in regular use, including by commercial vehicles engaged in the</p>	<p>See above</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>servicing and management of the Garden itself, for example skip deliveries and delivery of garden materials.</p> <p>It must be assumed that such roads, driveways, parking areas etc. are not inconsistent with appropriate use of land as a Local Green Space. If they were, to superimpose a new policy inconsistent with what is already there over such area(s) would be wholly incorrect. Specific clarification and confirmation of this is requested.</p> <p>E) NPPF Green Space Assessment condition 4.</p> <p>Appendix III on Page 45 of the Plan includes a list of Green Space Assessment conditions. One of these, condition 4., is headed "Is it shown to be of local significance".</p> <p>This appears to be a partial extract deriving paragraph 100 b) of the NPPF which in full states that, in addition to other criteria and the wider proper purpose of the Policy, Local Green Space designation should only be used where a green space is :</p> <p>"demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife"</p> <p>The emphasis here must be on both of two separate aspects of that requirement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) demonstrably special to a local community; and 2) holds a particular local significance [not just a general 'local significance' as indicated in condition 4. of the Green Space Assessment conditions on Page 45, Appendix III of the Plan. <p>The Toolkit again provides some useful guidance here, specifically on Page 21 of the Toolkit in the section "NPPF Criteria Selection".</p> <p>With regard to point 1) above "demonstrably special to a local community", indication is given that this should "describe ways in which the space is used or enjoyed by the community"</p> <p>The emphasis here is on "used or enjoyed by the community" and no such convincing case has been made in relation to the Garden. The Garden is clearly not "used" by the community. It is a private garden and the Kingston Neighbourhood Plan Task Group acknowledged in their letter to me of 7th August 2018 that "it is now a private garden and there is no intention of changing that, nor could we do so".</p> <p>As regards enjoyment, any such enjoyment could only ordinarily arise either through visual appreciation or indirectly through passive knowledge of the existence of 'some green space' of 'some nature'.</p> <p>As regards visual appreciation, relatively few in the village were aware of the existence of this garden, and in particular its extent, prior to the publication of this Plan. This is because impact on the area as a whole is largely limited to the boundary planting which is visible mainly from Vicarage Lane, and the large planting of trees on the Eastern boundary. The Southern half of the Garden is not visible from any adjacent properties. The North West corner can only be clearly viewed from the upstairs windows of Robins Cottage, the dwelling belonging to the owner of the Garden itself. The visual impact of the 'green space' is therefore materially limited to the household which it forms part of, and is in substance a private domestic garden currently enjoyed by family and friends</p>	<p>See above</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>of its owners in the manner of any other private domestic garden, as agreed by the Neighbourhood Plan Task Group in their written response to my Previous Comments lodged in 2018.</p> <p>Any benefit or amenity value to the community arising from this green space is passive in nature and as such, it cannot reasonably be evidenced to contribute beauty, recreational value, tranquillity, wildlife or other values exceeding those arising from any other gardens of a similar size or character in Kingston in the near vicinity. The Garden is simply not 'demonstrably special to the local community' on the basis of such values, which are not exclusive, unique or unusual for a garden.</p> <p>With regard to local significance, Paragraph 100b) of the NPPF emphasizes "particular" local significance indicating an exceptional set of local values attaching to a green space before it might be reasonably considered appropriate for designation as a Local Green Space. Those deriving from its current use as a private garden have already been discussed above.</p> <p>The description of the Garden on Page 47 of Appendix III of the Plan begins with an statement about its purported past use. This states:</p> <p>"This area of land was traditionally the site of the village allotments and was known as 'Coytes Hay' or 'Cuthay'" before going on to clarify that it is now a private garden and there is no public access.</p> <p>In this statement, the word "traditionally" is used without reference to any point in time or length of duration in the context of purported Allotment use. The photograph included in the Plan is similarly undated. Aside from any separate consideration of the extent (if any) to which historic use of land confers significance in this context, such a statement does not offer any meaningful parameters against which significance could be objectively evaluated. There are few gardens in the country which were not used at some time during the 20th Century for the cultivation of food during the Second World War and years which followed.</p> <p>The late Mrs Cattley, who visited the Garden for tea several years ago, gave a very clear account of the history of the family's holdings in Kingston during the 20th Century, which included the Garden. Plantings in 'Cuthay' were described by her as daffodil beds laid for the production of flowers destined for Covent Garden in London, in the late 1940s and 1950s. There is no indication that the Garden was at any time a community asset. Short-term concessionary use of ground by friends for planting, if it occurred, would not amount to the formal provision of Allotments to the community.</p> <p>A long term elderly resident of the village, who was brought up in Kingston, has also verbally contradicted the claim that 'Cuthay' was historically the site of village Allotments in dialogue with me. I cannot, therefore, hold the assertions made in the Plan as regards purported historic use of the Garden as village Allotments to be convincing evidence any more than hearsay.</p> <p>Furthermore, as is evident from the more recent aerial photograph on Page 47 of Appendix III of the Plan, no indications of any kind remain that reflect, resemble or retain the legacy of</p>	<p>See above</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>any such purported historic use. The site has been in use as a private garden for over 40 years now.</p> <p>During this time, the Garden has matured and developed in its rightful present use, as part of the natural evolution of the village. The aerial photograph has no doubt been selected for informative purposes owing to the considerable difficulties capturing photographic depiction of the Garden at ground level today. This is because it is only really now visible at the level of its boundaries. The Plan is forward-looking and therefore, present conditions are now the relevant benchmarks in relation to the Garden.</p> <p>This leads directly on to the cited SHDC Saved Policy: South Hams Local Plan 1989- 2001. Part S: Modbury Area MP11: Kingston which states in supports of designation of the Garden as an Open Space:</p> <p>"The open area to the south of Morgans Row shown as a Policy Area on the Proposals Map, Inset M9, should be retained as open space in order to maintain the contribution it makes to the visual character of the area."</p> <p>At the time this Policy was originally drafted, the visual character and landscape incorporating the Garden was very different to how it presents today. Many trees and shrubs planted as part of immature garden landscaping around that time (and since) are now maturing and the effect of this has been the visual 'enclosure' of the Garden within its boundaries. It no longer has the visual characteristic of an open field or tract of land and has no lines of sight through the whole of the Garden from the outside.</p> <p>The contribution made to the visual character of the area by the Garden is now limited to the contribution made by its perimeter plantings. The interior of the Garden, forming the best part of that Policy area simply does not make any material marginal contribution to the visual character of the area because its character can only now really be seen from an aerial view or from within the Garden itself, which is in private use with no public access.</p> <p>It does therefore seem that the original Policy adopted has been 'held over' well beyond the shelf life of its original intended purpose, and certainly in relation to the effect described as having been its original aim. Open Space designation and Local Green Space designations are not identical. The Garden is private land with no public access. The Toolkit is instructive in illustrating the importance of persuasively evidencing assertions underlying proposed designation of Local Green Spaces, with a high hurdle of justification.</p> <p>Relying heavily on a historic designation of the Garden as an "Open Space" that has been carried over beyond its original period of application as "evidence" is not of itself sufficient or particularly helpful. This is in light of the great divergence between the current character of the Garden and its historic presentation, arising from the natural development and maturing of plantings.</p> <p>With regard to the current proposed Local Green Space policy, the explanatory information given on Page 47, Appendix III of the Plan goes on to state:</p>	<p>See above</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>"It is now a private garden and there is no public access. It represents, nevertheless, an important open space within one of the village Conservation Areas and undoubtedly contributes to its character'.</p> <p>The question here is whether on balance, it is justifiable to attribute such significance to its particular characteristic, as to justify the description in Paragraph 6.9 on Page 35 of the Plan as being "one of the most important of the ... open spaces in the parish".</p> <p>I consider all gardens within the village of Kingston to be important open spaces, contributing to the character of both Conservation Areas and the village as a whole, whether or not directly falling within the designated areas. I do not think there are many in the Parish who would disagree with this.</p> <p>What is required however for a garden to be designated as a LGS subject to Policy, is that such an open space is both demonstrably special and of particular local significance. In particular view of the comments made above, it must be the case that other gardens in the village representing important open spaces contributing to the character of the Conservation Area(s) and/or the village as a whole are similarly designated as LGSs on those grounds. Several examples were cited in the Previous Comments lodged in 2018. It is simply not reasonable, realistic or appropriate to attach particular significance to this Garden over all others.</p> <p>Alternatively, and this is my strong contention after very careful consideration of the LGS proposals in the Plan as applied in the case of the Garden, the proposed designation of the Garden as a Local Green Space should be withdrawn</p> <p>This is primarily on grounds that the Garden has not been (and cannot credibly or persuasively be) evidenced as meeting the exceptional criteria relevant to justifying its designation as a Local Green Space within the provisions of NPPF paragraph 100.</p> <p>This is particularly so in the context of the proposed application of a Policy to a private garden with no public access, where the restrictions envisaged by the Policy are clearly directed at public areas, and aimed at their long-term management or development in public use.</p> <p>On careful consideration, the proposals present as an attempt to 'shoe-horn' Local Green Space Policy designation inappropriately on the Garden for the reasons comprehensively outlined above.</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p>Debbie Shotter, Resident</p>	<p>KNP1 There are inconsistencies with the settlement boundary that should be resolved. Surely all properties that are part of the village, and directly attached to it, should be included within the boundary. Vicarage Farm for example. Shouldn't the boundary follow that of the Undeveloped Coast?</p>	<p>The settlement/ development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.</p>
<p>Debbie Shotter, Resident</p>	<p>KNP2 Can a clause be included to encourage existing properties to comply with these requirements, especially when being extended? Could biodiversity enhancements be encouraged such as new ponds, native planting, orchards, etc.?</p>	<p>Where planning permission is required then the Neighbourhood Plan, when made, will be a material consideration in planning decisions. Biodiversity</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
		encouragement is a subject for the Community Action Plan
Debbie Shotter, Resident	KNP3 Can a clause be included to encourage existing properties to undertake works to discharge their surface water to soakaways or SUDS systems to reduce the existing hydraulic load on our sewage treatment works?	Outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan
Debbie Shotter, Resident	KNP5 Can it be stressed that affordable exception sites will have to comply with the other requirements of the plan, particularly Design & Construction as there may be pressure to reduce standards to make this sort of scheme viable.	This is covered in KNP2 and in the JLP policy DEV10
Debbie Shotter, Resident	KNP6 Why can't this policy also apply to replacement dwellings?	This policy is consistent with current law.
Debbie Shotter, Resident	KNP11 The current external lighting around the Dolphin cannot comply with this policy and causes a nuisance to surrounding residents and must affect the bat population as detailed in the 'Wildlife site resource map and species information for neighbourhood planning' document. If this policy is to be included in the plan then shouldn't existing lighting that does not comply with it be dealt with through negotiation with the owners?	Outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan
Debbie Shotter, Resident	KNP12 Should it be made clear that the whole of the property associated with the Dolphin should be safeguarded, including the carpark, green space, watercourse and tulip tree?	The whole property is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Debbie Shotter, Resident	Should this section refer to the fire station building? Can the building be classed as an important community asset so that if the fire station is closed its use as some form of community building is protected? It may even help persuade the fire service not to close it if they think it will not have such a high resale value.	The Fire Station is leased from the Flete Estate. Designation as an asset of community value is outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan.
Debbie Shotter, Resident	KNP13 The green space associated with the Dolphin should be included in this policy. It is probably the most important green space right in the centre of the village, is adjacent to listed buildings and community facilities. As it is owned by a commercial organisation wishing to maximise profits at any cost this area must be given maximum protection.	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Debbie Shotter, Resident	KNP15 Can the policy include a proposal for any new equipment to be housed in purpose made/built enclosures that fit into the locality rather than using the standard unsightly boxes, etc.?	Noted, no change made to KNP15 as 96% of respondents agreed.
Debbie Shotter, Resident	Appendix 1 At the entrance to Church Park there are the remains of stonewalling. See photo below. Is this a historical feature/asset? 	There is no feature recorded here in the National Heritage List for England

