

JW

4 September 2013

**TO: ALL MEMBERS OF FAVERSHAM TOWN COUNCIL'S
FAVERSHAM CREEK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP**

The Mayor, D H S Simmons, The Deputy Mayor, N A Kay, Cllr J Coulter and Cllr T R Payne

Together with: SBC Cllr M Cosgrove, SBC Cllr M Henderson, A Salmon, A Osborne, J Sell, N Earl

Dear Working Party Member

YOU ARE HEREBY INVITED TO ATTEND a meeting of Faversham Town Council's Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to take place at **7.00 p.m.** on Thursday, 12 September 2013 in The Guildhall, Market Place, Faversham when the following business will be transacted.

Yours sincerely

Jackie Westlake OBE
Town Clerk

The Chair will allow fifteen minutes for Members of the Council to receive questions from registered electors for the Town before the formal meeting starts.

AGENDA

1. To receive any apologies for absence
2. Welcome to new members and procedural matters (papers 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3)
3. Minutes of the meeting of 15 August 2013 and matters arising (papers 3.1 and 3.2)
4. Site proposals for Town Council consideration – oral update on meeting with landowners, and next steps
5. Budget update
6. Any Other Business

Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Members

Nigel Kay, Faversham Town Councillor, Nigel@kayna.plus.com
Mike Cosgrove, Swale Borough Councillor, cllrcosgrove@swale.gov.uk
David Simmons, Faversham Town Councillor, dhsimmons@btconnect.com
John Coulter, Faversham Town Councillor, john@jcoulter.plus.com
Trevor Payne, Faversham Town Councillor, trevorpayne49@hotmail.com
Andrew Osborne, Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group, andrewosborne3@tiscali.co.uk
Michael Henderson, Swale Borough Councillor, mr.michaelhenderson@virgin.net
John Sell, Faversham Town Council Planning Agent, john@sellwade.co.uk
Natalie Earl, Senior Planner Swale, NatalieEarl@swale.gov.uk
Anne Salmon, Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group, annesalmon62@hotmail.co.uk
Jackie Westlake OBE, Town Clerk, jackie.westlake@favershamtc.co.uk
Christopher Wright, Faversham Creek Trust, christopherwright@uwclub.net
Kirsty Northwood, Faversham Traders Group, kirstynmike@sky.com
Brenda Chester, Brents Community Forum, brenda.chester@zen.co.uk
Janice Hennessey, Faversham Creek Management Company (Belvedere Road), janicehennessey@talktalk.net

Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Terms of Reference

Area of Interest

1. The core area of interest to be all the land and channel included within the Area Action Plan for the area for Faversham Creekside as defined within the Vanguard Neighbourhood Plan designation.

Role

2. The role of the Steering Group will be to manage and guide the development of the Neighbourhood Plan and to assist with community engagement. It will be the responsibility of the Steering Group members to report back to their constituent bodies for scrutiny and comment on the content of the Plan as it progresses.

Membership

3. The Steering Group will consist of:

- **Faversham Town Council**; 4 Members and their Planning Agent. The Town Clerk will provide secretariat support
- **Swale Borough Council**; 2 Ward Members
- **The Faversham Creek Consortium**; 2 Members of their Steering Group
- **Faversham Creek Trust**: 1 Member
- **Faversham Society**: 1 Member
- **Faversham Traders Group**: 1 Member
- **Brents Community Forum**: 1 Member
- **Belvedere Road Residents Association**: 1 Member
- **Faversham Area Tourism Association**: 1 Member
- **Landowners**: 1 Member

4. In addition, an independent planning consultant will report to the Steering Group and assist with technical advice and production of the plan. A second Borough Council officer will provide planning support and procedural advice.

Procedural Matters

5. The Steering Group will elect a Chair from Faversham Town Council and a Vice Chair from the Swale Borough Councillors.

6. Decisions of the Steering Group that are to be presented to the Town Council for approval will be by a simple majority of the Town Council members present and voting. Other matters may be voted on by all Steering Group members, but that vote will be consultative only.

