**KINGTON AREA NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

**PUBLIC MEETING - 27 JULY 2017: FEEDBACK ON REG 14 CONSULTATION**
Approximately 80 people attended.

PQ =question or comment from member of the public
R = response from Martin Fitton

Meeting was chaired by Mrs Elizabeth Banks, (EB) currently Vice-Chair of Kington Town Council.

EB opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and giving short introduction as to purpose of meeting to provide feedback and opportunity for questions.

Martin Fitton (MF) reviewed purpose of KANP and progress to date. In light of many comments MF repeated instruction in Core Strategy that new dwellings (200 in Kington Town and c 15 in Hergest) were allocated by Herefordshire Council and confirmed by Inspector, to be delivered via NDP

Celia Kibblewhite (CK) presented brief overview with graphs on results from questionnaire that had been sent/delivered to every household in the 3 council areas. Return had been just over 12%.
In addition all notes left in Library plus separate written letters and emails have been recorded.

PQ1: clarify what is meant by “12% return”

PQ2 : for 50 houses (not sure which site) upgrade of the sewerage system will be required – currently have 9inch pipe running through garden on Old Eardisley Road and bottom of Kingswood Rd (leaking sewage?)

R: Welsh Water won’t upgrade before 2020 so there can’t be more than 50 houses built before then and even then they may not upgrade; developers can pay for upgrade if they wish to progress sooner.

PQ3: be clear, it is not “the community” that has identified the sites that will cause the least amount of damage – and I don’t think you (the KNP Committee) have (either) as clumping them altogether is not a good idea

R: we are well aware the community want small, brownfield sites (but not enough to meet the 200 requirement, if anyone has other suggestions for a 100 houses let us know).

PQ4: the text (from HCC) says “constraints…can be reviewed…”
(so that means we don’t have to comply with 200 houses)

PQ5: Is it possible that the necessary infrastructure will not get built (so the plans will not materialise?).

R: yes, there’s no drive currently (by developers?) The plan is not just concerned with housing.

PQ6: unclear what is meant by…(?) ‘built the plan’ because… don’t want anything imposed on it…

R: Current Settlement Boundary has been in place since 2005..

PQ7 (Terry James Ward Councillor): Take issue with two points:

1. After public inquiry the Public Inspector said minimum 200….but look at Leigh near Ross where they had 41 houses to build and now 108 houses have been passed. So, having a plan won’t stop (more than 200) houses being built!
2. HC have not insisted on NPs but the gov’t has invited councils to prepare them. An NDP could create rigid plans which defend developers (i.e. developers will stand to gain by having the plan and knowing where they can push to build).
3. Other parishes have produced ‘criteria –led Plans and not allocated specific sites..a better idea

R: yes, the govt could insist on more houses being built

PQ8: with the development date 2031, I would prefer it to be left up to market forces. K12 and 13 have access problems that won’t attract developers. No developer showed interest in Kington. Kington is a large village. Can’t parishes transfer allocations?

R: no (they can’t transfer allocations) the allocation is designated to be within the parish boundary

PQ9 : I see a problem with K20 because it’s in Kington Rural. The Parish Boundaries are set by the government not by a little group…

PQ10 : it is the least worst option. Other towns have chosen not to do one that’s how as a town council you can defend against unwanted developments. If we don’t put a plan in, do you think Hereford will impose it (200 houses)? **What do you fear they will do that is worse than what we are proposing ourselves? We’re surely giving them an amber light?**

R: this strategy (not to do a plan) might work. From experience, with no NDP then HCC will impose their plan. It needs the whole community to say, “we don’t want 200 houses”…

PQ11: have other NDPs come together with criteria and avoid a large site?

Ros: Bromyard decided against a NDP, now they are having buildings imposed on them. The core strategy says 200 will be delivered through NP…The other places mentioned have very small allocations compared with Kington

PQ12 (TJ): ultimately the market plan…thesettlement boundary (2005) has constrained things..

PQ13 : questionnaire asked if people agreed with the settlement boundary…is it possible to disagree?

R: it is possible to move the proposed boundary.

PQ14: (Draper , Planning Agent)) you’ve emphasised that landscape is important – the sites you’re plumping for have been investigated three times already and are said to be ‘no-go’ areas – SHLAA analysis

PQ15: are there minutes of past meetings and this one? [yes]

*Results of the survey – presented by Celia*

Went through results for Questions: 1,3,5 & 6

1,500 questionnaires delivered (by hand) others posted to Kington Rural and delivered in Huntington. Received 161 completed responses i.e. 12%.