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Debbie Shotter, Resident	Appendix 2 Surely the tulip tree at the Dolphin should be included in this appendix. It is a very prominent and attractive tree and makes an important contribution to the visual amenity of the centre of the village. Isn't it also supposed to be the largest tulip tree in Devon?	A Tree Protection Order has been applied for and refused, so the tulip tree is now listed in the Plan as a Notable non-designated tree in Appendix II.
Debbie Shotter, Resident	Appendix 3 The green space associated with the Dolphin should be included in this appendix.	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Debbie Shotter, Resident	I would like to add the following comments that do not fit within any of the standard response boxes above and may not be able to be included in the plan, but I would still like to raise them: 1. Can an aim to close the road running through the centre of the Dolphin be added to the plan? This would have community and safety benefits. It could be accessible for deliveries and emergency vehicles, if necessary, with the use of removable bollards. This would have a significant benefit to the centre of the village.	This would be outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
Debbie Shotter, Resident	2. Is there a way of encouraging land owners to undertake, or allow others to undertake, works that would improve access into and around the village? The access road into the centre of the village past Vicarage Farm, which now appears to be the preferred option for accessing the Church and Dolphin car parks could be improved with some minor road widening/visibility improvements. Realignment of the hedge-banks on the sharp corners would improve visibility and safety.	This would be outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
Debbie Shotter, Resident	3. Should alternative uses for the fire station be considered in case it is closed.	This would be outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
Debbie Shotter, Resident	4. To aid possible developers, businesses and home owners it would be helpful if guidance could be provided somewhere on some of the requirements referred to in the plan, such as how to construct traditional Devon banks, natural stone walls (dry and mortared), recommended tree and hedge plants, sustainable urban drainage, sources of appropriate materials, etc.	This would be outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
Debbie Shotter, Resident	5. Could guidance be provided to businesses and home owners on how they could separate their surface water from their foul water drainage to reduce the existing hydraulic load on the sewer running down past Walkespool and the sewage treatment works. It would also help if South West Water could be encouraged to improve the conditions of their sewers if this is part of the problem.	Outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan. Kingston Parish Council has an ongoing dialogue with South West Water
Debbie Shotter, Resident	6. In an ideal world it would be great if a new parking area to serve the Church, Dolphin, Reading Room and walkers could be provided close to the centre of the village. This would allow the existing parking area to the Dolphin to be changed to grass/planting, which would effectively create a village green in the centre of the village. It would be a great benefit to the community, would enhance the visual amenity of the village and improve the setting of the adjacent listed buildings. A sensitively designed car park, such as that at Buckfast Abbey, could use high quality materials and landscaping to achieve an attractive parking area. The land to the north of the Church would be ideal, but other locations may be	At present no appropriate space is available, so the issue of parking in Kingston has been included in the Community Action Plan for the Parish Council to keep under review.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	possible. This may be hard to achieve due to land ownership and cost issues, but surely it would be a good proposal to aim for?	
Debbie Shotter, Resident	<p>7. If the housing needs register has a need for smaller affordable homes could exception sites be actively pursued in order to enable the community to control the location and quality of housing provided? Personally I believe that a terrace of small dwellings facing directly onto one of the existing roads immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary would be the best way of achieving this. See image below.</p> 	Noted
Hilary Winter, Devon Countryside Access Forum	KNP7 and KNP13 Public rights of way should be included in the Plan and associated policies. The Devon Countryside Access Forum Position Statement is attached for information and guidance. Aspects related to this could be included in KNP 7 or KNP 1	Noted
Kevin Shotter, Resident	KNP1 There are inconsistencies with the settlement boundary that should be resolved. Surely all properties that are part of the village, and directly attached to it, should be included within the boundary. Vicarage Farm for example. Shouldn't the boundary follow that of the Undeveloped Coast?	The settlement/development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Kevin Shotter, Resident	KNP2 Can a clause be included to encourage existing properties to comply with these requirements, especially when being extended? Could biodiversity enhancements be encouraged such as new ponds, native planting, orchards, etc.?	Where planning permission is required then the Neighbourhood Plan, when made, will be a material consideration in planning decisions. Biodiversity encouragement is a subject for the Community Action Plan
Kevin Shotter, Resident	KNP3 Can a clause be included to encourage existing properties to undertake works to discharge their surface water to soakaways or SUDS systems to reduce the existing hydraulic load on our sewage treatment works?	Outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan
Kevin Shotter, Resident	KNP5 Can it be stressed that affordable exception sites will have to comply with the other requirements of the plan, particularly Design & Construction as there may be pressure to reduce standards to make this sort of scheme viable.	This is covered in KNP2 and in the JLP policy DEV10

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Kevin Shotter, Resident	KNP6 Why can't this policy also apply to replacement dwellings?	This policy is consistent with current law.
Kevin Shotter, Resident	KNP11 The current external lighting around the Dolphin cannot comply with this policy and causes a nuisance to surrounding residents and must affect the bat population as detailed in the 'Wildlife site resource map and species information for neighbourhood planning' document. If this policy is to be included in the plan then shouldn't existing lighting that does not comply with it be dealt with through negotiation with the owners?	Outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan
Kevin Shotter, Resident	KNP12 Should it be made clear that the whole of the property associated with the Dolphin should be safeguarded, including the carpark, green space, watercourse and tulip tree?	The whole property is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Kevin Shotter, Resident	Should this section refer to the fire station building? Can the building be classed as an important community asset so that if the fire station is closed its use as some form of community building is protected? It may even help persuade the fire service not to close it if they think it will not have such a high resale value.	The Fire Station is leased from the Flete Estate. Designation as an asset of community value is outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan.
Kevin Shotter, Resident	KNP13 The green space associated with the Dolphin should be included in this policy. It is probably the most important green space right in the centre of the village, is adjacent to listed buildings and community facilities. As it is owned by a commercial organisation wishing to maximise profits at any cost this area must be given maximum protection.	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Kevin Shotter, Resident	KNP15 Can the policy include a proposal for any new equipment to be housed in purpose made/built enclosures that fit into the locality rather than using the standard unsightly boxes, etc.?	Noted, no change made to KNP15 as 96% of respondents agreed.
Kevin Shotter, Resident	Appendix 1 At the entrance to Church Park there are the remains of stonewalling. See photo below. Is this a historical feature/asset? 	There is no feature recorded here in the National Heritage List for England
Kevin Shotter, Resident	Appendix 2 Surely the tulip tree at the Dolphin should be included in this appendix. It is a very prominent and attractive tree and makes an important contribution to the visual amenity of the centre of the village. Isn't it also supposed to be the largest tulip tree in Devon?	A Tree Protection Order has been applied for and refused, so the tulip tree is now listed in the Plan as a Notable non-designated tree in Appendix II.
Kevin Shotter, Resident	Appendix 3 The green space associated with the Dolphin should be included in this appendix.	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Kevin Shotter, Resident	I would like to add the following comments that do not fit within any of the standard response boxes above and may not be able to be included in the plan, but I would still like to raise them: 1. Can an aim to close the road running through the centre of the Dolphin be added to the plan? This would have community and safety benefits. It could be accessible for deliveries and emergency vehicles, if necessary, with the use of removable bollards. This would have a significant benefit to the centre of the village.	This would be outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
Kevin Shotter, Resident	2. Is there a way of encouraging land owners to undertake, or allow others to undertake, works that would improve access into and around the village? The access road into the centre of the village past Vicarage Farm, which now appears to be the preferred option for accessing the Church and Dolphin car parks could be improved with some minor road widening/visibility improvements. Realigning the hedge-banks on the sharp corners would improve visibility and safety.	This would be outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
Kevin Shotter, Resident	3. Should alternative uses for the fire station be considered in case it is closed.	This would be outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
Kevin Shotter, Resident	4. To aid possible developers, businesses and home owners it would be helpful if guidance could be provided somewhere on some of the requirements referred to in the plan, such as how to construct traditional Devon banks, natural stone walls (dry and mortared), recommended tree and hedge plants, sustainable urban drainage, sources of appropriate materials, etc.	This would be outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
Kevin Shotter, Resident	5. Could guidance be provided to businesses and home owners on how they could separate their surface water from their foul water drainage to reduce the existing hydraulic load on the sewer running down past Walkespool and the sewage treatment works. It would also help if South West Water could be encouraged to improve the conditions of their sewers if this is part of the problem.	Outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan. Kingston Parish Council has an ongoing dialogue with South West Water
Kevin Shotter, Resident	6. In an ideal world it would be great if a new parking area to serve the Church, Dolphin, Reading Room and walkers could be provided close to the centre of the village. This would allow the existing parking area to the Dolphin to be changed to grass/planting, which would effectively create a village green in the centre of the village. It would be a great benefit to the community, would enhance the visual amenity of the village and improve the setting of the adjacent listed buildings. A sensitively designed car park, such as that at Buckfast Abbey, could use high quality materials and landscaping to achieve an attractive parking area. The land to the north of the Church would be ideal, but other locations may be possible. This may be hard to achieve due to land ownership and cost issues, but surely it would be a good proposal to aim for?	At present no appropriate space is available, so the issue of parking in Kingston has been included in the Community Action Plan for the Parish Council to keep under review.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Kevin Shotter, Resident	<p>7. If the housing needs register has a need for smaller affordable homes could exception sites be actively pursued in order to enable the community to control the location and quality of housing provided? Personally I believe that a terrace of small dwellings facing directly onto one of the existing roads immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary would be the best way of achieving this. See image below.</p> 	Noted
Laura and Rebecca Cole, Suburban Scope Ltd, landowner	Vision We fully acknowledge the importance of ensuring a vibrant, healthy and prosperous future for Kingston especially by encouraging a balanced community of all age groups and income levels.	Support welcomed
Suburban Scope Ltd	Objectives Generally agree but the objectives are, in many cases, unworkable without private sector encouragement.	noted
Laura and Rebecca Cole, Suburban Scope Ltd, landowner	KNP1 You should look more carefully at the village settlement boundary.	The settlement/development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Suburban Scope Ltd	Whilst the principles of the draft neighbourhood plan are acceptable, there are several inconsistencies (how can you restrict development yet create a sustainable village?) which together with the objectives set out in paragraph 2.11 suggests the aims cannot be readily or easily achieved, we feel further analysis is required.	The Plan welcomes development of the right sort and in the right place. See section 4.19
Suburban Scope Ltd	The draft plan makes it clear the Parish should be made “more sustainable for existing and future residents”, the plan should “foster a vibrant healthy and prosperous future”, ensure a “sufficient number of principal residences”, create “entry level homes for local people” but contrary to what is suggested in paragraph 4.19, the Plan is clearly anti-development. How can you deliver the sustainable development that you crave by only promoting small scale (infill) development on “suitable small sites, page 19?	The Plan is not anti-development
Suburban Scope Ltd	KNP2 New development should be of high quality design but development (to achieve this) must be profitable.	Noted
Suburban Scope Ltd	KNP3 Severn Trent Water are committed to improving sewage capacity with any new development.	The water provider for Kingston is South West Water

