

IWADE PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE LOCAL PLAN WORKING PARTY

Held on Friday 15th July 2016

<u>Present:</u>	Cllr. M. Gale – Chair	Lynda Fisher, Clerk
	Cllr. J. Hunt – Vice-Chair	Residents:
	Cllr. S. Plumb	G. Pungenti
	Cllr. P. Horner	J. Wallis
	Cllr. S. Cheeseman	B. Wallis
	Cllr. R. Langham	M. Pearce

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed Councillors and residents who had volunteered to sit on the Working Party to the meeting; apologies were received from Parish Cllrs. Clark, Rook, Hyde, Mitchell and White.

2. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations - None

3. Visitors/Public Time – None attended.

4. Swale Borough Council Local Plan

The Chair advised that the Working Party, comprising Parish Councillors and residents, has been convened to look at the modifications to the Local Plan, this is the only area that can be commented on. The Working Party needs to define sound reasons why the housing planned for Iwade is not feasible. The recent Housing Survey carried out in Iwade showed that the majority of residents were against development.

Modification 158 (6.5.86) – Item 1 lays down the need to maintain the separation of Iwade from Sittingbourne; particularly the southern and eastern sides. Item 3 refers to the environmental designations (SSSI and Ramsar Sites); Great Crested Newts, but does not mention the Noble Chafer Beetle. Item 4 states that Iwade is a Rural Local Service Centre (as is Newington and Teynham – the reason Iwade has been given this designation is Ridham Dock) and mentions the need for improved public transport. Item 5 refers to flooding risk; the history of this is well known to those who have resided in the village for a number of years.

Item 6 the main point to be raised is the Grovehurst Interchange; it states that the capacity of this and other junctions in the A249 corridor, including J5 of the M2 will be impacted by growth at Iwade. Although it refers to ‘financial contributions’ £37 million is required for the Interchange; this is a major consideration for no further development in the Village.

Work to the Key Street roundabout, which will cost £500,000 is looking to comment in 2018; the consultation for Junction 5 of the M2 is starting in September. Because of better transport links development in South-West Sittingbourne/Newington is logistically better place and links in better with delivery schedule and dates.

Modification 106 – There are sufficient school places at Iwade and on the proposed Grovehurst Development (2-form entry available from 2023); S.106 agreements will cover the cost of £7.2 million. On the same development a Secondary school will be available³ from 2027; costing £9 million (CIL payments and capital funding). Iwade Medical Centre could take up to 8,000 patients.

The Parish Council is pleased with the cycle and walkway proposals over the Grovehurst Interchange; however, we wish to point out that there are no links to employment at Ridham Docks.

Modification 292 – Enforces issues with the Grovehurst Interchange and improvement delivery.

Sustainability Appraisal

It is wrong to include SW116, SW117 and SW123 all under the heading ‘SW123’; these are three individual sites and the Parish Council strongly objects that these are not be treated as such.

SW116 - The Parish Council objects to this site as it is on the edge of the SSSI; is of high landscape value and pushes outside of the village ‘boundary’.

SW117 – The originally only made round 2 and is near to the floodplain. Developers have already said that they will not build there because of the quality of the land (bog like).

SW183 – The Parish Council objects to this site as it increases the village boundary and includes a historic orchard which hasn’t been touched for years and supports a large range of wildlife, which includes protected/endangered species such as the Noble Chafer Beetles list, which is found in orchards elsewhere in the village. The village is the only site in Kent known to be a habitat of the Noble Chafer Beetle.

SW216 – Coleshall Farm – This proposal is out of the natural boundary of the village and is on land which has landscape values.

SW123 - We believe Swale has got it right by allocating to the East and that this is a better option than SW216, which as stated above is out of the natural boundary of the village and on land which has landscape values.

If the housing proposed under SW116, SW117 and SW183 is not included in Iwade the Parish Council need to comment that the 42 houses at the Floplast site – 14/506167/OUT do not appear in the Local Plan and could offset some. Furthermore, two planning applications for Newington – 15/509664/OUT (put forward for approval by the Officers but refused by the Planning Committee) and 15/510595/OUT will more than offset the remainder; these would be logical sites to include the proposed Iwade housing because of the reasons given above and because Newington is a Rural Service Centre with less stress on infrastructure.

Modification 158 –SW123 is a more viable allocation because of all the benefits it brings to the village; not SW126 which as stated above is outside the village boundary and does not bring the benefits. This is on the proviso that the Grovehurst Interchange improvement goes ahead.

Modification 46 – Rural Service Centre; Iwade – public transport services need improvement and the railway service. We agree with the comments relating to Iwade; which reinforces our comments in Modification 158. As regards Newington, we do not agree that the only opportunities are limited to the brown field sites or the East of the village because Pond Farm - 15/500671/OUT - was turned down by the Planning Committee but was put forward for approval.

Page 33 – Breakdown – it is wrong to include all of these (572); they should be split into individual developments.

Modification 65 – we agree with the comments contained within; we do need the links for walking and cycling. It would have been nice if links to employment at Ridham Dock had been included to assist people going to this employment area.

Modification 69 – noted.

Modification 106 – See above notes.

Modification 292 – See above notes.

Modification 295 – This reinforces comments regarding development in South-West Sittingbourne, in particular Newington.

Modification 296 – Reinforces above comments. Noted land reserved for Grovehurst development but is not being done quickly enough.

Modification 297 – We can see that the Council are accepting that there are uncertainties with the delivery of the infrastructure at Grovehurst interchange but we don't think the strategy the council is using is right because they are just hoping that the funding comes forward for Grovehurst with no clear evidence it will. It seems that Iwade has been added on to the end and hope it works.

Modification 301 – This reinforces our comments and the Parish Council agrees with this.

5. **Any Other Matters Arising** – None.

6. **Next Meeting(s)**

An Extraordinary meeting will take place on Tuesday 26th July, 2016, 7.30 p.m. in The Barn. There will be no meeting in August.

The meeting closed at 8.15 p.m.