

Minutes of the Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting: Tuesday, 25 March 2014

Present

Nigel Kay, Faversham Town Councillor (FTC) – Chairman
David Simmons, Mayor, Faversham Town Council
John Coulter, Faversham Town Councillor
Trevor Payne, Faversham Town Councillor
Cllr Mike Cosgrove, Swale Borough Council
Cllr Mike Henderson, Swale Borough Council
Andrew Osborne, Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group member
Anne Salmon, Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group member
Sue Akhurst, Faversham Creek Trust
Janice Hennessey, Faversham Creek Management Company
Janet Turner, Faversham Society
Brenda Chester, Brents Community Association

In attendance

Natalie Earl, Swale Borough Council Senior Planner
Jackie Westlake, Faversham Town Council Clerk – Secretary

1. Apologies for absence

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. John Sell had advised the Secretary he would not be taking part in the Steering Group for the foreseeable future.

2. Minutes of the last meeting and matters arising.

2.1 The minutes were agreed with the exception of the following:

- 4.1 Bullet point 15: should read “an estimated 10 FTE jobs would be created”
- 5.6 Delete the paragraph

2.2 All matters arising had been dealt with the exception of the following:

- NE to send the scoping report for the core strategy as a guide to JW for onward circulation to the SG. JW agreed to re-send
- Natalie Earl (NE) had emailed the Environment Agency’s views on the flood risk assessment. As far as it was concerned, the situation remained as it was last November:

“We cannot see why the NPPF would change the designation of FZ3a(i). The flood zone categories have not changed and at the present time we don’t think there is a need to re-visit the SFRA Supplementary Document. “

- NE would forward the open green spaces list to JW for onward transmission to the Steering Group once it has been checked by Andrew Osborne (AO).

2.3 Cllr Kay (NK) agreed that flooding and working with the Environment Agency could be a future agenda item.

2.4 On declarations of interest, Cllr Kay (NK) said that the following appeared to be appropriate declarations of interest:

Declarations of Non-Pecuniary Interest

Brents Community Association; Faversham Creek Trust; Swale Borough Council; Faversham Town Council; Faversham Traders Group; Faversham Creek Management Company; Faversham Municipal Charities 2010; Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group

Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

Cllr Mike Henderson (upstream from the Brents for the whole of the Creek Basin and downstream as far as the Albion public house); Cllr J Coulter (Shepherd Neame)

2.5 For those who had not already done so, a formal declaration should be sent to Jackie Westlake for the records.

3. Draft Neighbourhood Plan

3.1 NK gave a brief overview, making the following points:

- Everyone was extremely grateful to the drafting group members for all their hard work and time spent on the preparation. The Steering Group would like to thank everyone for their contribution
- There were a number of minor amendments still to be addressed which could be resolved outside the meeting
- SBC's initial comments had been circulated and would need to be addressed and incorporated into the final document.
- The Steering Group would be grateful if NE could highlight what was significant and needed Steering Group agreement
- Members needed to be succinct and precise in their comments. It wouldn't be helpful to hear repetition in arguments about the text.
- The black text indicated a level of agreement in the drafting group
- Where there were diverging views, alternatives were presented to the group either in colour (red/green) or option A or option B
- There was another opportunity before the next Town Council meeting (Steering Group meeting on 1 April) to run through the draft
- The Town Council had to agree the draft for consultation
- If the Steering Group came to another conclusion (on offering options that were outside the resolutions passed by the Town Council) those alternatives would have to be presented through the process agreed by current Standing Orders [Secretary's note: 5 councillors to present changes in writing 7 days before the Town Council meeting].
- There will be votes on each alternative. [Secretary's note: Only Town Councillors could vote on matters to be presented to the Town Council. All other votes would be advisory, although, as before, the Town Council would have due regard to the vote]

3.2 The Group considered the draft in detail, focusing on the alternatives, but also making a number of drafting comments on the text as a whole. The latter would be incorporated without record unless they were deemed to be significant.

ACTION: JW to make amendments to the text for next week's meeting

Part 1: the Plan

Aspirations chapter

The Group considered whether to retain the chapter in its entirety. NE suggested that it would need a sustainability appraisal if it was retained. It was felt that the chapter would be helpful in explaining the alternatives for different sites, and to introduce land uses. The Mayor suggested, agreed by the Group, that the Plan should identify that there were different schools of thought which needed to be publicly acknowledged. The Group considered an alternative to the chapter, where some of the detail could be incorporated into the preamble at the start of the Plan.

Cllr Henderson (MH) suggested, and the Group agreed, that there should be a paragraph explaining the risks involved in not having a Neighbourhood Plan.

It was agreed, by 9 votes to 3, to ask NE to draft the aspirations paragraph.

ACTION: NE to draft

Undesignated Heritage Assets Map

It was agreed the UHA map should form part of Part 1.

Setting the Scene: paragraph 2.6

It was agreed to replace "the piecemeal growth of/replacement with significant residential development" with "its replacement with areas of residential development".

Introducing the Neighbourhood Plan (after 2.18)

The Group considered the paragraphs outlining the designated area. Although there was an argument for keeping the document succinct, it was agreed that a revised, pared down version would be acceptable.

ACTION: Anne Salmon to revise

Introducing the Steering Group: paragraph 2.22

It was agreed to remove the reference to the independent planning consultant.