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Suburban Scope Ltd	KNP5 paragraph 1 contradicts the basic sustainability aims of the Plan. Furthermore, construction costs of solely building a terrace of 2 bedroom properties using 'innovative low carbon construction techniques', (paragraph 6) which would bring new employment skills, can only be subsidised by the construction/sale of a much larger house(s). If the plan's proposals can only happen with private sector investment the financial viability of only building small houses should be taken into consideration.	Noted
Suburban Scope Ltd	Furthermore paragraph 5 of KPN5 makes suggestion of an "exception site" being welcomed however the coordinated opposition to the application by Vicarage Park for the most suitable and uncontentious exception site, hidden from the Village (and posing no harm to the AONB), proves this not to be the case. The Vicarage Park site was unfairly, misleadingly and inaccurately portrayed (as being a 50 home site) and yet still received many positive comments by Kingston residents.	Noted
Suburban Scope Ltd	KNP7 Sympatetic and excellent design should be permitted in the AONB.	AONB Policy applies
Laura and Rebecca Cole, Suburban Scope Ltd, landowner	KNP12 paragraph 1 suggests development supporting the vitality of the village plus (paragraph 3) priority will be given to providing/enhancing local facilities should be given greater prominence in the Plan. Your paragraph 8.1 accepts the plan's proposals will only happen with "private sector investment" so why is the plan so negative, anti-development and discouraging for private enterprise? You had the opportunity of working with VPL to create a special and unique scheme which would satisfy many of the aims of the draft plan, yet the chance to provide "affordable and entry level housing", plus satisfy the aims of KNP 12 and add to the provision of additional open spaces were ignored	Noted
Laura and Rebecca Cole, Suburban Scope Ltd, landowner	KNP13 The entrance to Westerntown and the entrance to the VPL site is incorrectly shown on page 47.	Plan is same as the old South Hams Local Plan. Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Linda Watson, Resident	Vision NPPF: paragraph 16 d) requires plans to contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals; KNP 2.9 is ambiguous as living country village is not explained and has no agreed definition or meaning. Also the vision should embrace the entire parish and not just the main settlement. The AONB aspect needs better explanation too. Whilst this designation does give the landscape protection it is likely that the landscape of the parish and its surroundings is what is significant not the restrictions imposed by legislation. The points made by the community in 2.8 ought to be more clearly integrated into 2.9 as this must surely be the source of the vision. The purpose and source of KNP 2.10 is unclear. Is it an explanation of the Vision or a list of objectives to	This strapline was set by the local community during the early stages of the plan process. We now clarify that in referring to "village" we incorporate the whole parish.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>deliver the Vision? If the latter is 2.11 redundant? This ambiguity should be avoided.</p> <p>It may be that this lack of clarity is causing concern across the parish. It was upsetting to be told by an elderly resident of Kingston that "I'm not even looking at the plan as it contains nothing for the young people of the village and it is this attitude that will see the fire station close" Although there appears to be a misunderstanding in this comment it is hoped that this attitude isn't shared across the parish.</p>	
Linda Watson, Resident	<p>Objectives Does this his refers to 2.11? or 2.10 & 2.11?</p>	The Objectives have been clarified.
Linda Watson, Resident	<p>2.11 Point 2 Surely the current age of the residents suggests that within the life of the KNP many will require assisted living or even a care home if we intend to house our aging population. Other NP have consider this a means of freeing up properties for younger residents.</p>	The size and potential within Kingston does not support this at present.
Linda Watson, Resident	<p>2.11 Point 5 The parish heritage cannot be conserved and enhanced until it is more fully identified. So an objective ought to be the compilation of a Local List as recommended by Historic England.</p>	See Appendix 1 for the link to the Historic England list. Now included in the referred to Character Assessment
Linda Watson, Resident	<p>KNP1: Development and the Settlement Boundary Settlement Boundary</p> <p>It is worth having a clear definition of a settlement boundary and fuller criteria for its selection as has been provided as an Appendix of Thurlstone`s Neighbourhood Plan included below. This would allow a more informed discussion of whether it is correct to adopt the settlement boundary included in the South Hams Local Plan 25 years ago. It is also worth noting that the Settlement Boundary and Development Boundary are the same in Thurlestone`s definition. Is this the case for Kingston? Lack of clarity here creates ambiguity!</p> <p>A settlement boundary is a line drawn around a settlement that demarcates the built form from the surrounding countryside. The purpose of the settlement boundary is to mark the limits of settlements and to define where planning policies apply in order to prevent encroachment into the countryside. Different criteria-based policies apply either side of the line.</p> <p>The criteria used in this Plan for deciding the settlement boundaries were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly defined physical features were used where appropriate e.g. walls, fences, roads, streams, field boundaries, hedgerows etc. - Curtilages of dwellings were included, unless (1) functionally separate to the dwelling, or (2) where the land has the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. - Recreational and amenity open space at the edge of settlement was included only where the land is surrounded by the built form of the settlement. - Freestanding, individual or groups of dwellings, farm buildings or other structures detached or peripheral to the built form of the settlement, were excluded. <p>As currently presented the review of the Kingston`s Settlement Boundary lacks rigor. That it was fit for purpose 25 years ago does</p>	The settlement/ development boundary in the Plan has been defined and replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>not make it appropriate for the next 15+ years. Circumstances have changed and will continue to change especially if the changes requested by the parishioners for additional housing etc. are incorporated.</p> <p>The current Settlement Boundary appears to pass through property curtilages although the size of the map included in the document makes observation difficult. I have been advised by a planning consultant that If the settlement is rural, the gardens fall within the definition of ‘previously development land’ and in practice the lines should follow the back gardens as they properly form part of the ‘settlement’ and cannot reasonably be described as falling within ‘open countryside’</p> <p>In addition Historic England also highlights the archaeological potential of historic rear plots in Historic England Advice Note1 p4. So if settlement boundaries should include back gardens that of Kingston appears to have been drawn far too tightly. Therefore Kingston`s current settlement boundary could be considered incorrect by ignoring curtilages and must be reconsidered.</p> <p>In addition it omits properties and their curtilages which are shown on the Tithe Map and subsequent historic maps and only partially recognises the historic Medieval Settlement Boundary which is include on the HER. So the current text (see 3.3) is incorrect as the proposed Settlement Boundary does not follow the ancient outline of the village. The NP process provides the opportunity to rectify the mistakes and omissions of the out of date development plan (1995-2011)SHLP. This should become an objective of the KNP and should not to carry forward an incorrect and out of date Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>To correct the Settlement Boundary requires a clear rational. This could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Recognition of Historic Environment Record MDV 19442 (VII to Late Medieval Settlement in the Parish of Kingston) https://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/ 2 .Inclusion of all buildings and their curtilages on the 1841 Tithe Map, First Edition OS Map 1885 and Second Edition OS Map 1906 (Readily available on Devon`s http://map.devon.gov.uk/dccviewer/) 3. The Settlement Boundary should include the curtilages of the properties included within the Boundary. <p>N.B. Careful consideration must be given to the farmsteads within village when reconsidering the Settlement Boundary. Of the 14 farms in the parish of Kingston, 6 farms were located within the village. Evidence of each the village farmsteads survives some with their farmhouse and/or agricultural buildings and Torr Farm remains a working farm. The survival of these farms is evidence of the settlement`s history and heritage and a significant characteristic of Kingston village`s identity. The home fields which still remain within the curtilages of the village farmsteads contribute to the story of past farming practice. Therefore these farmsteads and home fields should be recognised by the settlement boundary as a legitimate part of the village`s history. It is certainly wrong to exclude farms peripheral to the settlement as</p>	<p>The Character Assessment has been revised and is now referred to in the Plan</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>suggested in 3.3. Basically the farms were the raison d`etre of the village, intermingled with dwellings which housed either the farm workers or crafts people required to sustain the village. Respect for the predominantly rural character and historic settlement patterns is noted by AONB in Planning for South Devon AONB p.43</p>	
<p>Linda Watson, Resident</p>	<p>Consideration should also be given to the hamlet at Torr from Higher Great Torr to Lower Torr. This modest settlement ought not to be omitted from KNP and may provide opportunities for managed development.</p>	<p>A site in the Torr settlement was investigated and assessed and rejected in the Site Assessment for planning and landscape reasons</p>
<p>Linda Watson, Resident</p>	<p>KNP1: Development and the Settlement Boundary (cont) Development Boundary: This has not been clearly defined. The text implies that this is the same as the Settlement Boundary. Once Kingston`s Settlement Boundary has been more accurately established the `previously development land` and other sites for additional buildings should be identified within in the settlement. This is surely an expectation of a NP in delivering the management of change. It can be determined whether there is sufficient land within the Settlement Boundary to deliver in KNP5. If there is sufficient sites the Settlement Boundary and Development Boundary can be the same. If this cannot be achieved a Development Boundary needs to be established to identify additional sites. There is little point in quantifying what is required in KNP5 if the KPC do not `cease the nettle` and indicate where development can be located. Managing change is the purpose of a plan. According to the advice and guidance `Neighbourhood Plans should shape and direct development` NPPF (2018) clause 13 `to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built...` Gov.UK PPG `it must be primarily about the use and development of land and buildings.` CPRE `Choose where new homes, shops, offices and other development should be built.` `a neighbourhood plan should address the development and use of land and it could set requirements to make proposed development acceptable.` NPlans and the Historic Environment: Historic England Advice Note 11 As KNP1 is the means of delivering the policies which follow in the current document it might be more helpful if it concludes the KNP as it is summative and should show where change can be incorporated. Accepting the Boundaries of KNP1 before the majority of the policies are presented suggests the NP has been derived inappropriately. For instance without reading the content of the NP it is hard to know if KNP1 Point 1 can be achieved especially as none of the intended sites have been identified. Also there is no discussion on key character givers to either the settlements or the parish which precedes the presentation of the Settlement/ Development Boundary. Surely this understanding of</p>	<p>The settlement/ development boundary in the Plan has been defined and replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.</p> <p>This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>the parish`s characteristics together with the results of the questionnaire must inform the Development Boundary and be used to navigate and understand the KNP.</p> <p>Historic England Advice Note 11, p.4 notes that planning policies should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, and establish or maintain a strong sense of place. It goes on to advise that a character assessment is an important tool to articulate what is distinctive about a place.</p> <p>Surely a boundary can not be established before local distinctiveness is understood and clearly presented at the outset of the NP.</p>	<p>The Character Assessment has been revised and is now referred to in the Plan</p>
<p>Linda Watson, Resident</p>	<p>KNP2: Design and Construction</p> <p>Again for readers and users of this NP this character assessment of the parish including its settlements needs to be presented so that this policy can inform understanding and has meaning as recommended by Advice Note11.* Without this understanding some of the points included in KNP2 are ambiguous. Also I think the list is unnecessarily long and wordy.</p> <p>*If it makes sense to locate the character assessment elsewhere in the Plan it is vital that its location is given here.</p> <p>In the absence of a character assessment or Conservation Area Appraisals I will summarise some of the key characteristics of Kingston village`s townscape. The village is essentially made up of two architectural typologies: the Vernacular and the Post War. The Vernacular is the cottage building type derived from the use of local materials (mud, rubble and straw in the case of Kingston) construction by local builders and/or home owners to accommodate local need (which were very modest in scale when the cottage architecture of Kingston was created). There was likely no aesthetic ambition at the outset although the Vernacular of Kingston has a distinct but unintentional appearance through the use of local materials and their limitations. Some farmhouses have aesthetic ambition such as the use of symmetry and higher floor to ceiling heights etc.</p> <p>The Post War is derived from a different circumstance by using a palette of `factory` produced modern materials (including in the case of Kingston mostly concrete blocks, cement render and concrete or clay roof tiles) Aesthetic ambition together with the use of recent materials presents a very different appearance. Also of note is that many of these buildings are bungalows although some are two storey dwellings of varying scales. So to which should the proposed interventions respond?</p> <p>Also of note is how buildings of different ages are positioned on their curtilage and address the street. For instance the vernacular usually addresses the street with limited if any front garden. Sometimes there are back gardens and in other circumstances ground for a kitchen garden/allotment is elsewhere in the parish. Post War buildings tend to be located in the centre of their plot immediately creating a very different characteristic to the vernacular. So how buildings address the street is a very important character giver too. Given the time there`s a lot more I could write here!</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment, the Character Assessment is now referenced in the Plan. We have amended it to incorporate your helpful suggestions</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>Although this summary is a generalisation I hope it helps to understand why KNP2 needs some revision</p> <p>KNP2 All new development should be <i>derived from the site and its context</i> :</p> <p>Point 1 Having spent my working life teaching architects how to achieve `high design quality` I can assure the Parish Council that this is so subjective such that it is meaningless statement. `derived from site context is similar to points 2,3, 4 & 5 so should be relocated as a summative statement at the outset.</p> <p>Point 2 This ought to read ` respect local character to safe guard local distinctiveness` (<i>These will need to be quantified as noted above in order that the KPC can be informed when they assess an application for change</i>)</p> <p>Point 3, 4, 5 OK</p> <p>Point 6 Given many of the parish boundaries are Devon hedgebanks this should be taken into account. Also several of the village buildings are cob and it is possible that boundary walls may have been and still rendered cob too as in other Devon settlements. So to be so specific here is inappropriate. Perhaps point3 should embrace the boundary construction by including buildings and their boundaries should be in scale and keeping..... (also shortens the long list of points)</p> <p>Likewise the content of Point 7 is so similar to Point 4. So Point 7 should be removed and Point 4 modified.</p> <p>Point 8 & 9 OK</p> <p>Point 10 could read modern technologies and building materials to maximise...and thus remove the last phrase. And Point 11 just adds some detail to Point 10 so should incorporate in 10.</p> <p>Point 12 some contradiction with Point 8 as last phrase of Point 12 implies well external space. So which is more important safety or dark skies?</p> <p>Point 13 whilst parking is a problem and this Point presents a solution it may make it difficult to respect the traditional street property relationship characteristic of the village. Also it will not solve the problem of visitor parking as mention in the questionnaire.</p> <p>Point 14 May be this should include the keeping of animals e.g. cockerels, dogs etc</p> <p>It would also be good to cross reference the above points to the results in the questionnaire to give them greater credibility. Also it is worth considering how this list relates to development proposals across the parish outside of the settlement of Kingston. .” Historic England Advice Note 11 points out that <i>Addressing how best to integrate new development into an existing place can encourage people to be innovative</i>. How will KPC accommodate this?</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. We have made some changes to KNP2. The issue of parking has been added to the Community Action Plan.</p>
Linda Watson, Resident	<p>KNP3 Flooding and Sewerage Fine.</p>	Support welcomed
Linda Watson, Resident	<p>KNP4 Renewable Energy 3.16 should include all the HERs across the parish and the setting of other Heritage Assets.</p>	Section 3.16 is amended

