



## Steering Committee Meeting 3 February 2021

**Present:**

Cllr John Crawford  
Cllr Jean Curteis  
Irene Dibben  
Joseph Franklin  
Siggi Nepp  
Sue Quinton  
Stephen Sidebottom  
Helen Whitehead

**Apologies:**

Cllr Kate Walder  
Graham Smith

**Also in attendance:**

Richard Masefield  
Tony Fullwood  
Richard Eastham (Feria Urbanism)

### **01. Minutes from last Meeting**

Minutes of 22 January 2021 were accepted and approved.

### **02. Letter to landowners**

Richard Masefield was thanked for providing the initial draft.

Siggi stated that it was her intention to agree the approach in contacting landowners at this meeting. She stressed that it was important to get these letters correct and that they should be friendly, informative and tailored to each recipient. She invited comments from the group, using the draft letter prepared by Richard Masefield as a basis for discussion.

Various viewpoints were expressed by Tony and Richard Eastham for consideration by the committee. It was agreed that the prime principle was to ensure transparency to the community and that all stakeholders and residents have equal opportunity to comment as part of the Reg 14 process before decisions are made by this committee. It was important to show no particular stakeholder was given preferential treatment.

It was agreed that the letter should be standardised, concise and very clear: it should alert the landowner to the fact their land has been identified for designated and that they will have an opportunity during the consultation process in which to read the Plan in its entirety and respond accordingly.



Once the Reg 14 consultation period is underway there would be opportunities to engage with the landowners by, for example, running a dedicated landowner zoom session to answer specific queries. FU would assist with this.

It was agreed to preserve a positive relationship with landowners, but that if their support is not forthcoming this should not obstruct the aims of the Plan but considered with other Reg 14 community comments.

In summary it was agreed that:

- The letter should be sent a week or so before the consultation period begins.
- Dependent SC agreeing with Tony the date for Reg 14 publication.
- It will provide the dates of the consultation period
- The tone will be friendly and factual. Each letter will only be tailored in as much as it will refer to the particular site owned by the recipient, with a reference to the page in the Plan where the site is mentioned.
- It will include a link to the NP website for further information about LGS designation and what it means in practice.
- Contents to stated how comments could be submitted (through the website) as well as information and dates regarding any general public or landowner zoom sessions (probably set up using Eventbrite).
- John will draft a new letter for approval.

*(Action: John to draft new letter)*

Stephen noted that another area of landowner engagement will be on local heritage listings. Richard Eastham added that listing is a restrictive policy and will impact what a landowner can and cannot do with the affected site. Tony noted that the same would apply to the Design Code in terms of how it affects the allocation site. Siggie observed that all such landowner communications should be made at the same time before the Reg 14 stage.

*(Note: this will need to be discussed at the next SC)*

Richard E left the meeting.

### **03. Working Groups update**

**Biodiversity:** Richard M mentioned that Tony has the wording for the evidence base. One map is still to be added, along with a few more illustrations. Richard is awaiting a minor amendment from KWT. He expects this within the next week.

*(Action: Richard to send final version to Siggie)*



**Green Spaces:** Sue reported that Graham has completed the paper on Sport and Open Recreation Spaces. This has been altered to accommodate the re-siting of the football pitch on Tenterden Rec once the re-ordering of the Rec is given the go-ahead. The paper now proposes to designate both of Homewood School's playing pitches on Appledore Road for use as football pitches. Graham is arranging for a plan to be included with the paper showing the potential layout of the pitches, to illustrate that what is proposed can be accommodated. The proposed footpath on Limes Land has been appealed by the landowner but this does not prevent Limes Land from being put forward as an LGS. The footpath application is noted in the site assessment and will remain there until the outcome of the appeal is known.

There was a short discussion on whether to include NCA (National Character Area) designations. Tony said that local designations generally carry more weight and are noted in ABC's supplementary planning document. NCA designations are more generic and, in his opinion, would not add to the justification of the selected sites. John asked if the NCAs were included elsewhere in the evidence base; Tony thought they would probably be mentioned in the landscape document.

Sue mentioned that the table of landowner engagement for the Methodology paper had not been completed; Tony said that this was not applicable now that the landowner engagement strategy has altered (as per the previous discussion).