On Q1 re K12 and 13, only 149 responses, from which 48% indicated approval

Clarification: the questionnaire asked you to tick which proposed sites you approved of.
If no tick then assume you have not approved.

PQ16: will the average be adjusted to take into account only 149/161 responded?

PQ17: people I’ve spoken to didn’t want any development. What about having a plan that just sets out criteria instead of a plan for 200 houses? Or why not something in the middle? …this is what the community want and anything over this …here are the criteria…

R: repeated this in the meeting with inspector who listened but stuck to 200 allocation

PQ18: don’t state no to 200. Say there are sites the community is happy with, then if we have to have further 100 say there are the criteria…

R: would have to decide on the settlement boundary…it will be out of our control…NP would be invalid. It wouldn’t go to referendum stage.

PQ20 : re the criteria – is there any obligation for HC to take note if planning applications made?

R: the officers would say, “the NP argues…and we recommend supporting it”

PQ21 (RW): there are already strict criteria in the Core Strategy, 14 points, but they are meaningless with developers who argue ‘viability’ and say there are too many criteria. You can’t use them to block developers.

PQ22: what about Eardisland criteria?

Bob: developers can ignore them.

PQ23: how will HC look at the plan?

R: it will be evaluated ultimately by an independent advisor. We’ve been talking a lot to HC officers especially re K12 and 13.

PQ24: can you make it less attractive for developers? Make them take a road out to the recycling place? [worry too re number of vehicles, danger for children]

R: we were very clear that Kingswood Rd can’t be used. We accept it will increase traffic. We will stress that alternative access will need to be looked at.

PQ25: I thought it might be an inspiring plan, got involved but you have to be so compliant that it’s actually boring and divisive. Choice to approach it differently was monitored by HC. It’s only quite a boring plan – it has some good elements. A plan is the best option, this may not be the best plan but feedback has been generated – how to fit into policy? Need entrepreneurs and people with ideas to live here…questionnaire invited people to suggest other things

*Kington Rural PARISH*

*EB invited Chair of KR to comment*

R: Our council thinking is: it’s of benefit to cluster the 15 houses, an opportunity to get better services and access; proposal includes a footpath to the bridge and proposals to install footpath the length of Hergest Rd The industrial site at Hergest has to be protected for future jobs.

There may also be windfall sites within the parish

PQ26 (Julia Jones – chair) had open meeting, asked landowners if they had land to put in. No response. Hence it is as it is.

EB: I want to be open – the land in question belongs to my son and is a brownfield site.

PQ27: it’s a sewage farm from the hospitals and now a private sewage farm.

PQ28: re windfall sites: have two banks on the High St that are shut. If in due course…could make 10 flats on High St.?

R: interesting proposal. Still have to find space for 100 houses.

PQ29: also conversion of agricultural sheds…

R: that’s not relevant option for Kington town. Two sites are desperate for development: Wesleyan chapel and down near old surgery in Victoria Rd. But they don’t do enough to dent the 100.

PQ30: we used to have 3 bed flat on High St…need to avoid any more single accommodation as people get shipped in – it’s OK for couples and families. We already have plenty of singles accommodation.

PQ31: if we go for this is it the best bet? Why has access to K12 and 13 gone to Old Eardisley Rd? Would it not be more feasible to take it out onto the main road? Creates a traffic issue for children from existing houses.

R: We’ve had the same concern. Think we could indicate that we’d expect a very detailed plan re access would be carried out. **We will try to add this change into the document.**

PQ32 : we want to hear what the questionnaire results were. Concerned re proposal for Old E. Rd.

PQ33: that access was already turned down.

PQ34: thank you, appreciate all the work that’s been put in. You say it’s all going to fall on a referendum? Is that 12% referendum?

R: Next stage:

* Revisions will be done based on the consultations
* Send to HCC to assess
* Further consultations if massive revisions
* Goes to inspector for 56 days
* Revisions
* Back to inspector
* Referendum – yes / no, can be postal votes. We will try to get everyone to vote.

Ros: from all the responses including notes and correspondence there is a whole list of things to amend on the plan. And good suggestions e.g. making the allotments a green space. K12 and 13, protecting people around the neighbouring area. Proposed amendments will be publicised

EB: Huntington Parish have done a summary of what they want (though no houses required).

PQ35: re the referendum, so will Huntington and KR vote ? What responses were there from Huntington?

R: yes, they will. No responses were received (with a Huntington postcode mark on them).