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Linda Watson, Resident	Point4 Some contradiction here. Looking at the questionnaire results shows 56% of community support solar panels. Surely this should be recognised in the policy!	Appropriate siting is supported under KNP4 (2)
Linda Watson, Resident	KNP5 Housing Development New Housing: The need for affordable housing is well put although restricting it to mainly 2 bedrooms means families with two children of both sexes could not be accommodated (KNP5 Point 2) Given 51% of the villagers thought this (just of half) should this be reconsidered? (A pity nothing has been mentioned about the aging population. Better provision could release family homes with only one occupant for instance) Also it should also be recognised that small sites with very few units can be more expensive to develop.	KNP5 has been drafted to reflect the majority view from the community questionnaire and KNP5 (2) now includes 3 bedrooms
Linda Watson, Resident	What exactly does scope for a suitable rural exception site mean? (4.8) Is it a parcel of land already dedicated or is it up to landowners to speculate where it might be? This appears to be a very negative and time wasting approach to the provision of housing.	There is now a definition of an exception site now included in the Glossary
Linda Watson, Resident	Surely to encourage the additional affordable housing (4.8) it is the responsibility of KPC to identify suitable sites. How to manage change as well as suggest what is needed is the purpose of the NP. Without any identified development sites if appropriate housing is proposed on a non designated site the Councillors will have to give the application much greater consideration and will certainly lose control of the development in the parish.(especially if won on appeal!) And not being `welcoming` by having no dedicated sites may keep house providers away. The lack of clarity with regards the potential development sites makes assessing the merits of the NP very difficult. Site Assessments: this lacks transparency as the sites and their assessments are not presented nor a link provided. 4.18 Admits defeat with regards potential development sites however the lack of transparency of the site assessments make the reason for this conclusion unclear. Also there is no reference to where the clear criteria for new build is located in NP unless it is contained within KNP5. I assume KNP2 also applies. This should be stated here.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish. See section 4.14 - 4.18. The Site Assessment has been available on the website since its completion in 2017 and as support for the Reg14 consultation
Linda Watson, Resident	KNP6: Principal Residence Requirement It is difficult to form an opinion here given the lack of evidence and the problems St. Ives is now facing. Also interesting that 51% of those completing the questionnaire agreed 2nd homes and holiday lets help to sustain the village. They employ a lot of villagers!	64% of the responses to the Community questionnaire agreed that second homes and holiday lets are undermining local services and village character.
Linda Watson, Resident	KNP10: Heritage and Conservation Much more could be included on the character of the parish's heritage. Whilst the protection given to the designated heritage assets by the legislation is of note to list the characteristics that gives the parish its distinctiveness is much more important. It is the identification, analysis, agreement and presentation of a list of values which contribute to Kingston's significance which will allow the KPC to be better informed when judging an application. In addition it will also inform the designers of change and intervention. This understanding will be required if a Strategic	The Character Assessment is now referenced in the Plan.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>Environment Assessment is necessary when/if potential development sites could affect the significance of a heritage asset or its setting. The latter is particularly relevant in an AONB. In the case of non-designated heritage assets e.g. HER Monuments they are a `material consideration` when determining a planning application. So they are given `protection` making the last comment of 5.19 redundant.</p> <p>Policy KNP10 should read (to place it in the context of the current NPPF)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kingston Parish`s heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations; 2. Where appropriate heritage assets should be put to viable new uses consistent with their conservation; 3. Development should sustain and enhance the significance of Kingston Parish`s heritage assets and their setting and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; 4. Also an appraisal and management plan of the two existing conservation areas could be undertaken, but by whom? SHDC don`t have the resources. Also to combine the 2 Cas may not comply with NPPF CI 186. 5. Also a Local List could be compiled of additional heritage assets across the parish using Local Heritage Listing, Historic England Advice Note 7 	<p>Section 5.19 has now been extended to refer to the National Heritage List and the HER database (now 5.20)</p> <p>KNP10 reflects these views as received in the community questionnaire</p> <p>A Conservation Area review has been included in the Community Action Plan.</p>
<p>Martin Lee, Agent</p>	<p>KNP1 Development & the Settlement Boundary</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 - Vicarage Park development proposals are restricted to within the `bowl` and lower part of the site. Great care has been taken to respect views to listed buildings and across the AONB. b) The plan clearly recognises that the village`s current demographic (54% of the population over 60) and house prices averaging £365,000, make it impossible for most younger people and families to remain in, or move to, the village. It states that limited development of smaller marketpriced and affordable houses is needed to ensure a sustainable, living country village with `a mixed community in age, income and occupation`. c) To satisfy the need for affordable housing, identified in the 2016 Housing Needs Survey, a small mixed development will be required in which small market-priced units fund the development of affordable homes. d) Paragraph 1 of KNP1 states that development will be permitted inside the village settlement boundary, subject to specified conditions. However, because the settlement boundary is so very tightly drawn around the current built area of the village, the plan`s aim of achieving housing sustainability can then only be met by a small development outside the settlement boundary. e) Paragraph 2 of KNP 1 states that development outside the settlement boundary `will be strictly controlled and permitted only where it can be delivered sustainably and requires a countryside location or will meet a proven local need which cannot be met 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted b) Noted c) Noted d) This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish. e) Noted f) This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>inside the settlement boundary.’ The latest proposals for Vicarage Park completely accord with that policy requirement. Yet, the recent planning application for what would be a small development on the edge of the settlement boundary met strong, organised opposition and did not receive active support from the Parish Council.</p> <p>f) To achieve the plan’s objectives to ensure a sustainable future for Kingston, the Parish Council will need to recognise the need to either support appropriate development proposals on a site, outside the settlement boundary, or consider amending the draft boundary to include a suitable site, such as Vicarage Park, would positively enable the development required in a manner which best meets the policy criteria contained in the Plan.</p>	
<p>Martin Lee, Agent</p>	<p>g) The entire Parish (even inside the existing settlement boundary) lies within the AONB and is covered by the same landscape designation. Accordingly, any proposed development will involve developing ‘within the AONB’. Development outside the defined boundary, of a small area of Vicarage Park, would be in keeping with the scale of the village, strictly controlled and in the public interest. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of the village of Kingston by providing new public right of way and public recreational space, with an excellent mix of open market and affordable homes which enables resolution of the village’s sewerage problems is very much in the public interest and so a small development as proposed which has minimal adverse impact on the AONB should be supported. Scattered individual dwellings on separate sites would not</p>	<p>g) Noted</p>
<p>Martin Lee, Agent</p>	<p>KNP2 a) The latest proposals for Vicarage Park meet all of the 14 listed criteria.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Martin Lee, Agent</p>	<p>KNP3 Flooding & Sewerage a) The latest proposals for Vicarage Park would satisfy all 3 policy criterion, but most importantly criterion 2 by requiring the South West Water to remedy all existing shortcomings for the benefit of the whole village.</p>	<p>Noted. KNP3 (2) is amended - see Environment Agency response.</p>
<p>Martin Lee, Agent</p>	<p>KNP5 Housing Development a) The latest proposals for Vicarage Park would satisfy 5 of the 6 criteria. b) Our support for the policy is caveated by the following comments, reservations and requested amendments: i. Criterion 1 & 2 – our comments in relation to these are set out in our response to KNP1 above; ii. Criterion 4 - In view of the pressing need for housing identified in 4.12, the proposal in 4.9 for 6-8 affordable houses over the plan period to 2034 (two per year on average) does not appear to be sufficient to ensure a sustainable future for the parish. The 2016 Housing Needs Survey by SHDC identified a need for six new housing association properties in the parish plus one help-to-buy property over the subsequent five-year period. No affordable housing has been built within the Parish since the date of the survey. It is now three years since the completion of the survey and it needs to be brought up to date to validate the</p>	<p>i. Noted ii. Noted</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	Neighbourhood Plan assumptions in relation to current affordable housing need.	
Martin Lee, Agent	<p>iii. The community opposition to the proposed development of Vicarage Park referred to in 4.15 was based on a very misleading assessment and representation of the scale of the development proposed on this site by the Neighbourhood Plan consultant, Lee Bray. The assessment made the assumption/claim that the entire 2.2-hectare site would be fully developed for between 50-60 houses. The most recent proposals presented within the planning application which was current on the site at the time of that assessment made clear why a development on that scale was totally unrealistic. Despite the fact that the actual development proposals and submitted plans were badly misrepresented by this assessment, the KNDP survey in 2017 indicated that 33% of the respondents rated the site as definitely or possibly suitable for new homes. We consider the appraisal should be re-written and that a revised public consultation is essential to address the substantial and prejudicial misrepresentation perpetuated by that assessment through the survey process.</p> <p>iv. Our planning application submitted in November 2017 and refused in March 2019, which not only followed but fully addressed the results of extensive pre-application consultation with the village community, was for 11 units (3 affordable and 8 market) on less than 25% of the site. 25% of the site was proposed to be retained as agricultural pasture for private rental. 50% of the site was proposed to be new permanently publicly accessible open space with a new public right of way connecting western end of Kingston Footpath 4 to a point on the northern boundary close to the southern end of Kingston Footpath 6, thus providing valuable new community facilities in support of the aims of policy KNP12.</p> <p>v. Moving to Para 4.17- Site Assessments. Vicarage Park is assumed to be is one of ‘the 2 latter sites’. If so, we would take issue where it states that ‘Both of the latter sites are on raised ground, and their development could affect views across the AONB and to listed buildings’. The most recent proposals restricted housing to the lower part of the site and care has been taken to respect views to listed buildings and across the AONB.</p>	<p>iii. This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish, so the site appraisals are not being updated.</p> <p>iv. Noted</p> <p>v. Noted</p>
Martin Lee, Agent	<p>KNP6 Principal Residence Requirement</p> <p>a) Whilst a laudable policy there is insufficient evidence of imbalance in the housing market to justify a ‘principal residence’ policy of the form accepted for St Ives (see Independent Examiner’s Report).</p>	<p>The concern with the housing market in St Ives which formed the evidence base justifying in that Neighbourhood Plan a similar policy to KNP 6 was that 25% of the relevant properties were not occupied by a resident. In Kingston, as reported at Section 4.22, the equivalent percentage is 21% and that is considered sufficiently high to justify KNP 6, the purpose of which is to help prevent</p>

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
		that percentage increasing further.
Martin Lee, Agent	<p>KNP7 Protecting the Landscape & Biodiversity</p> <p>a) The latest proposals for Vicarage Park would satisfy all 6 of the criteria.</p> <p>b) The policy reference to the protection and enhancement of trees and hedges is positive and the latest proposals for Vicarage Park incorporate practical demonstration of how this principle policy aim may be put into proactive.</p> <p>c) Whilst there is no objection to this policy, we do question whether View 7 in Appendix IV (page 50) is actually taken from the public right of way crossing Vicarage Park or whether it is taken from further up the field off the current alignment of this pathway.</p>	<p>a) and b) noted.</p> <p>c) View 7 is taken from the public footpath.</p>
Martin Lee, Agent	<p>KNP9 Protecting Agricultural Land</p> <p>a) The recent planning application on Vicarage Park clarifies the relative agricultural value of the land proposed for development.</p>	Noted
Martin Lee, Agent	<p>KNP10 Heritage & Conservation</p> <p>a) The Conservation Officer supports both the principle and design concept of the latest development proposals for Vicarage Park. The latest proposals for Vicarage Park satisfy all 3 policy criteria.</p>	Noted
Martin Lee, Agent	<p>KNP11 Dark Skies & Tranquillity</p> <p>a) The latest proposals for Vicarage Park satisfy all 3 criteria.</p>	Noted
Martin Lee, Agent	<p>KNP12 Community Facilities & Infrastructure</p> <p>a) Paragraph 6.3 - should The Plan not promote improved public access through the village and wider countryside? It does not mention this specifically.</p>	Thank you for your comments, the parish is well provided with clearly signed paths and narrow lanes, especially the South West Coast path. These are well used by visitors and residents.
Martin Lee, Agent	<p>KNP13 Local Green Spaces</p> <p>a) Whilst there is no objection to the policy, we do take this opportunity to highlight an error evident within the last map extract in Appendix III where the boundary of Cuthay has been mistakenly extended to include the Westentown roadway.</p>	Plan is same as the old South Hams Local Plan. Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Martin Lee, Agent	<p>Section 8 – Delivery and Monitoring</p> <p>a) Paragraph 8.1 recognises the importance of private sector investment in the achievement of the plan’s objectives. We would welcome the opportunity to participate actively with KNPTG and KPC to ensure these objectives are met particularly in relation to enhancement and/or replacement of existing community facilities and services.</p>	Noted
Martin Lee, Agent	Accordingly, Vicarage Park Ltd. respectfully and formally request consideration be given to the amendment of the Plan to include: (i) an amendment to the proposed settlement development limit boundary to include an allocation for housing, and (ii) the allocation of new, public recreational space and provision of a new public right of way, within Vicarage Park in accordance with the	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish. The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	latest proposals for development of the site considered under planning application 4068/17/OPA.	with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Stuart McFarlane, Resident	Objectives, KNP1, KNP5 Whilst in general agreement with most of the stated objectives I think too much emphasis is placed on low cost and social housing. I doubt that there is sufficient infill land to accommodate such development and therefore some flexibility regarding the development boundary should be allowed.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish
Susie Cattley, non resident	KNP1 Surely the natural boundary of the village settlement (ie inner Kingston) follows the road and the hedgerows between Vicarage Farm and Four Cross? The unnecessarily tight development boundary proposed by KNPG will exclude the possibility of the future use of an area of land within the village at Vicarage Park, which could well be used for the benefit of the community.	noted
Susie Cattley, non resident	KNP5 There is a need for more housing in Kingston which would be suitable for disabled people and for an aging population. Some people may already live in the village, but wish to downsize. Most older properties are not suitable for adaptation. Modern means of internet communication has made the disadvantages of limited public transport, shopping facilities, work opportunity and access to medical and residential care will become less of a problem for the elderly people who wish to remain in Kingston for the rest of their days, particularly if family support is there. Young people want to make a living locally, and can't do so without the availability of the sort of jobs that sustained the village economy in previous years.	The plan recognises the need for housing to meet local needs.
Susie Cattley, non resident	There is a need for 'affordable' housing to attract and retain a younger age group and families, in order to achieve a 'vibrant and sustainable' village for the future. The community will no longer be viable if changes are not introduced. Restricting the number of units to be built to between 6-8 units to be built in the village until 2034, is plainly unrealistic. It is also unnecessary, in view of the housing shortage nationally and locally.	The numbers referred to in section 4.9 are not a limit, but are based on the Housing Needs Survey.
Susie Cattley, non resident	There is suitable land currently owned by VPL within the village envelope and available for a carefully planned and designed, modest development, including the provision of adequate and appropriate access, which could be achieved without undue impact on the a.o.n.b status of the village. Sadly, a degree of nimbyism seems to be unduly influencing some decisions relating to this sort of development in Kingston.	Noted
Susie Cattley, non resident	The latest (2017) revised proposals from VPL for a small scale, sensitive development would seem to meet all requirements and criteria. ie: 11 units, 3 affordable and 8 market, with safe, improved access and improved services, without upsetting any bats or badgers. Unfortunately the Consultant advising KNPG has seriously misrepresented the VPL application of November 2017. which was turned down in 2019. Some of the advice given to KNPG was based on seriously false assumptions. In 1992 Mr Bray, their chosen "Independent Consultant" (was then working in the SHDC	Noted

