

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
Working Group, 5th January 2022, 9am on Zoom**

Cllr J Saunders (Chair)	Cllr A Reynolds	Chris Wright
Tim Stonor	Katie Cullen	Alastair Gould
Adrian Berendt	Natalie Earl	Miranda Palmer

In attendance:

Adrienne Begent (Deputy Town Clerk)

1.	<p>Apologies for absence Apologies were received from Ben Coleman, Cllr C Cavanagh and Cllr E Thomas</p>	
2.	<p>Declarations of Interest No Declarations.</p>	
3.	<p>To approve the minutes of 27th October The minutes were proposed by Cllr Saunders and on being put to the meeting, it was AGREED to approve the minutes of the previous meeting.</p>	
4.	<p>Matters Arising None</p>	
5.	<p>Endorsement of Faversham LCWIP (final version) The full final version and covering note giving context had been circulated prior to the meeting. JS summarised the covering note: Regular meeting since April 2001 to develop the LCWIP. Phill Jones has now provided the final report, summarising the process and setting out a set of recommendations and interventions. Government Policy encourages Local Councils to have a LCWIP in place to steer cycling and walking infrastructure decisions and also optimise government active travel funds. There is therefore a sense of urgency to have the plan in place. The LCWIP will be a living document, with regular updates.</p> <p>It was proposed by Cllr J Saunders, seconded by A Reynolds and on being put to the meeting it was RECOMMENDED that Faversham Town Council should</p>	

approve the Final LCWIP report prepared by Phil Jones Associates at the next meeting of Full Council in February.

It was proposed by Cllr J Saunders, seconded by A Reynolds and on being put to the meeting it **was RECOMMENDED that a twin track process of approving this version of the LCWIP while launching a period of consultation on it be adopted.**

It was proposed by Cllr J Saunders, seconded by A Reynolds and on being put to the meeting it **was RECOMMENDED that the prioritised set of interventions developed by the group and summarised in 8.2 of the report are approved by Faversham Town Council, on the understanding that they will be regularly reviewed and subject to change.**

It was noted that officers present from KCC and SBC offered their full support of the recommendations.

Further MP confirmed that she had forward the document to Jamie Watson and Colin Finch (KCC), whilst she had not yet received their feedback on the final version, they had been supportive of earlier ones.

The proposed next steps are:

1. Advice to be sought from the relevant KCC and SBC officers on the process of the endorsing the LCWIP by the relevant councils and the possible involvement of the JTB.
2. A period of public consultation on the content of the LCWIP, including an online questionnaire and a public exhibition possibly linked to the Neighbourhood Plan.
3. Analyse the results of the public consultation and feedback to the Working Group; along with the report from the Parishes to Town Project. The Working Group to agree revisions the LCWIP to reflect this fresh evidence and republish.

NE suggested that endorsement by the JTB would allow SBC and KCC to jointly adopt the plan which may be the quickest method. Advice would be sought from Managers. Early adoption would make it part of evidence base and developers would need to consult it ahead of the emerging Local Plan.

KC advised that a Equality Impact Assessment should be included and offered to get advice. She questioned how it should be referenced that the LCWIP is a live document. Consideration should be given to how often and how the document will be reviewed.

JS considered that further thought would have to be given to the review process of the living document and the version control.

	<p>TS commented that this group should continue to meet and update the live document. Further he expressed thanks to everyone involved on behalf of the community.</p> <p>The Chair thanked Officers, Community Members and Adrian Berendt for their work on producing the plan.</p> <p>AB confirmed that the implementation of interventions would be funding dependent.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Project Plan for the Town to Parishes Project</p> <p>It was reiterated that the project was funded by SBC Eastern Area Committee to improve walking and cycling routes from Faversham to the surrounding villages. As the emphasis of the project is liaison with the community (including local cycling and walking groups) it is considered a better use of resources to engage Adrian Berendt to undertake project work rather than PJA.</p> <p>A working group will need to be formed, with emphasis on community rather than transport planning. The working group may draw from the membership of this committee, but it will need more representatives from the eastern area. Rich Lehmann was mentioned as a possible member.</p> <p>AG suggested that the Parish Councils be asked to suggest people with relevant knowledge.</p> <p>The importance of maps was discussed and the need for an initial meeting with an appropriate map to assess established routes.</p> <p>ACTION: Ask SBC for support with the maps.</p> <p>MP commented that KCC are currently reviewing all the cycle routes in Kent, they are being compared to the legacy routes and some discrepancies have been found which are being investigated. Boroughs will be invited to comment in due course.</p> <p>CW stressed the importance of a seamless join of the LCWIP and the Town to Parishes and therefore continuity of membership of working group would be helpful.</p> <p>The Chair confirmed that the Town Council would need to explore adjusting resource and that there would need to be strong community involvement.</p> <p>The next step would be to develop a timetable.</p>	<p>NE</p>

7.	<p>Future of Working Group</p> <p>When the Town Council approve the final version of the LCWIP this stage of the project will end, though the document will remain a live project with regular revisions,</p> <p>The Town Council is looking at its committee structure, the initial proposal is for an Active Travel and Highways Committee with sub groups of which the LCWIP WG could be one.</p> <p>MP confirmed that KCC are meeting to discuss crossovers and can take the restructure suggestion to the table.</p> <p>TS commented that isn't the LCWIP is the Active Travel Committee and commented that separating highways and public realm is a big risk. Likewise separating pedestrian movement from public realm would be a big risk. Having two separate committees could be a mistake.</p>	
8.	<p>Next Meeting</p> <p>The next meeting of the group would be scheduled for the beginning of March.</p>	