

## Minutes of the 20's Plenty Working Group – Wednesday 27 June 2018

Attendees:

Alison Eardley	Cllr Antony Hook
Ellie Jupp	Chris Oswald-Jones
Amanda Russell	Cllr David Simmons
Tim Stonor	

Present: Louise Bareham

### 1. Apologies for Absence

Cllr Mike Henderson, Gulliver Imminck

### 2. Election of a Chair

Cllr Antony Hook was proposed as chair by Cllr Mike Henderson, seconded by Chris Oswald-Jones. Amanda Russell was proposed as chair by Tim Stonor, seconded by Alison Eardley. On being put to the meeting it was ***RESOLVED that Amanda Russell be Chair of the 20's Plenty Working Group for the Civic Year 2018 to 2019.***

VOTES: Antony Hook 2, Amanda Russell 3, Abstentions 1

Proxy votes were not included at this stage.

The Town Clerk advised that this did not set a precedent for the use of proxy votes in the meeting.

### 3. Declarations of Interest

None

### 4. Minutes of the Minutes dated 23 May 2018 and Matters Arising

A lengthy discussion took place regarding the minutes of the previous meeting, the main points are highlighted below:

- Item 2: It was confirmed that TS was not the reason the election of the chair was postponed
- Item 4: The lady referred to by DS is Deborah Kapaj
- Item 4: Should read AH said that Love Lane *can't* be included as currently 40mph.

- Items 5: There was a discrepancy as to whether AE was a member of the group. AE was definitely confirmed as a member of the group.
- Item 10: The minutes referred to are Faversham Town Council of 8<sup>th</sup> May and not the JTB
- Item 6: TS asked for an amendment to say the group confirmed agreement to achieve a town wide limit across town with exceptions where necessary. However, it was felt that this was not agreed at the last meeting, but would be discussed later.

COJ observed that there was too much discussion taking place via email. AR felt this was due to there not having been regular monthly meetings, but agreed that it should not now be a problem. EJ considered that sharing of information and bringing everyone up to date should take place via email.

There was an outstanding action from the previous minutes for AE to look into Coastal Communities funding.

#### 5. Terms of Reference

AR said the aim should be 'Town wide with exceptions where necessary'. She explained it was the same way the 20's Plenty organisation worded their country wide campaign. This wording was on the petition and what had been taken to the JTB and had worked well across schemes. It was better to have a scheme as wide as possible with roads opting out than to have areas added in. AR felt to change the wording now would make people uneasy.

TS supported the continued use of the wording, and felt using any others would be a risk. (1) across the entire town was comprehensive and had been seen as effective (2) common sense and evidence where 20mph was not suitable, where faster speeds are required; these are the exceptions

TS proposed, seconded by COJ and on being put to the meeting it was ***RESOLVED that the Terms of Reference are updated with the words of the 20's Plenty campaign group – Town wide 20mph limit with exceptions where necessary.***

TS referred to Item 5 for the Draft ToR, which included the words 'where practicable', he asked whether this points to the exclusions or whether it meant the resources of the group. AH suggested the words remained for protection, for those who didn't want the scheme to happen and might pick faults in the circuit of information. He felt using where practicable was a compromise with reality and the capacity of the group.

Everyone agreed that ToR 1, 2 and 3 were standard for FTC, however EJ questioned sending the minutes to the Town Council meeting. LB explained

that the working group had no authority or powers and any recommendation for action or spending would need to be agreed by the Town Council. COJ thought this would provide better awareness of the scheme.

It was confirmed that non-councillors also had voting rights on the working group.

Membership of the group was deliberated, did the group want to increase and be able to co-opt other members? Consideration was also given to how the group would work with members of the public, particularly those who joined the meeting in the public gallery; how do they engage? LB confirmed that it was at the discretion of the Chair whether to allow members of the public to speak at the meeting, explaining that a working group was less formal than a committee or sub-committee.

TS felt membership of the group should allow other people to be co-opted as required, to which AH agreed. DS suggested the group should be left as it is for a couple of meetings before asking others to join, if they have something of value to give.