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	Planning Dept) was also involved when similar problems arose - ie giving misleading information, and a degree of inaccuracy in planning detail, including boundary lines. This was in relation to the development of 6 affordable houses intended for local people at Great Orchard, (now called Westentown) Eventually a legal settlement was reached.	
Susie Cattley, non resident	My family moved to Robin's Farm in Kingston in 1947 and only left the village in 1991 because of old age and infirmity. Vicarage Park was in our ownership for nearly 70 years, until 2015 I have been involved in the village of Kingston all my life and care deeply about its future.	Noted
Tom Matthews, Resident	KNP4 As long as they are in keeping and unobtrusive, I think small scale renewable energy development should be actively encouraged (not just welcomed). This would hopefully encourage use of renewable energy installation at an individual dwelling level and help reduce the environmental footprint of the village.	The detail of KNP4 does support this.
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	Vision We fully acknowledge the importance of ensuring a vibrant, healthy and prosperous future for Kingston especially by encouraging a balanced community of all age groups and income levels	Support welcomed
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	KNP1 The plan clearly recognises that the village's current demographic (54% of the population over 60) and house prices averaging £365,000, make it impossible for most younger people and families to remain in, or move to, the village. It states that limited development of smaller market-priced and affordable houses is needed to ensure a sustainable, living country village with 'a mixed community in age, income and occupation'.	Noted
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	To satisfy the need for affordable housing, identified in the 2016 Housing Needs Survey, a small mixed development will be required in which small market-priced units fund the development of affordable homes.	Noted
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	Paragraph 1 of KNP1 states that development will be permitted inside the village settlement boundary, subject to specified conditions. However, because the settlement boundary is very tightly drawn around the current built area of the village, the plan's aim of achieving housing sustainability can only be met by a small development outside the settlement boundary.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	Paragraph 2 of KNP 1 states that development outside the settlement boundary 'will be strictly controlled and permitted only where it can be delivered sustainably and requires a countryside location or will meet a proven local need which cannot be met inside the settlement boundary.' Recent proposals for small developments on the edge of the settlement boundary met strong, organised opposition from many residents and were not supported by the Parish Council.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	To achieve the plan's objectives to ensure a sustainable future for Kingston, the Parish Council will need to support appropriate development proposals on a site, outside the settlement boundary, which best meets the criteria summarised in the plan. This will inevitably involve developing within a small area of the AONB, which is possible 'in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest'. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	the village of Kingston is very much in the public interest so a small development which has minimal impact on the AONB should be allowable.	
Vicarage Park Ltd	KNP5 VPL in principle supports the policies in KNP5, subject to the following comments	Support welcomed
Vicarage Park Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our comments on KNP5 paras 1 and 2 are set out in the response to KNP1 above 	Noted
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 4 - In view of the pressing need for housing identified in 4.12, the proposal in 4.9 for 6-8 affordable houses over the plan period to 2034 (two per year on average) does not appear to be sufficient to ensure a sustainable future for the parish. The 2016 Housing Needs Survey by SHDC identified a need for six new housing association properties in the parish plus one help-to-buy property. No affordable housing has been built since the date of the survey. 	Noted
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community opposition to VPL's site referred to in 4.15 was based on a very misleading assessment of the scale of the development proposed on this site by the consultant, Lee Bray. It made the assumption that the entire 2.2-hectare site would be fully developed with 50-60 houses. VPL has always regarded a development on this scale as being totally unrealistic. Despite the fact that our development plans were badly misrepresented, the KNDP survey in 2017 indicated that 33% of the respondents rated the site as definitely or possibly suitable for new homes. 	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our planning application submitted in November 2017 and refused in March 2019, which took into account extensive consultation with the village community, was for 11 units (3 affordable and 8 market) on less than 25% of the site. Much of the remainder of the site was proposed to be permanently publicly accessible open space which would provide facilities for the community, satisfying policy KNP12. 	Noted
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	KNP7 We do not object to this policy but would question whether View 7 in Appendix IV is actually taken from the public right of way crossing the VPL land or is it taken from further up the field?	View 7 is taken from the public footpath.
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	KNP13 We have no objection to the policies in KNP 13 in principle. However, the last map extract in Appendix III is incorrect. The boundary of Cuthay should not include the Westentown roadway.	Plan is same as the old South Hams Local Plan. Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Paul Batho and Andrew Cole, Vicarage Park Ltd, Landowner	Section 8 – Delivery and Monitoring Paragraph 8.1 recognises the importance of private sector investment in the achievement of the plan's objectives. We would welcome the opportunity to participate actively with KNPTG and KPC to ensure these objectives are met.	Noted
Jill D Uttley - resident	Objectives: Having lived and worked in this neighbourhood for 34 years I am concerned that Kingston is now becoming a village of retirees. We urgently need to attract more young middle income families in their 30s / 40s to keep an even balance in our	noted, but this was not identified as a priority in the Questionnaire responses.,

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	community (as there always has been). We have no affordable housing for professional families looking to make their 2 nd / 3 rd house move.	
Jill D Uttley - resident	KNP1 Boundary is far too narrow and restrictive.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Jill D Uttley - resident	KNP4 Everyone in this village, county, country should be committed to every type of renewable energy possible. We can't just push it somewhere else. Our future depends on it.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Jill D Uttley - resident	KNP5 In the 80s and 90s Kingston had a vibrant, very mixed population. Homes were available and affordable for young families who commuted from Kingston. We have small homes available BUT no longer for those mid bracket young families we very much need.	noted, but this was not identified as a priority in the Questionnaire responses.
Jill D Uttley - resident	KNP13 Area to the south of Morgan's Row can hardly be classed as an 'important open space' when privately owned and with no public access.	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Jill D Uttley - resident	Area to the right of entrance to Westentown contributes little to the visual character of the village. As a teacher I don't consider it a safe play area for children. Hardly safe by the road and at the entrance to an estate.	Noted
Lance Doswell - resident	KNP1 Settlement Boundary is looking incomplete and not including all the necessary area.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Jean Rosemary Barker - resident	KNP1 Map looks incomplete. Is it up to date.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Jean Rosemary Barker - resident	KNP2 What about the elderly?	KNP2 and KNP11 do support appropriately fitted security and safety lighting.
Jean Rosemary Barker - resident	KNP13 Don't see the point of area by Morgan's Row – invisible from the road – no access to public. What about area around the pub – more of a public space than Morgan's Row? Is it protected anyway?	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Eve Elizabeth White - resident	KNP1 On reflection and having been asked by several parishioners – perhaps this should be looked at again – concerns about being able to build within the curtilage of homes and clearer explanations of the boundary and why it is there.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Eve Elizabeth White - resident	Para 5.4: NB. Wonwell Court Farm (not mentioned) has been participating in various government wildlife / conservation schemes for the last 20 yrs+, due to its sensitive position on the mouth of Erme estuary and associated SSSI / Conservation Areas etc.	More detail is in the Character Assessment.
Eve Elizabeth White - resident	Appendix III (p46): Recreation Ground given by the Honourable Helen Mildmay-White.	Noted and amended
Graham Phillips - resident	KNP5 Any new Social Housing which is built must be included in the housing stock for the Kingston Local Lettings Plan.	Noted, see sections 4.4 and 4.5, KPC has committed to this.
Graham Phillips - resident	KNP12 In view of the threatened closure of our village fire station, can we include a statement: “For the continuing safety of our community and those vulnerable residents, Kingston must keep its long treasured Fire Station of 70 years a most valuable asset.”.	This is being dealt with by the Fire Service. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot make such a statement.
Adrian Lewis – resident and landowner	KNP1 We must safeguard, from development the pub car park and gardens and get the tree there protected.	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Adrian Lewis – resident and landowner	Development boundary should include all houses and gardens in the village.	The purpose of the settlement/ development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Adrian Lewis – resident and landowner	KNP4 Surely the more renewable energy the better! Development should be encouraged and on farms!	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Adrian Lewis – resident and landowner	KNP5 We need to allocate a site for development or it makes it easier for companies to develop one!	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.
Adrian Lewis – resident and landowner	KNP13 I fail to see how it is legal to make someone’s garden a Green Space.	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Matthew Stanesby - resident	Objectives Points are not clear in the books. I understand that the plan is trying to keep Kingston from over development but in my opinion is that not all development is bad. Do not stand in the way of progress.	Noted, the plan is not anti development (sections 3.2 and 4.19)
Matthew Stanesby	KNP1 Boundary stated is too tight and doesn’t even cover all of the village.	The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Matthew Stanesby	KNP4 The use of farm land for renewable energy sources when abiding by current legislation will not hinder the village.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Matthew Stanesby	KNP9 It is up to legislation within AONB and planning bodies as well as landowners to control farm development. Not up to this village plan.	This is very relevant in a rural parish plan
Matthew Stanesby	KNP11 A limited number of external lighting is / has added to safety in the village. No blanket ban is required.	Noted
Matthew Stanesby	KNP13 I agree with protecting green spaces, but this should not interfere with ownership ie no 4 a private garden.	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Matthew Stanesby	Basic Conditions Statement Not sure what relates to.	See Appendix V of the Plan
Matthew Stanesby	Statement of Consultation Not sure what relates to.	See Appendix V of the Plan
Matthew Stanesby -	Monitoring Framework Not sure what relates to.	See Section 8 of the Plan
Karen Freeman - resident	Vision The Kingston plan must be more “forward looking” with monitored progress for both young and old generations.	See Section 8 of the Plan
Karen Freeman - resident	KNP1 Residential properties that have been part of the village for hundreds of years are excluded! So I feel boundary lines are wrong.	The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Karen Freeman - resident	KNP2 New houses should have to provide suitable living space for no. of occupants. Not shoeboxes. Garden space for young and old to enjoy safely.	Noted, there are national guidelines and JLP policy DEV10
Karen Freeman - resident	KNP6 (4) For farms to survive sometimes they need to diversify. This doesn't support our farmers.	Overall the Neighbourhood Plan does encourage diversification.
Karen Freeman - resident	KNP14 (2a) Most redundant farm buildings would need a lot more than minimal alterations to make useable and secure.	Noted, KNP14 (2a) altered to restrict the policy to external alterations.
Karen Freeman - resident	Appendix II Tulip tree at Dolphin Inn is not on list why?	A Tree Protection Order has been applied for and refused, so the tulip tree is now listed in the Plan as a Notable non-designated tree in Appendix II.
Karen Freeman - resident	Basic Conditions Statement (4D) In encouraging new appropriate employment is likely to need redundant farm buildings.	See KNP14 point 2

