## Minutes of Faversham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held in via Zoom on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2022

Present:

Kris Barker, John Irwin (Chair), Harold Goodwin, Hannah Perkin, and Alison Reynolds

In attendance: Adrienne Begent (Deputy Town Clerk)

| ologies were received from G Wade.<br><u>cclarations of interest</u><br>ere were no new declarations of interest.<br><u>nutes of 21<sup>st</sup> March</u>   |   |
|--|---|
| ere were no new declarations of interest.<br>nutes of 21 <sup>st</sup> March   |   |
| nutes of 21 <sup>st</sup> March  |   |
|  |   |
|  |   |
| e Minutes of the meeting held on 21 <sup>st</sup> March were approved as an curate record. These minutes had been presented to Full Council on April.  |   |
| scussion on Matters Arising from Minutes of 21 <sup>st</sup> March   |   |
| nute 5 – Screening of Draft Plan: It was noted that it had been agreed<br>Town Council on 4 <sup>th</sup> April that the draft plan should be sent to SBC for<br>reening. When the recommendation was made, the Steering Group<br>d been under the impression that as the screening was not a statutory<br>quirement it was not necessary for the sites to be included. Urban<br>sion had told the DTC on 5 <sup>th</sup> April that the sites should be included and<br>nce the draft plan had not been sent.<br>arification to be sought at the next session with UV on 26 <sup>th</sup> April.<br>nute 7 – Critical Junctions: It was noted that it had been agreed at<br>wn Council on 4 <sup>th</sup> April that Option 2 from PJA should be accepted. It |   |
| build be preferable for the cost of the work to be shared with the LCWIP<br>brking Group and whilst it had been discussed at the meeting on 6 <sup>th</sup><br>ril it had not been agreed. PJA had been instructed to commence the<br>idy.   |   |
| e Selection  |   |
| e public Consultation in site selection had closed. The feedback from<br>e exhibition and more general comments received was presently being<br>llated for sharing on the website. Once this had been competed all<br>adowners/agents would be written to.   |   |
| C / S nTred Pisina nvuoru S eselli   | April.<br><u>cussion on Matters Arising from Minutes of 21<sup>st</sup> March</u><br>nute 5 – Screening of Draft Plan: It was noted that it had been agreed<br>Town Council on 4 <sup>th</sup> April that the draft plan should be sent to SBC for<br>eening. When the recommendation was made, the Steering Group<br>d been under the impression that as the screening was not a statutory<br>uirement it was not necessary for the sites to be included. Urban<br>ion had told the DTC on 5 <sup>th</sup> April that the sites should be included and<br>nee the draft plan had not been sent.<br>rification to be sought at the next session with UV on 26 <sup>th</sup> April.<br>nute 7 – Critical Junctions: It was noted that it had been agreed at<br>wn Council on 4 <sup>th</sup> April that Option 2 from PJA should be accepted. It<br>uld be preferable for the cost of the work to be shared with the LCWIP<br>rking Group and whilst it had been discussed at the meeting on 6 <sup>th</sup><br>ril it had not been agreed. PJA had been instructed to commence the<br>dy.<br><u>e selection</u><br>e public Consultation in site selection had closed. The feedback from<br>exhibition and more general comments received was presently being<br>ated for sharing on the website. Once this had been competed all |

| 6. | Timetable  |    |
|----|--|----|
|    | Advice regarding the timetable to referendum would be sought at the next session with Urban Vision. The revised timetable would be shared on the website.                      |    |
| 7. | Communication Plan   |    |
|    | Once the timetable had been amended contact would be made with Breakthrough Communications regarding the communication plan to referendum.                                     |    |
| 8. | Draft Housing Needs Assessment from AECOM  |    |
|    | The draft Housing Needs Assessment was received. It was considered a useful report. There were however some inaccuracies which needed addressing before it could be finalised. |    |
|    | There were some helpful comments regarding issues that would be outside the scope of the NHP, but that the SG could bring to the attention of SBC.                             |    |
|    | It was considered that the NHP SG would need to collaborate with the Community Land Trust and other interested parties to campaign on issues.                                  |    |
|    | ACTION: AECOM to be asked for a meeting to discuss the report  | AB |