AH thought it was important to work with members of the public and consult as the group needed to reflect the views of the people, if there isn't the buy in from Faversham the scheme would fail. COJ agreed that the public needed to be involved. AH confirmed there was a requirement for public consultation, which could not be tokenistic.

It was agreed that Item 4 should include 'in accordance with the wishes of the people of Faversham'. AE suggested that public engagement would be a better term than consultation. AR confirmed that consultation was part of the JTB motion and that engagement was necessary for compliance. AE said engagement was a two way dialogue. TS was happy to change the wording.

COJ suggested having a stall on market day and LB noted that Optivo were holding fun days at Love Lane, Bensted Grove and the Brents, which would help cover all areas.

TS showed the Faversham hot spots map, which was the result of a public event organised by the group in 2016.

**Action: AE to put together an engagement strategy**

**Action: LB to forward draft ToR to AR, then send out to the wider group for agreement at the next meeting**

#### 6. Progress on Discussions with Kent Highways

AH reported that Paul Brand (PB) had been away. Regarding the schedule of roads; based on the journeys taken on 10 April and 11 May which all had

seen copies of, PB considered 80% were suitable for 20mph, with just the change of signage. There was some need for traffic calming but this view was formed from the traffic survey. PB had been sceptical of some of the roads, prior to seeing the traffic survey, for example Millfield estate. Having seen the results he had changed his mind, however Park Road, St John's and St Mary's were too fast. Another traffic survey was being undertaken, paid for by AH. COJ asked what type of survey and AH confirmed it would be rubber tubes; an all count traffic survey which showed speed and the types of vehicles. AH said that the surveys had already been put to other uses, including providing useful evidence for the Ospringe bypass. AH felt the next steps would be to formulate representations. Any road that was vaguely bendy and/or narrow PB was happy with; however wide and/or straight he was less happy. He didn't think signage alone would work. AH confirmed this conclusion was made from surveying and sight, gauging what the normal speed would be on the roads. COJ observed that they were just the comments of one officer. AH felt that PB was experienced and when out driving with him, AH could see the points being made by PB.

AR questioned whether PB had spoken to any other groups who were managing traffic calming and thought signage could be put in place first to see if that worked, on an installation and review basis. Questions again arose about the DfT guidelines and KCC's policy, which wanted upfront calming, issues with A roads at 20mph as no calming allowed KCC Citing high speeds as reason not to lower the speed limit.

It was agreed that the group should respectfully engage with PB and make him aware of other schemes which did not rely on traffic calming.

EJ could see the argument for Whitstable Road, but felt roads like Edith and Kingsnorth, with double parking, became narrow. AH thought Belmont could also be included. There was an argument against going from a 20mph to a 30mph to 20mph along different roads. EJ thought all the roads had the same typology, being Victorian streets. AH reiterated it was not a case of leaving those roads out, but that they would require traffic calming. AR said she would need to look at the map in more detail to get a clearer picture.

AH felt the chance of changing PB's mind was less than 50% and confirmed that the leadership had a negative opinion. AR thought contact with other campaigners needed to be made. AH suggested evidence was needed. AR confirmed that there was a growing number of voices. She had recently attended a Swale KALC meeting, where representatives from Newington and Sheldwich parish councils were present. There is a growing call for putting their voices together to address the issue. AR said that more people were calling for 20mph. This was seen as a positive move.

TS felt it was frustrating to know that others had implemented 20mph without the requirement for traffic calming. He asked how the group could bring weight and experience into the political process and to have a consistency to what is being argued for, which was a town wide limit and not roads going from 20mph to 30mph to 20mph. Reading from the notes he thought all roads could be 20mph, but some needed physical intervention. TS suggested asking what the physical interventions required would be – significant moving of kerbs, a table or signage, removal of centre road lines, painted fake 3D crossings etc. TS felt making written representations would be protracted and could the group not meet PB at a workshop, bringing experts to bear. He also questioned whether PB had implemented a 20mph scheme before and thought it would be helpful to put PB in touch with experts. AR agreed that engagement with PB needed to be more meaningful.