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
John Howard Taylor - resident	KNP6 I would be happier if this section could also apply to the sale of existing homes, current or future. We suffered for 2 years when our now neighbours used the house as a holiday let half of the year. Now, as our other neighbour's house appears to have been sold, what sanctions are there to stop the new owners from using it as a holiday home, holiday let, or – more likely, an Air B and B property? Such matters affect the future of the village too!	This policy is consistent with current law.
John Howard Taylor - resident	The Final Step (ref Plan Summary document) On the numbers required to accept the plan, would it not be prudent (given the 2016 referendum repercussions) to go for a 55% or 60% acceptance level instead of a simple majority? At least it would give copper bottomed legitimacy to the result?	The Localism Act 2012 sets out that a simple majority is required.
Thelma Jane Rumsey - resident	KNP7 As a result of ash dieback, and the likely loss of a significant number of ash trees in the parish, I would like KNP7 to incorporate the 3/2/1 formula advised by the Devon Ash Dieback Resilience Forum to retain our treescape. They advise that 3 new trees should be planted for loss of a large tree, 2 for a medium tree and 1 tree for a small tree. NB This same formula could be applied for other trees.	Noted and included in the Community Action Plan.
Thelma Jane Rumsey - resident	KNP8 It would be beneficial if there was some way to include an effort to try and reduce the amount of fertiliser / slurry that runs off agricultural land (which we are protecting) into our rivers and estuaries (which we are also meant to be protecting).	This is outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan.
Thelma Jane Rumsey - resident	KNP9 It would be beneficial if there was some way to include an effort to try and reduce the amount of fertiliser / slurry that runs off agricultural land (which we are protecting) into our rivers and estuaries (which we are also meant to be protecting).	This is outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan
Beth Nichola Lewis – resident and landowner	Vision As a new home owner / builder I feel more opportunities should be given to the young people. The Plan is very stationary and not looking into the next generation. Small builds and affordable homes should be encouraged not hindered.	Noted, in Section 2.11 objectives
Beth Nichola Lewis	Objectives If the red bullet points are objectives (as not clearly stated).	The Objectives have been clarified.
Beth Nichola Lewis	KNP1 The boundary should include all houses and garden boundaries.	The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Beth Nichola Lewis	KNP4 Farmers should be allowed to use green energy should they choose. Land is already strongly protected.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Beth Nichola Lewis	KNP13 I don't not feel the pub garden should never be developed, it would be loss to the village so protection needed.	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Beth Nichola Lewis	A private garden (4) should not be included.	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
		Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Michael Jarvis-Resident	KNP2 Object to phrase in Key Pointsuse only sustainable building materials So does this mean no concrete, no PVC etc ? Better to say “where possible” as otherwise all new building would need to be built without using ANY cement !!	Noted, wording of KNP2 (10) amended.
Gill Beresford-Resident	KNP1 A larger Settlement Area is needed. This tight-net Settlement Area is already fully developed, including mainly conservation zones.	The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Gill Beresford-Resident	KNP2 There should be stricter guidelines for sustainable build homes with renewable energy sources.	Noted, wording of KNP2 (10) amended.
Gill Beresford-Resident	KNP4 Wind turbines and solar farms are not eyesores; they are necessary for our future.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Gill Beresford-Resident	KNP5 “It is hoped.....new homes will incorporate low carbon techniques..”. Is not strong enough. “Essential” comes to mind.	Please see KNP5 (6) in the Plan.
Gill Beresford-Resident	KNP8 This should not exclude the very practical possibility of wind turbines.	Wind Turbines would not be allowed in an SSSI.
Gill Beresford-Resident	KNP9 The consideration of using agricultural land which is not farm-profitable as meadowland to improve biodiversity should be included.	This is outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan
Gill Beresford-Resident	KNP12 Pushing for a lower speed limit is always going to be worthwhile. 20mph is not too much to ask !	Noted, but see section 6.5
Gill Beresford-Resident	KNP15 I don’t think we need to be over-worried about the impact of broadband and telecommunications structures.	Noted, KNP15 should achieve this.
Andrew Kinder-Resident	KNP4 Fully support this policy.	Support welcomed
Andrew Kinder-Resident	KNP5 I agree that the Village needs a mix of housing. There are some practical difficulties regarding lack of public transport, sewer capacity, rural location, shops however.	Noted
Hugh Stanley-Resident	KNP1 Agree !	Support welcomed
Hugh Stanley	KNP2 Agree !	Support welcomed
Hugh Stanley	KNP3 Agree !	Support welcomed
Hugh Stanley	KNP4 Definitely agree !	Support welcomed
Hugh Stanley	KNP5 Young people need to be able to buy a home.	Noted
Hugh Stanley	KNP6 We have enough second homes in the Village already.	Support welcomed
Hugh Stanley	Basic Conditions Statement We agree that Kingston must maintain its character as a living country village in an area of outstanding natural beauty.	Support welcomed
Mark Harding-Resident	KNP1 Critical to protect Village from over-development	Support welcomed
Mark Harding-Resident	KNP3 Must be considered priority in any future building/developments	Support welcomed
Mark Harding-Resident	KNP7 Essential to protect character and beauty for generations to come	Support welcomed

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Mark Harding-Resident	KNP12 Community facilities essential for all generations due to isolated location	Support welcomed
Mark Harding-Resident	KNP14 Employment opportunities will retain young people in the Village	Noted
Mark Harding-Resident	KNP15 Essential – but not at the cost of appearance of Village/Landscape	Noted, KNP15 should achieve this.
Richard Dalley-Resident	KNP1 The Settlement Boundary as proposed in the Plan is the most appropriate and will provide a sound basis for ensuring that future development respects the special qualities of Kingston	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
John Connor-Resident	KNP1 There are some omissions from the current settlement boundary eg Westview, Homecroft and Curlew Cottage amongst others	The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
John Connor	KNP8 No new structures will be supported- Full Stop.	Support welcomed
John Connor	KNP12 There is no mention of the pub garden or car park, which may be left vulnerable to development. Also the tree in the garden needs a TPO.	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Alan and Suzannah Grant-Resident	KNP11 Very, Very Strong Support for Dark Skies	Support welcomed
Colin and Anita Moore- Resident	KNP1 It seems that a number of properties currently excluded should be included in the Settlement Boundary eg Curlew Cottage (formerly two farm cottages), Homecroft, Wonwell Gate Cottage and The Old Forge (the Smithy)	The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Colin and Anita Moore- Resident	KNP6 It is essential that Kingston does not become overburdened with second homes to ensure a thriving community which is sustainable.	Support welcomed
Colin and Anita Moore- Resident	Unallocated Thank-you for your hard work in producing such an excellent plan.	Support welcomed
Margaret Cocks-Resident	KNP5 I agree to a single development	Support welcomed
John Cocks-Resident	KNP5 All new housing limited to a single home.	Noted
Jennifer May Kinder - Resident	KNP4 No objections to wind turbines on open farmland. I think we all need to take action on climate change – this is a compromise.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Jennifer May Kinder - Resident	KNP5 I agree with the first part of the statement but am concerned that any open market housing for buyers on low incomes considers the lack of transport, limited road access, sewerage limitations etc.	Noted
Rachel Bush - Resident	KNP1 I support the retention of the existing Settlement Boundary, recognising that small-scale development outside this boundary may be acceptable to meet genuine local need.	Support welcomed
Owen Roberts - Resident	Objectives – Unable to find Objectives in the Plan	The Objectives have been clarified.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Owen Roberts - Resident	KNP5 However, concerned at the level of NIMBYism that prevails despite residents proclaiming their support for “good development”.	Noted
John Edward Ebsworth - Resident	KNP3 Not only should the sewage works be suitably upgraded the system ie pipe work requires upgrading to be fit for purpose	KNP3 (2) is amended to remove the reference to on site treatment and to change the emphasis to support an improvement of the sewerage system.
Penelope Ann McFarlane - Resident	KNP1 It is difficult to see how Objective 2 – support for small scale housing develop etc and Objective 3 – opportunities for new employment etc can be achieved if development is only permitted inside the village settlement boundary. Suggest no. 2 needs to be relaxed to allow provision for above.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.
Penelope Ann McFarlane - Resident	KNP13 Not sure why the open area south of Morgan’s Row is included in this?	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Robert William & Janet Mary Gilbraith - Residents	If all shall come to pass then Kingston will be the most idyllic place to live and thrive	Support welcomed
Neville Thomas - Resident	KNP14 Concerned about additional traffic involved if possible further development which could occur from my experience	Noted, KNP14 (1) covers this.
Claire and Andy Barnes - Residents	KNP12 Consider including the Fire Station under point 4 of this policy.	This is being dealt with by the Fire Service. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot make such a statement.
Claire and Andy Barnes - Residents	The draft plan is a very thorough and balanced document which clearly reflects all the effort put into it.	Support welcomed
John Douglas Whalley - Resident	KNP1 I think it is most important that the Settlement Boundary is confirmed.	Support welcomed
John Douglas Whalley - Resident	KNP2 I agree that all new development is within a strict criteria, to maintain the unique character.	Support welcomed
John Douglas Whalley - Resident	KNP5 All new housing must be limited to single homes or extensions etc. to meet the needs of our community.	Noted
Peter Bratton - Resident	KNP1 I disagree that my house “Homecroft” is shown to be outside the Parish Boundary, when in fact we are only about one minutes walk from the Church, the Dolphin Inn and the Reading Rooms. This puts us more central to the village than a lot of properties on the outskirts of Kingston.	The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Mervyn Freeman- resident	Vision The need to encourage youngsters as new business. The average age is way old	Noted
Mervyn Freeman	Objectives Sites for housing and business not where and what we don’t want	Noted