The bridge and the sluices: paragraph 4.4

It was agreed to incorporate "and working, opening gates and sluices".

The Group agreed there should be a glossary of terms for the Plan, to include a reference to different crafts as well as e.g. sustainability.

Flooding: paragraph 4.4

It was agreed to delete the reference to a revision of previous assumptions about the level of flood risk.

Sewerage and drainage

It was agreed to retain the paragraph, which would need revision when information from the utilities was available.

ACTION: NE to investigate

Ground stability and load bearing

It was agreed the paragraph would remain provided there was evidence to support it.

ACTION: BC to research the evidence

Maximising access

Brenda Chester (BC) agreed to provide appropriate wording.

ACTION: BC to draft

7.1 Natural Environment

The Group considered the alternative drafts. They noted the arguments for a shorter paragraph, and the arguments for a more detailed explanation to provide clarity for the reader.

The Group voted 6 votes to 5, in favour of the more detailed paragraph.

Infrastructure

The Group discussed the reference to the “four metres from the waterfront policy”. It was agreed to revise to “In principle, buildings on any waterfront shall be no less than four metres”.

Flooding

The Group agreed there should be a separate chapter on flooding (7.3). Cllr Cosgrove (MC) said the chapter would need to be revised in the light of any further work by the Environment Agency.

Business, tourism and employment

The Group considered BTE1. Members agreed it was too restrictive and it should be deleted.

New Housing

The Group agreed to retain the second paragraph which referred to the emerging Local Plan.

The Group considered the alternative paragraphs on affordable housing. It was agreed that option B should be used, deleting the reference to “reasonable”, and replacing the 20% affordable housing figure with 35% (this would be reflected throughout the draft).

Site Specific Policies

8.1 Introduction

The Group agreed the second alternative should be used with an amendment to take account of the reference to feedback from the public consultation.

8.2 The Purifier Building

The Group agreed option one, provided it deleted the reference to present use classes and the policy on seeking planning permission. The reference to Agrigano's use should be amended to reflect the variety of uses.

8.3 Ordnance Wharf

The Group voted (7 to 2) in favour of retaining the reference to responses to the public consultations as a disadvantage.

The Group agreed to delete the reference to housing on Ordnance Wharf not being compatible with the work on the Purifier Building as it was not capable of being evidenced.

OW Policies

The Group voted (6 to 4) in favour of 3 storeys.

The Group voted (7 to 1) in favour of a public walkway for the site.

BMM Weston

The Group voted (4 to 3) in favour of retaining the reference to affordable housing being a high priority in public consultation.

It was agreed that BMM2 relating to the Streetscape Strategy should be identified as a project, rather than a policy (this would be the same for other Streetscape Strategy "policies").

Frank and Whittome

The Group considered the alternative paragraphs and voted (7 to 2) in favour of retaining the more detailed paragraph which allowed for the possibility of other development in the future.

FW policies

The Group voted (6 to 2) in favour of retaining FW2 with amendments (maintaining creative workshops).

Swan Quay

AS said the first option aligned with the developers' earlier proposals and would need amending in the light of new information. BC said the second option reflected feedback from public consultation and the work undertaken by Ray Harrison.

The Group agreed both options (revised) should be included for the Steering Group to consider at its meeting on 1 April.

SWQ policies

The Group agreed with SWQ2 rather than SWQ3 on access, but noted the importance of providing disabled and other access.

8.7 The Oil Depot

The Group noted that two options had been put forward for the site. AS said that this reflected the Town Council's support for the commissioning of the business case. MH stressed the importance of a continuous walkway around all the Creek, which should be as close to the Creek as possible. Any references to otherwise should be removed.

The Group agreed the two options with the amendments suggested.

OD policies

The Group agreed OD2.

8.9 The Coach Depot

The Group agreed to include both options to go before the Town Council and to public consultation.

8.10 Standard Quay

AS said the first alternative wording provided detail as to what had happened to date on Standard Quay. The second alternative could have the effect of taking all the current businesses out of Standard Quay.

The Group voted (6 to 4) in favour of the first alternative wording, provided there was an amendment to incorporate a use for Building 1. The Group would consider the revised wording at the next meeting. It was also agreed to remove references to current development control and enforcement issues in Building 1 and Baltic House.

STQ projects

The Group agreed the projects with the exception of the last (relating to a tariff of mooring fees).

8.11 Standard House

The Group agreed to select the first alternative wording, which retained Standard House as a dwelling, rather than the second, which sought Standard House development as a small hotel.

STH policies

The Group agreed the policies, but recognised the difficulty of implementing STH5, relating to vehicle access from New Creek Road.

8.12 Fentiman's Yard

The Group agreed the wording without change.

8.13 Brents Industrial Estate

The Group voted (7 to 2) in favour of the paragraphs outlined in red which outlined the need for improvements to the site (buildings, roads and footpaths).

The Group agreed that BIE2 and BIE3 should be projects.

8.14 Iron Wharf

The Group agreed to delete the insert (relating to moving machinery when the footpath was not in use). The related project should be deleted.

The Group agreed that IW2 was a project.

Public Questions

Q. Would the Steering Group consider alternative proposals for each site?

A. That had yet to be decided, but there were opportunities for alternatives, within the decisions taken by the Town Council.

Q. Would the report by Ray Harrison and the Business Case be included in the appendices as part of the evidence base?

A. Part 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan would identify the various supporting documents. This had yet to be finalised.