TS produced a map of the speed survey, showing green, amber and red. Red was mainly the perimeter of the town. AR asked if everyone was working with the same figures. TS noted that he would not have taken the day and night figures together, he saw the danger to pedestrians was during the day plus the speed data would show that people drive faster at night. AH agreed, he noted that Lower Road was recorded as 26mph for 24 hours, but felt it should have been less. COJ felt PB should be invited to Faversham again. AH said he would write to seek a meeting. EJ felt TS's work was the beginnings of a report and it wouldn't take much more work. TS agreed to produce a report before the meeting but wondered how the group could get KCC to up its game, they had originally been tasked to work with KCC by the JTB in the first instance, getting a response from KCC has been difficult and protracted.

AR agreed that the maps and survey should be created into a report to give to PB with a view to having a meeting.

COJ wondered about Nichola Floodgate and whether she was bringing in any consultants. AH said KCC had been reviewing their approach to 20mph because they had received so many requests for 20mph. AR said that was one of the reasons given by KCC for not responding promptly to the group's JTB report of Dec 2016.

**Action: AH to follow up with Nichola Floodgate and Mike Whiting to question KCC's approach**

**Action: The working group to produce a report**

## 7. Outside Advisors

TS suggested the group went back to Andrew Saffrey of Phil Jones Associates for advice on what to do next; to provide a proposal and costings.

The question of funding was raised, last time DS and MH funded the report between them, or there may be funding available through FTC.

TS also suggested contacting Andrew Cameron of the Duchy, however everyone was uneasy of his involvement, but TS suggested he might be asked just to give a presentation.

AH saw the immediate issue was to change PB's opinion.

**Action: TS to contact Andrew Saffrey for a proposal**

#### 8. Any Other Business

AR had received an email from a resident living on the A2, following the recent meeting at Ospringe, carrying a complaint to the press over reporting of the meeting. She asked if anyone had attended the meeting. AH, COJ and DS had all attended. AR asked if there were any minutes.

**Action: Minutes to be sent to AR**

AR felt it was important to refocus the campaign to re-introduce air quality. She offered to provide information from the 20's Plenty briefings to anyone attending meetings so they could be better informed. AR had not seen the minutes, just the report in the KM but it didn't appear that any conclusion had been made at the meeting. AR handed out the leaflet 20mph limits offer a toxic diesel fume reduction equivalent to taking half of all petrol cars away.

AR said the AQ argument has been made before but we do need to keep saying the same things and keep up to date with research and briefings.

TS said that there was not only air quality, but economic, injury and community benefits to 20mph. If in doubt the answer was 20mph!

Everyone was encouraged to mention 20's plenty campaign at every opportunity.

EJ noted that KCC accepted public health issues, but they were not high enough in Faversham. She asked where she could find deprivation statistics, in particular Davington area which she knew to be high. DS had seen these figures, which compared wards and Davington was in the top 10% for deprivation. AE suggested the item be on the agenda for the local engagement forum to share benefits. TS was reassured that there was a way forward.

AR had attended a recent a Swale KALC meeting which had 13 parish councils in attendance, Adrian Berendt and AR gave a presentation on 20's Plenty. Several Parishes want to create a 20's Plenty for Swale committee. Brian Clark of Bredgar had been trying to get a scheme in place at Bredgar

but KCC say speeds are too high at 29mph for a signage only scheme. Sheldwich and Badlesmere mentioned mounting concerns over air quality. AR will attend the first meeting with a view to joining the group. COJ wondered if Sheldwich were including the A251. The councillors felt sorry for Faversham for the length of time it was taking to implement 20mph. Cllr Baldock has been calling for a Swale wide 20mph since the JTB motion but is not being heard, joining voices will make us harder to ignore.

AE and DS gave apologies for the next meeting and it was agreed that FTC should appoint a substitute to attend in these circumstances.

9. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> July at 7pm, The Guildhall