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Mervyn Freeman	KNP1 The Settlement Boundary should include all house and farms in the village	The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Mervyn Freeman	KNP3 Sewage works have the capacity for 300 more houses so remove the on site need	KNP3 (2) is amended - see Environment Agency response.
Mervyn Freeman	KNP14 Old farm buildings should be allowed to be replaced with modern fit for purpose units	Noted, KNP14 has been amended
Mervyn Freeman	KNP7.3 Important views need to be of the bits we want to keep	Noted - no other views have been suggested
Mervyn Freeman	Basic Conditions St. Not accessible to non internet	This document was available in the Reading Room and Church during the consultation period.
Mervyn Freeman	Misc Users trouble getting to display on android or ipad	Noted
Mervyn Freeman	Leaflet to each house: No numbers on page. Did not set out the full draft policy and is not truthfully showing the implications. It doesn't show the settlement boundary	Noted
Mervyn Freeman	KNP1 The settlement boundary is out of date and restricts growth, At you Meeting on 7th March 19 I requested on behalf of the parish council that it was reviewed, I was told it was saved policy from South Hams	The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Mervyn Freeman	KNP3 You have received notice from South west water that the sewage works has capacity for 300 extra dwellings, on site sewage treatment plants take up room, reducing the area for building making it restrictive for small sites.	KNP3 (2) is amended - see Environment Agency response.
Mervyn Freeman	KNP4 Surely solar should be restricted to roofs of existing buildings and not open farmland, it is a poor use of land	Support welcomed
Mervyn Freeman	KNP6 Why are replacement dwellings not included in the principal residence policy?	This policy is consistent with current law.
Mervyn Freeman	KNP14 Use of redundant farm buildings may require more than "minimal" alteration and should be welcomed, as should new units built in existing farmyards, they are after all brownfield sites and employment opportunities should be welcomed, not restricted and uneconomic to deliver,	Noted, KNP14 (2a) altered to restrict the policy to external alterations. New units would be subject to agricultural planning considerations.
Mervyn Freeman	KNP7 Appendix IV distinctive views. Photos 8,9 &10 seem to be included to restrict the use of Sandersons field, they are not distinctive in the sense that holiday makers nor locals gasp in amazement, where are the postcard views that are enjoyed by all and have been for generations?	Views 8 to 12 were included to show the village sitting within its natural bowl.
Mervyn Freeman	Statement of Consultation Although your plan meetings were held in public, the were not advertised as such nor was engagement with the parish encouraged, your consultation has relied on a drop in day and a questionnaire with a different settlement boundary	Minutes are on the website and the KPC noticeboard and contain the dates of future meetings. Regular Newsletter articles encouraged involvement.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Mike Uttley - resident	Objectives needs to address the consequence of local people being able to commute to work in Plymouth and Exeter and to provide appropriate housing for people on middle incomes. This demographic is families in 30s and early 40s who are looking for their second or third home in the area. Suitable family homes are in short supply because of the burgeoning retiree population	See bullet 2.2 under section 2.11
Mike Uttley - resident	KNP1 The settlement boundary too tightly drawn and does not allow for any development. In particular Vicarage Farm field is an obvious place for in fill development and could be provided with access so that traffic does not have to go through the centre of the village.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Mike Uttley - resident	KNP4 It is inconsistent with the aspirations towards renewable energy to limit solar panels and wind turbines based on sightlines. There is an element of hypocrisy in aspiring to renewables as long as energy is generated somewhere else. All of our landscape is man made and renewable energy generation development may be the necessary cost of saving the planet	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Mike Uttley - resident	KNP5 A balanced community needs young -middle aged working families not just first time buyers and retirees from away. Smaller 2 bed homes will not meet the demand of families, instead there should be some provision of larger family homes . In the 80s and 90s such homes were available in Kingston yet the change in demography of the village following growing influx of retirees has limited the availability of houses that are suitable for families who work a commuting distance from Kingston. Mixed small to medium sized development such as Loddiswell would provide the necessary diversity of housing	noted, but this was not identified as a priority in the Questionnaire responses.
Mike Uttley - resident	KNP6 Having a principal residence requirement is fine but does not address an equally large problem for housing availability which is the purchase of family homes by retiree couples	Noted
Mike Uttley - resident	KNP7 A recent planting can hardly be justified as notable trees	The copse was planted by the community for the future and in that sense they are notable.
Mike Uttley - resident	KNP13 The designation of the entrance to Westentown and the area south of Morgans Row as green spaces is entirely contrived .The Morgans Row site makes hardly any contribution to the visual character of the village unless you are in a plane and as private land gives no amenity value to the village	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Mike Uttley - resident	The designation of the entrance to Westentown and the area south of Morgans Row as green spaces is entirely contrived .The entrance to Westentown is hardiy different to the entrance to any other housing estate in the country is rarely used and has limited visual character	Noted
Colette Bernard- resident	Vison I agree with most of the key points but some policies are too short sighted and limiting as explained in the attached sheets	Noted and see responses below
Colette Bernard- resident	KNP1 The “settlement boundary” is a <u>very</u> limited area for new development, almost impossible, except, for perhaps extensions to existing houses or squeezing another house into a garden. I	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	agree that it would be wise to deter large developments of more than 12 houses but this policy seems extreme. Gardens will be important for the future, as well as eco-friendly and energy efficient buildings: tiny box like dwellings with little outside space and no room to grow produce are not a good plan for the future or the sustainability of the village: more space for future development will be required	with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Colette Bernard-resident	<p>KNP2 This policy is based on excellent principles but I worry that it will be too exacting and inflexible for any new development plans to success. In order to survive Kingston needs more homes to be built particularly for those which will encourage young people to live here.</p> <p>Why is this policy so precise and limiting ? for example what exactly is the “local vernacular” or style of architecture, why will bins and meters be hidden away, why only stone wall boundaries and isn’t it overly optimistic to expect new development to actually “improve “ habitats etc. Maybe “conserve” would be more realistic</p> <p>Kingston has always been a working village: surely we should not be attempting to turn it into a pretty chocolate box village so beloved of tourist brochures?</p>	Noted, wording of KNP2 (10) amended.
Colette Bernard-resident	In addition I think this policy should highlight the need for encouraging the provision of parking spaces /car parks for those people who have no designated parking near their homes	At present no appropriate space is available, so the issue of parking in Kingston has been included in the Community Action Plan for the Parish Council to keep under review. But see KNP12 (3).
Colette Bernard-resident	KNP3 This seems very sensible – though apparently SWWater say they will improve the sewerage treatment if houses are built!	KNP3 (2) is amended - see Environment Agency response.
Colette Bernard-resident	KNP4 The renewable energy policy is far too restricting and short sighted . The ability to produce renewable energy is very important now and will be even more crucial in the future. The policy is far too strict concerning the limiting of solar arrays and wind turbines in particular which will be of great benefit during the 25 years that this plan will be in place. I think that the impact of renewable energy sources far outweigh the ‘unacceptable’ and “ negative” impacts stated. There is s danger that Kingston will be stuck in the past and will not thrive.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Colette Bernard-resident	KNP5 I agree with this in principle but I feel it is too limiting again. Why limit housing development to “single buildings ‘ or ‘small sites’? The provision of affordable homes is very important and local people should have priority but young people from outside the village not be discouraged surely ? “New development should be of smaller units primarily 2 -bedroom”- provision should be made for 3 bedroom properties to accomodate young , growing families with more than. 2 children. The principle of encouraging young people to live here is so important (the village is growing older and will not thrive without them) but, according to this	The plan recognises the need for housing to meet local needs. KNP5 (2) now includes 3 bedroom.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	policy, there doesn't seem to be much scope for building suitable housing	
Colette Bernard-resident	KNP8 I agree with this but it seems short sighted to deny the use of wind turbines	Wind Turbines would not be allowed in an SSSI.
Alison Lewis - resident	Vision statement – needs to be more proactive “maintain” indicate staying still, not embracing change	This strapline was set by the local community during the early stages of the plan process.
Alison Lewis - resident	Objectives though a heading ‘objectives’ would have useful	The Objectives have been clarified.
Alison Lewis - resident	<p>KNP 1 (Settlement Area) As minuted in Council Parish Meetings I have continually questioned the settlement area boundary feeling that it is not inclusive of every home and its curtilage. The settlement boundary misses some of the older properties in the village totally. On the Eastern edge- Gabberwell Cottages .The Old Smithy – now Rock House and Half the farm buildings of Torr Farm. This seems strange as the area is specifically mentioned in the plan(P 14) as an area of strong communal and historical associations, linked to The Gabberwell. The well is important enough to be listed as a Non- designated Heritage Asset.</p> <p>On the Northern boundary- Vicarage Farm, Prospect Cottage and East View are not included in the settlement boundary. To the West, Curlew Cottage , West View, Homecroft, Wonwell Cottage and Orchard Cottage are missed. These are older properties as well. To the South, the border tends to include houses , however their curtilages are left outside. (As with Pounds Barn in the East) I sought expert advice regarding settlement area and NP production. This is what was received. “As part of the consultation process you will have the opportunity to challenge the ‘lines’ If the settlement is rural the gardens fall within the definition of ‘previously development land’ and in practice the lines should follow the back gardens as they properly form part of the ‘settlement’ and cannot reasonable be described as falling within open countryside</p> <p>Chapter 3 of NPPF 2019 provides basic parameters! Paragraph 16.d</p> <p>Despite questioning this I was told that the settlement area boundary around the village was confirmed and could not be changed before consultation.</p> <p>Concerned about this I sought advice from South Hams as a Parish Councillor) Phil Baker and Duncan Smith were very helpful- advising “Reviewing and updating the settlement boundary is more effective in informing how the policies in the NP are applied”.</p> <p>The only caveat to this was “A revised boundary should not include ‘development sites’ unless these sites have been subject to a wider assessment process”.</p> <p>Settlement Boundary needs revisiting?</p>	<p>The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.</p> <p>The purpose of the settlement/ development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan</p>
Alison Lewis - resident	<p>KNP 5 (Development) From the initial village questionnaire the plan is very good in identifying that there s a need for affordable and entry level home</p> <p>Housing Need 4.6 4.9 (p16 + 17)</p>	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	<p>It is stated (4.7) “the plan makes this a priority.”</p> <p>I feel that with this in mind despite opposition the Neighbourhood Task Group refused to consider it was important to identify a site.</p> <p>* NPTG + KPC Meeting 22.5.19 (As minuted) Duncan Smith advised strengthening the evidence base in the Housing Section and moving to allocate a site. He clearly gave his advice and stated several reasons and pointed out the assistance he could offer if we did allocate, he was incredibly supportive and despite several Parish Councillors wishing to follow this route following his advice a site was not considered A forward plan – providing growth until 2034 NEEDS to allocate a site so that we can with with South Hams and developers to get the development we need.</p>	
Alison Lewis - resident	<p>In addition I was rather disappointed as the elderly are seldom mentioned in the plan. In the 2017 Questionnaire where 48% of the population that responded to the survey were over 60.</p> <p>In Housing the top two needs identified were:</p> <p>2 bed houses- 277 people</p> <p>2 bed bungalows – 252 people</p> <p>I feel that as bungalows were identified they need a mention. Parishioners have mentioned they need to downsize and free housing stock. We have many 3 bed houses occupied by elderly (often single people) Some have been forced to move to downsize. In short facilities and homes are needed for the young to rent /and buy, self build ? Homes for the elderly – possibly communal. We need an open approach to development and to work with a developer.</p> <p>In order to be a “living village ” we need to embrace change. It would be unthinkable that the village plan contributed to its demise.</p>	This would be a conversation to be had with potential developers.
Alison Lewis - resident	<p>KNP 13 I agree with Local Green Spaces need to be protected from development – although I do not agree with “South of Morgans Row””</p>	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Alison Lewis - resident	<p>However I wish to point out the importance of the pub car park and garden and wish it to be added.</p> <p>I totally realise that Pub and Curtilage is t the moment a ‘Community Asset’ however this will have to be updated as it was for 5 years. This will adequately protect the pub as there are several who would help as benefactors it was offered for sale. This would not be the case if Punch was to sell the car park and land for development. No benefactor would be in a position to buy an area as an “open space”, despite its importance to the village. This is why I consider that the area needs the additional protection of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Alison Lewis - resident	<p>Misc A lot of the Plan is good- thanks for the huge amount of work that has gone into it so far.</p>	Support welcomed
T J Kingdom Resident/ Landowner.	<p>KNP5 It will be very difficult for small housing developments to include affordable homes as they are usually financed by the more expensive houses.</p>	Noted

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
T J Kingdom Resident/ Landowner.	KNP1 I think there are seven properties some being very old that are not in the Settlement Boundary. Why is this? Surely, they should be included.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire. The purpose of the settlement/ development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Bruce Thomson Resident.	KNP9 Add “except in exceptional circumstances”	This is covered in KNP9.
Katherine Harding Resident.	KNP1 Needed to stop unwanted over-development in the village.	Noted
Katherine Harding	KNP2 Eco-housing, good design + quality housing <u>MUST</u> be always built.	Support welcomed
Katherine Harding	KNP3 A <u>priority</u> for all future building developments!	Support welcomed
Katherine Harding	KNP5 Eco-housing, good design + quality housing <u>MUST</u> be always built.	Please see KNP5 (6) in the Plan.
Katherine Harding	KNP7 Essential to preserve character + environment for future generations.	Support welcomed
Katherine Harding	KNP11 Dark skies <u>so</u> important.	Support welcomed
Katherine Harding	KNP15 But not at the cost of the environment + landscape.	Noted, KNP15 should achieve this.
Richard Gulliford Resident.	KNP4 Regarding large scale renewable energy on open farmland, please define your criteria of what is/isn't acceptable. We need to look at the bigger picture.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Richard Gulliford Resident.	KNP5 this encourages “younger” people.	Noted
Richard Gulliford Resident.	KNP9 What is the definition of “good” agricultural land?	Grades 1,2 and 3a as set out in KNP9
Lorraine Gulliford Resident.	KNP4 Regarding large scale renewable energy on open farmland, please define your criteria of what is/isn't acceptable. We need to look at the bigger picture.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Lorraine Gulliford Resident.	KNP5 We would like to see more encouragement for self-builds, this encourages “younger” people.	Noted
Lorraine Gulliford.	KNP9 What is the definition of “good” agricultural land?	Grades 1,2 and 3a as set out in KNP9

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Sue Green. Resident and works in Parish.	KNP1 I think consideration could be given to protecting 1) Dolphin Inn Garden and Car Park; 2. Yellands Car Park and Corner Copse. Either could be built on.	Car parks cannot be allocated as Local Green Spaces. This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Sue Green. Resident and works in Parish.	KNP7 Can the Dolphin Inn Tulip Tree have a TPO?	A Tree Protection Order has been applied for and refused, so the tulip tree is now listed in the Plan as a Notable non-designated tree in Appendix II.
Robert Beard, Resident and works in Parish	The vision for Kingston See my comments relating to KNP3.	Noted
Robert Beard, Resident and works in Parish	KNP3 The present combined drainage pipes through the village urgently need to be separated, so that only the sewage goes into the existing sewage works, and the rain water on past, down the stream. That way the sewage works would be able to cope with some extra sewage, and the existing overflow problems would be alleviated.	Outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan. Kingston Parish Council has an ongoing dialogue with South West Water
Robert Beard, Resident and works in Parish	KNP4 Some renewable energy panels should be allowed on Listed Buildings if they cannot be seen	Support welcomed
Jeanne Ivy Curtis. Resident.	KNP3 Drainage of foul sewage is very important – flooding could cause contamination and illness.	Noted. KNP3 (2) is amended - see Environment Agency response.
John Henry Charles Sibley, Resident.	KNP5 Housing – if smaller homes, particularly 2 bedrooms were built for old people living in Kingston it would release larger homes onto the housing market rather than new build 3/4/5+ bedroom houses.	See KNP 5(2)
John Henry Charles Sibley, Resident.	KNP7 Vicarage Field The oak tree + old gate stone next to oak tree and protection of footpath as is (i.e. no diversions) included in KNP7.	The oak tree has a TPO as identified in Appendix I. Any diversion of a footpath is subject to a legal process.
John Henry Charles Sibley, Resident.	KNP12 A bus service (e.g. South Hams circular) linking Kingston, Ringmore, Bigbury etc. with Modbury to connect via No.3 bus to Plymouth/Kingsbridge.	This is outside the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan
John Henry Charles Sibley, Resident.	KNP13 Is it possible to open green lane from Westentown into Vicarage Field footpath.	Not a Neighbourhood Plan issue.
Colin Small. Resident, works in Parish and landowner.	KNP5 and KNP6 Affordable housing first and repeat sales to residents in Kingston of 3 years or more.	See KNP5 (4) and see section 4.2 re the Devon Covenant.
Judy Wurr. Resident.	I would prefer to see “older people” used in the text, if it has to be used at all, rather than “the elderly” with its dodderly connotations”	Noted and amended

