

**Minutes of Faversham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
held in via Zoom on Monday 15th November 2021**

Present:

Kris Barker, A Hook, H Goodwin, John Irwin (Chair), Hannah Perkin, Alison Reynolds and

In attendance: Adrienne Begent (Deputy Town Clerk)

1.	<p><u>Apologies for absence</u></p> <p>Apologies were received from G Wade</p>	
2.	<p><u>Declarations of interest</u></p> <p>There were no new declarations of interest.</p>	
3.	<p><u>Minutes of 18th October</u></p> <p>The Minutes of the meeting held on 18th October were approved as an accurate record. These minutes had been presented to Full Council on 1st October.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Discussion on Matters Arising from Minutes of 18th October</u></p> <p>Minute 4 (Matters Arising (18th October)) – Affordable Housing: A date is still to be set for the meeting with Urban Vision to discuss affordable housing definitions.</p> <p>Minute 4 (Matters Arising (18th October)) – Draft Documents: The Steering Group had met with SBC representatives on 11th and received feedback on the draft documents that had been submitted.</p> <p><i>Draft Policies V7:</i> A few minor comments around the evidence base which Hannah Barter is considering.</p> <p><i>Local Green Spaces:</i> LGS/007 – Former play area off Wallers Road and rear of Lionfield: There has been previous discussion around this site, including the possibility of it being developed by the CLT. If not developed for housing then it will taken forward as LGS. Waiting for confirmation from SBC.</p> <p><i>Site Allocation:</i> SBC had no concerns concerning the sites that the SG wished to allocate subject to accompanying policy.</p> <p>There was some debate about housing numbers, and more specifically how the allocations from the Creek Neighbourhood Plan are carried forward. Jill Peet and Hannah Barter to meet to discuss and clarify exactly what existing sites can be included in the 200 units that the Neighbourhood Plan is allocating.</p>	

	<p>There is the possibility that the SG will need to allocate additional sites. An additional call for sites will not be needed.</p> <p>Minute 5 – Swale Local Plan: Members of the Steering Group had met on 10th November and agreed that it did not wish to submit its own response to Regulation 18. The Town Council would be submitting a response.</p>	
5	<p><u>Critical Junctions</u></p> <p>Draft Policy FAV06: Critical Road Junctions</p> <p>1. For development that impacts on junctions with identified safety and/or capacity issues, schemes will only be supported where there is no severe impact, taking account of any mitigation measures that are incorporated into the scheme. These junctions are:</p> <p>Members considered junctions that should be listed in the policy and initial list was drafted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Abbeyfields & Whitstable Road (mixed ownership, high usage and poor visibility) 2- Crossroad of East Street, East Street, Crescent Road and Newton Road (AQMA, unsuitable location for a bench (air quality)) 3- Quay Lane (both ends) 4- Lower West Street and South Road 5- Love Lane & Watling Street 6- Love Lane, Whitstable Road & Graveney Road 7- Ospringe Street and Water Lane 8- A251 & Watling Street <p>It was proposed by Hannah Perkin, seconded by Kris Barker and on being put to the meeting it <i>was RECOMMENDED that the initial list be shared with Ward Councillors for comment and further suggestions.</i></p> <p>HG Asked that Chris Wright be asked to contribute, given his work as a transport planner.</p> <p>It was noted that other critical junctions may become apparent as the town evolves.</p> <p>Members raised concerns about the new traffic signals on the A251 and Watling Street junction and questioned if the lights were necessary all the time or possibly could be programmed for peak time only.</p> <p>ACTION: It was agreed that the issue should be kept under review</p> <p>Brenley Corner: The letter drafted by the Deputy Town Clerk was shared with the members. It was noted that any responses would be too late to feed into the Regulation 18 submission but may be useful for Regulation 19 consultation.</p>	

	<p>It was proposed by John Irwin, seconded by Hannah Perkin and on being put to the meeting it was RECCOMENDED that the letter be sent to the Leaders of Canterbury City Council, Thanet and Dover District Councils and Kent County Council.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Communications Plan</u></p> <p>It was agreed that a Communications plan was needed up to the referendum. Projects discussed included, newsletter (Spring TC), other publications, exhibitions and market stalls.</p> <p>It was considered that a strong business relationship had been built with Breakthrough Communications, and the communication plan was considered an extension of that work.</p> <p>It was proposed by John Irwin, seconded by Kris Barker and on being put to the meeting it was RECOMMENDED that Breakthrough Communications should be asked to submit a budgeted proposal.</p> <p>Confirmation is needed on rules surrounding the referendum and promotion of the plan proceeding.</p> <p>ACTION: Enquires to be made concerning availability of the bus for taking the NHP to all Wards and costs involved including a driver for two weeks.</p>	AB
7.	<p><u>Budget</u></p> <p>Members received the budget breakdown for 2021-22. It was noted that the Net Balance was £8816.92 with Earmarked Reserved £31,142.00 (which included grants awarded). It was considered that SG had significant funds to complete the project and that no request would be submitted for additional funds from the Town Council in 2022-23.</p> <p>Funds would be needed for the competing the plan through to production and implementing the communication plan.</p> <p>ACTION: Urban Vision to be asked to provide a breakdown of costs for completing the plan.</p> <p>Hannah Perkin introduced brownfield funding available from Government. Other members were not aware of this funding stream and restrictions on application.</p> <p>ACTION: SBC Officers to be asked for further details which would be emailed to members.</p>	AB HP