

Chartham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting Minutes

Virtual Meeting

6th May 2021 at 6.30pm

Present:

Gregory Williams

Lisa Root

Camilla Swire

John Field

Andrew Metcalfe (Squires Planning) until 7.17pm

Absent:

Tim Clark

Paul Coles

Teresa Curteis

Camilla agreed to chair the meeting.

Lisa agreed to take minutes.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received and accepted from Paul Coles and Tim Clarke.

2. Minutes of Last Meeting

The minutes from the meeting on 20th April 2021 were not reviewed and will be agreed at the next meeting.

3. Working Groups

Andrew gave an update on the progress of topic papers Squires planning are writing/reviewing. All four are in hand, transport and travel is virtually finished and they are actively working on Built Environment. Once complete they will move onto Economy and Landscape and Biodiversity.

06/05/21 – 01: Andrew to give an update on expected timescales for the completion of each topic paper which can be shared amongst the working groups.

Lisa gave an update on the Housing Topic paper. Paul Wookey is drafting the issues by Wednesday next week which will then be reviewed by the other members. It is hoped that a draft will be ready for review on 14th May.

Andrew advised that CCC are still engaging on the proposed MOU and have asked for examples.

Next steps are:

- Squires send draft papers to working group to review and finalise.
- The completed topic papers to be reviewed by the steering group
- The Steering group to consider options and agree the direction of the plan
 - An issues and options consultation could be carried out to seek parishioner support
- Squires planning to write a scoping report and submit to CCC.
- CCC decide if SA/SEA is required.

An SA (Sustainability appraisal) is relevant to everything as the overarching planning objective is to achieve sustainable development.

Camilla advised the steering group that she has raised an application for Judicial Review of the Cockerling road development. A discussion was had as to whether this posed a conflict of interest. Whilst the development is partially in the Parish, the evidence used for the topic papers is independent of the development and Camilla hasn't written any papers. It was felt that at this time it didn't pose a conflict of interest.

4. Engagement

Not discussed.

5. Neighbourhood Plan timeline

Not discussed.

6. Project Planner

Not discussed.

7. Finance

Andrew gave examples of costs for neighbourhood plans and advised that costs vary hugely dependent on the plan, extent of work and challenges.

Example A – Cost £32k

Performed a call for sites, but didn't allocate any sites and an SEA was not required, otherwise a full-on plan.

Example B – Cost £100k (half of cost spent before consultants involved)

Very involved and complicated plan including call for sites, SEA and highways study but no technical support packages from Locality were used. Lots of legal support needed due to queries from the district council and developers. The examiner called the plan to a hearing.

Example C – Cost £16k

Initially proceeded to Reg 14 but issues with the district council. Consultants were brought in to rework the plan. Site allocations were not undertaken.

Technical support packages help to reduce the cost, for example an SEA can be done through a support package, otherwise it would cost between £5k and £8k.

[Andrew left the meeting at 7.17pm]

Lisa shared the draft receipts and payments for the neighbourhood plan, details of some payments are still outstanding, such as for Zoom. However, all major expenditure, Squires planning, is included. There remains. Approximately £11k of the £20k budget from the Parish Council.

A grant was applied for from Locality in 2020-21 for £8,325, the end of grant report has been completed and the grant is now closed. The full amount was spent. An additional grant from Locality for £8k can be applied for this year.

A discussion ensued over whether to engage more support from Squires Planning. John raised that Andrew is doing a good job and is knowledgeable and felt that engaging them more would move us to more of a client/consultant relationship. Gregory felt that Andrew was knowledgeable and had the energy to drive us in the right direction. Camilla and Lisa felt that having the support kept the group on track and reduced wasted time.

It was agreed to seek the additional funding from locality which could mean that we would have £19k funding pot. The Parish Council could be then approached to support a potential additional £10k if required which would bring the available budget to near the level of the middle example costing which Andrew gave. Technical support packages and working group members could still be utilised to reduce costs as much as possible.

8. AOB

None

Date of Next Meeting

7pm via Zoom on the following dates

- 18th May

Meeting closed at 19:38