*(Action: Graham to insert plan into Open Spaces paper; Sue to send final versions of Open Spaces and Methodology papers to Siggie)*

**Landscape:** Siggie noted that the Important Public Views document was now finished and has been approved by Tony. There was surprise from members of SC that only six views had been put forward; Siggie pointed out that in line with the selection criteria the viewpoints were restricted to where the urban confines boundary intersects with PRow's, looking out from the town. John asked whether this criterion is a statutory requirement? Tony said it is not but pointed out the practical difficulty of adopting a less specific selection method, resulting in unending numbers of views, and weakening the strategy of focusing on controlling fringe development. The aim in the NP is to protect the countryside beyond the built confines so the views should be chosen to best achieve this. Stephen asked how these particular views would be treated in the Plan. Tony said that they would probably say something to the effect they should be maintained and not compromised. This policy will provide guidance in future to developers and planning authorities. Tony also confirmed that the view cones shown on the map could be widened depending on the view. Siggie will re-visit the views to check that the cones are the correct width. John noted that members of the public may query why some views been omitted. Siggie suggested that the document be re-named "Important Public Views from the Urban Confines Boundary" to provide some clarity. Tony pointed out that Reg 14



## TENTERDEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

provides the opportunity for the SC to ask people if there is anything that has been missed in terms of important or iconic views that meet the criteria.

*(Action: Siggie to check cone width; Helen to amend Views map accordingly; Siggie to re-title the document)*

The paper was approved subject to these alterations and signed off.

**Design Code:** Siggie has had a virtual site visit with AECOM. She told them that there was general support for Tent 1A in terms of appearance and quality and that Tent 1B should uphold those qualities so that it complements Tent 1A. Siggie has sent them material relating to Tent 1A so is expecting them to take all of this on board. She will wait to hear from them regarding an update and is hoping they can keep to the agreed deadline of end of February.

*(Action: Siggie to continue to liaise with AECOM)*

**Routeways:** The documents have been updated following feedback and are now finished. There is some additional work on maps which Helen is aware of.

*(Action: Stephen to forward final version to Siggie)*

**Local Economy:** The Business Needs, Business Sites, Tourism and Markets papers are complete.

**Heritage:** This paper has been updated. Stephen acknowledged that there is still some work to be done regarding the map of heritage assets, but that isn't due to be completed until March.

*(Action: Helen to complete assets map by 3rd March)*

**Comms:** Irene reported that the group are working on the list of stakeholders to be contacted and will update the SC in due course. In terms of leaflets and publications, Irene is following up on timescales on these and Joe is doing the same for banners. Kate is looking at drafting a piece for the TTC newsletter which could also be adapted for the Parish magazine, TDRA newsletter etc although timescales could be tight. She said that the Comms group will look further into this and come back to the SC by email.

Siggie asked the Comms group to confirm the requirements for the Consultation Statement.

Siggie reported that Gravity is working on the Plan cover and also the templates for the Plan, plus variations of the logo for the website and social media channels.

Siggie will feed all the evidence-base documents to Gravity.



Stephen commented that there are a number of spin-off projects related to the Plan, eg KWT, Civil Society. He asked the Comms group to consider what guidance the SC should provide to them about how they interact with the comms put out about the NP so that they are appropriately distanced and appropriately related. To clarify, Tony drew the distinction between policies that go into the NP and projects that might be stimulated by what is in the Plan without being part of the Plan itself.

John asked how the SC should share the Plan with TTC as part of Reg 14 and suggested this be put on the agenda for the next SC meeting for discussion with Tony and Richard Eastham. Tony asked if he could see the final versions of all the evidence papers.

*(Action: Comms Group to report back on list of stakeholders to notify; Comms Group to confirm timescales for Reg 14 banners and leaflets; Comms Group to confirm copy deadlines for local publications; Comms Group to confirm requirements for Consultation Statement; Comms group to consider communication strategy for spin-off projects; Siggie to forward all evidence papers to Tony and Gravity)*

Tony left the meeting.

**05. Treasurer's report:** John stated that he has agreed with Phil Burgess that any unspent budget for the current financial year can go into reserve and be ear-marked for NP use in the next financial year. Stephen reported that Tony is going to run two days over on the review of the evidence base, but that two additional evidence papers which were not part of the original specification have needed to be reviewed. This additional work falls within the available capacity of the budget.

**06. AOB:** None