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Guy Walker, Resident	KNP1 I do not agree with the settlement boundary as drawn by the last South Hams local Plan 26 years ago and as proposed to be readopted now as it does not include my property	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire. The purpose of the settlement /development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Andrea Edgcombe	KNP1 For the village to move forward accommodating families of those already living here, the settlement boundary cannot remain the same. Although there are some areas in the village which could be 'infilled', the remaining small areas, should they be filled, may cause overcrowding. This will change village life with more traffic on already narrow busy lanes. For a village to expand its housing needs, the boundary needs to expand too.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire. The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Andrea Edgcombe	KNP5 I support additional housing for the village, but feel strongly that it needs to be for the local individuals to live in and not large estates which would more than likely become second homes or be purchased by wealthy home owners. I support affordable homes for families, single people and bungalows for the elderly/reduced mobility. I am fortunately enough to have married into the 4th generation who have lived in Kingston over the past 70 plus years, with the 5th generation expecting the 6th generation in the New Year.	Support welcomed
Andrea Edgcombe	KNP4 Where stated solar arrays and wind turbines will not be permitted in certain areas, I feel that each request should be surveyed and considered on an individual basis.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Andrea Edgcombe	KNP9 What defines 'good' agricultural land? Protecting agricultural land is important as are homes for people. It is not practical to think agricultural land can be preserved as well as providing additional homes. If a 'good' agricultural field is on the boundary, you are unlikely to choose 'bad' agricultural land 3 miles plus outside the boundary to build home/se Common sense and the importance of people must be taken into consideration.	Good Agricultural land is Grades 1,2 and 3a as set out in KNP9. Exceptions are defined there.
Andrea Edgcombe	KNP10 The Gabberwell. I do not feel this should be a stated non-designated Heritage Asset. It is not frequented by visitors as it is positioned on a very narrow lane on a blind bend.	Noted. The Gabberwell has been removed from the Plan.
Andrea Edgcombe	KNP12 As I stated in section KNP1, there is limited space in the current settlement boundary. An expanded settlement boundary will be required for the potential additional community amenities.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Andrea Edgcombe	KNP13 We are a rural community currently without a shop, however we are fortunate enough to have the Dolphin Inn public house. I feel it is essential to have the pub beer garden and car park stated as 'local green spaces'. It would have a tremendous impact on the village if either the garden or car park were to become a development site of any kind.	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value
Andrea Edgcombe	KNP14 I am not entirely sure what this statement is actually meaning. If you are saying local owners of rural/farm buildings will be supported for their buildings to be used for their business purposes, then I am in agreement.	Noted, KNP14 supports such development.
Bill Mears	KNP1 I feel that the settlement boundary area needs flexibility to expand.	Noted, KNP14 supports such development.
Bill Mears	The obvious choice for infill is the lower side the Vicarage field and surrounding areas for small developments.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.
Bill Mears	At present it doesn't cover the entire village, so the settlement development area needs bringing up to date.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire. The purpose of the settlement/ development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Bill Mears	I'm in favour of controlled buildings and realistic housing. 1) To help young people to buy or self-build affordable homes. 2) Bungalows for existing residents needing to down size/ adjust their living circumstances. 3) To use derelict farm buildings as workshops to help local businesses. If we want to keep our community, we need to support the future generations. As the 2nd generation living in the village, I'm pleased that the 3rd and 4th generation are still living here and want to see support for the 5th. We don't need a large housing estate with multiple rooms, we need small developments for local people.	Noted
Bill Mears	KNP10 As this has, to my knowledge, never been any huge heritage asset. I don't think it requires any protection on the neighbourhood plan. Not only that, it is positioned on a narrow S-bend with no sufficient amenities to support visitors.	Noted. The Gabberwell has been removed from the Plan.
Carmen Mears	'The Vision for Kingston' If you can guarantee that any future plans outside of the boundary will be considered and welcomed by the village, I agree entirely at the outline of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan as long as there is future physical productivity to support it.	Any development will be supported as long as it satisfies the Plan

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Carmen Mears	'The Objectives of the Plan' A consideration of agricultural land should be made for any future plans to expand and offer affordable housing and single builds for the next generation, local residents and young families.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.
Carmen Mears	Local residents should have their properties including their gardens included in the settlement boundary instead of the proposed exclusions.	The settlement / development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire. The purpose of the settlement/ development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Carmen Mears	KNP1 I don't agree with the development and settlement boundary. I don't think that there is enough room to consider future plans or allow any natural infill. Existing homeowners should have their entire properties included in the settlement boundary including gardens. However if there is a rise in productivity of single builds and affordable housing that are considered for local people then I do agree on having a strict and precise boundary to avoid any misuse of planning opportunities for outsiders or developers.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish. The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Carmen Mears	KNP4 Whilst I agree that solar arrays and wind turbines are not always the most appropriate energy source, I do think that in certain circumstances each build should be considered as an individual build and all the necessary elements taking into consideration instead of banishing the idea completely - in some circumstances it will be more environmentally friendly. NB: I am more in favour of solar arrays over wind turbines.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Carmen Mears	KNP9 Protecting agricultural land is something I feel very strongly about, however, what defines agricultural land? How exactly do we expect to expand and offer the proposed affordable housing and local connection new builds with the already limited space to have available without utilising at least a small part of local agricultural land.	Good Agricultural land is Grades 1,2 and 3a as set out in KNP9. Exceptions are defined there. The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire
Carmen Mears	KNP12 If and when the village expands and we are obligated to offer more sufficient parking and other amenities; which I understand will be compulsory with expansion; where can we expect to see these changes with the already very limited space within the village and space in which you a proposing would be non-existent?	The issue of parking has been added to the Community Action Plan.
Carmen Mears	KNP14 I agree that using empty buildings for business and employment would be a charming idea and reinvestment into the village but would it invite a unwelcome hubbub to the tranquillity of the village and what considerations have been made for the already land owners.	Noted and covered by KNP14 (1)

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Carmen Mears	Overall comments I am not a home owner due to the constant increase in house prices in the village, but I am 3rd generation bringing up the 4th generation in my family. I am fortunate enough at the moment to live under the social housing umbrella and having (nearly) 2 young children of the 4th generation to the village I think it is vastly important that we are able to consider and welcome affordable housing and single new builds in an appropriate area so that me and my family and other people with similar circumstances can successfully become home owners and secure a future investment for our children in their future, whether in be an affordable family home a single new build on a private estate or a purchase they can make in their futures to be able to start their journey in the same way.	Noted
Louis Palmer	'The Vision for Kingston' I agree with the overall outline of the Neighbourhood Plan but like the guarantee that future plans outside the settlement boundary will be considered and supported.	Any development will be supported as long as it satisfies the Plan
Louis Palmer	'The Objectives of the Plan' A consideration of agricultural land should be made for any future plans to expand and offer affordable housing and single builds.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.
Louis Palmer	Local residents should have their properties including their gardens included in the settlement boundary instead of the proposed exclusions.	The settlement / development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire. The purpose of the settlement/ development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Louis Palmer	KNP1 I don't agree with the development and settlement boundary. I don't think that there is enough room to consider future plans or allow any natural infill. Existing homeowners should have their entire properties included in the settlement boundary including gardens. However if there is a rise in productivity of single builds and affordable housing that are considered for local people then I do agree on having a strict and precise boundary to avoid any misuse of planning opportunities for outsiders or developers.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish. The settlement / development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Louis Palmer	KNP4 I think that each potential new build should be considered as an individual building project; in some circumstances it will be more environmentally friendly.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Louis Palmer	KNP9 What defines agricultural land? How exactly do we expect to expand and offer the proposed affordable housing and local connection new builds with the already limited space to have	Good Agricultural land is Grades 1,2 and 3a as set out in KNP9. Exceptions are defined there.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
	available without utilising at least a small part of local agricultural land.	
Louis Palmer	KNP14 I agree that using empty buildings for business and employment would be beneficial to the growth of the village, being self-employed having a work space is very important to me and would allow me expand my self-employment and offer other opportunities to local residents.	Noted and covered by KNP14 (1)
Louis Palmer	Overall comments I am relatively new to the village but have been very local resident for the last 6 years and I now reside with a long term resident within the village. I now have a young family and would love to be able to invest in an affordable home or be given the opportunity to build an affordable single build to invest into my future but most importantly into my children's future.	Noted
Marie Eades	'The Vision for Kingston' The guarantee that future plans outside the settlement boundary will be considered and supported.	Any development will be supported as long as it satisfies the Plan
Marie Eades	'The Objectives of the Plan' Existing home owners should have their entire properties included in the boundary, including their gardens.	The settlement / development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire. The purpose of the settlement/ development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan
Marie Eades	KNP1 I don't agree that the settlement boundary is sufficient enough to allow natural infill for potential affordable housing. I believe that gardens owned by existing residents should be included in the boundary line.	This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.
Marie Eades	Overall comments I am new to the village and would like to know that one day in the near future I would be able to potentially get onto the affordable housing property ladder and invest something into my future to allow me to become a long term resident of Kingston.	Noted
Shane Edgcombe	KNP1 For the village to move forward accommodating families of those already living here, the settlement boundary cannot remain the same. Although there are some areas in the village which could be 'infilled', the remaining small areas, should they be filled, may cause overcrowding. This will change village life with more traffic on already narrow busy lanes. For a village to expand its housing needs, the boundary needs to expand too. I support additional housing for the village, but feel strongly that it needs to be for the local individuals to live in and not large estates which would more than likely become second homes or be purchased by wealthy home owners. I support affordable homes for families, single people and bungalows for the elderly/reduced mobility. I am the 4th generation who has lived in Kingston over the past 70 plus years, with the 5th generation expecting the 6th generation in the New Year.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire. The purpose of the settlement/development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan. This Plan does not seek to allocate development sites, but sets criteria for development in the Parish.

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Shane Edgcombe	KNP4 Where stated solar arrays and wind turbines will not be permitted in certain areas, I feel that each request should be surveyed and considered on an individual basis.	The detail of KNP4 sets some reasonable restrictions for our parish. This is consistent with the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2019-24 Planning Guidance section 8.8.
Shane Edgcombe	KNP9 What defines 'good' agricultural land? Protecting agricultural land is important as are homes for people. It is not practical to think agricultural land can be preserved as well as providing additional homes. If a 'good' agricultural field is on the boundary, you are unlikely to choose 'bad' agricultural land 3 miles plus outside the boundary to build home/so Common sense and the importance of people must be taken into consideration	Good Agricultural land is Grades 1,2 and 3a as set out in KNP9. Exceptions are defined there.
Shane Edgcombe	KNP10 The Gabberwell. I do not feel this should be a stated non-designated Heritage Asset. It is not frequented by visitors as it is positioned on a very narrow lane on a blind bend.	Noted. The Gabberwell has been removed from the Plan.
Shane Edgcombe	KNP12 As I stated in section KNP1, there is limited space in the current settlement boundary. An expanded settlement boundary will be required for the potential additional community amenities.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire.
Shane Edgcombe	KNP13 We are a rural community currently without a shop, however we are fortunate enough to have the Dolphin Inn public house. I feel it is essential to have the pub beer garden and car park stated as 'local green spaces'. It would have a tremendous impact on the village if either the garden or car park were to become a development site of any kind.	This space is included in the designation of the Dolphin as an asset of community value.
Shane Edgcombe	KNP14 I am not entirely sure what this statement is actually meaning. If you are saying local owners of rural/farm buildings will be supported for their buildings to be used for their business purposes, then I am in agreement.	Noted, KNP14 supports such development.
Tina Mears	KNP1 After consulting the book in the reading room and talking to various people; I feel that the settlement Boundary area is out of date. It doesn't cover all of the houses and gardens in the village at the moment. This means that the settlement development area needs bringing up to date. I'm in favour of controlled buildings, but realistic affordable housing is needed. 1) To help young people to buy or self-build affordable homes. 2) Bungalows for existing residents needing to down size/ adjust their living circumstances. If we become victim to development we need to be able to work with the developers to get what the village needs and not what they want to make money. We need to keep this village alive or it will die as a community if we don't grow with all generations. We don't want a large housing estate built, but small developments and single new builds for local people are needed.	The settlement /development boundary in the Plan has been replaced with the one used in the Site Assessment and questionnaire. The purpose of the settlement/ development boundary has now been clarified in the Plan Noted
Tina Mears	Vision I agree with all the Key Points in the NP Leaflet, I'm not sure if they are the vision or objectives.	The Objectives have been clarified

Responses to Kingston Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood plan

Consultee	Reg 14 draft Plan reference and Comments	Response
Tina Mears	KNP10 As this has, to my knowledge, never been any huge heritage asset. I don't think it requires any protection on the neighbourhood plan. Not only that, it is positioned on a narrow S-bend with no sufficient amenities to support visitors.	The Gabberwell has been removed from the Plan.
Tina Mears	KNP 13 Why is a private garden a Green space	Designation of Cuthay has been removed from the Plan and Appendix III in response to the comments made. Noted that it remains in the conservation area.
Tina Mears	KNP 14 Where would it go, if building needed to provide new employment	As covered by KNP14 - New building for new business would be welcomed subject to the provisions of the other relevant policies.
John Mildmay-White, Landowner	In general, I am in agreement with the proposed policies and the details behind them. One area that does raise a little concern is KNP8, in particular with regards to the Tor Wood teahouse. While we would not look to for any new development on this site, we may one day look at a change of use and I would be concerned that this policy would restrict any options here.	KNP8 does not exclude a change of use as long as this were consistent with the tranquillity and views around the estuary.
John Mildmay-White, Landowner	Additionally, agricultural policy is moving towards public money for public goods. This will inevitably include increased access to private land. As such, I am sure the question of parking at Wonwell, or elsewhere on the estuary, will come on the agenda again in the not too distant future. I know that Kingston parishioners are very protective of the access to the beach and have confirmed on a number of occasions that they would not like to see any increase in parking for users of the beach or coastal path. However, I think that this may soon be at odds with government policy	Thank you for this interesting comment. The Neighbourhood Plan can only work with current policies and will be reviewed throughout its life

[In addition to the above comments made during the Consultation period a number of comments were received from South Hams District Council. These comments and our responses are recorded in a separate document linked here.](#)