7. Each Steering Group meeting will be reported to the Town Council, and an update will include Town Council Member votes (if any), information on consultative votes (if any), and other detail required to enable the Town Council to make the necessary decisions on the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.
8. A quorum for a meeting of the Steering Group shall be 3 of the 4 of the voting members of the Group.
9. Seven days notice of exceptional meetings shall be given to members of the Steering Group.
10. The Steering Group may invite advisers or those with specialist knowledge to attend meetings by invitation of the Chair.
11. Minutes of meetings will be made and will be made available to the public.
12. All Members of the Steering Group shall declare relevant interests in a register to be maintained by the Secretary. Members shall be responsible for notifying the Secretary of any changes in their interests.
13. Meetings shall be held in accordance with Faversham Town Council Standing Orders (see Annex A for particular SOs relating to the conduct of business)

STANDING ORDERS (EXTRACT)

QUESTIONS

- 26 A Member may ask the Chairman any question concerning the business of the Council.
- 27 A Member with or without notice may ask the Chairman of a Committee any question upon the proceedings of the Committee then before the Council if the question is put before the Council's consideration of those proceedings is finished.
- 28 Every question shall be put and answered without discussion.
- 29 A person to whom a question has been put may decline to answer.

RULES OF DEBATE

- 30 No discussion shall take place upon the Minutes except upon their accuracy. Corrections to the Minutes shall be made by Resolution and must be initialled by the Chairman.
- 31 (a) A Resolution or amendment shall not be discussed unless it has been proposed and seconded and unless proper notice has already been given, it shall, if required by the Chairman, be reduced to writing and handed to him before it is further discussed or put to the Meeting.
- (b) A Member when seconding a Resolution or amendment may, if he then declares his intention to do so, reserve his speech until a later period in the debate.
- (c) A Member shall direct his speech to the question under discussion or to a personal explanation or to a question or order.
- (d) No speech shall exceed five minutes, except by consent of the Council, except that the mover of a Motion shall not speak for more than ten minutes.
- (e) An amendment shall be either:-
- (i) To leave out words
 - (ii) To leave out words and insert or add others.
 - (iii) To insert or add words.

- (f) An amendment shall not have the effect of negating the Motion before the Council.
 - (g) If an amendment be carried, the Resolution, as amended, shall take the place of the original Resolution and shall become the Resolution upon which any further amendment may be moved.
 - (h) A further amendment shall not be moved until the Council has disposed of every amendment previously moved.
 - (i) The mover of a Resolution or of an amendment shall have a right of reply.
 - (j) A Member may make a point of order relating to a specific Standing Order or a personal explanation. A personal explanation shall be confined to some material part of a former speech by him which may have been misunderstood. A Member speaking for these purposes shall be heard forthwith.
 - (k) A Motion or amendment may be withdrawn by the proposer with the majority consent of the Council, which shall be signified without discussion, and no Member may speak upon it after permission has been asked for its withdrawal unless such permission has been refused.
 - (l) When a Resolution is under debate no other Resolution shall be moved except the following:-
 - (i) To amend the Resolution.
 - (ii) To proceed to the next business.
 - (iii) To adjourn the debate.
 - (iv) That the question be now put.
 - (v) That a Member named be not further heard.
 - (vi) That a Member named do leave the Meeting.
 - (vii) That the Resolution be referred to a Committee.
 - (viii) To exclude the public and press.
 - (ix) To adjourn the Meeting.
- 32 . At meetings of the full Council a Member shall stand when speaking unless permitted by the Chairman to sit. All other Members will remain seated unless rising on a point of order or personal explanation.
- 33 . (a) The ruling of the Chairman on a point of order or on the admissibility of a personal explanation shall not be discussed.
- (b) Members shall address the Chairman.
 - (c) If two or more Members indicate, the Chairman shall call upon one of the them to speak.

- (d) Whenever the Chairman rises during a debate all other Members shall be seated and silent.
- (e) The Council may resolve by majority to suspend the necessity to stand when speaking at the Annual Meeting.

CLOSURE

- 34 . At the end of any speech a Member may, without comment, move “that the question be now put”, “that the debate be now adjourned” or “that the Council do now adjourn”. If such Motion is seconded and if the Chairman is of the opinion that the question before the Council has been sufficiently debated (but not otherwise), he shall forthwith put the Motion. If the Motion “that the question be now put” is carried, he shall call upon the mover to exercise or waive his right of reply and shall put the question immediately after that right has been exercised or waived. The adjournment of a debate or of the Council shall not prejudice the mover’s right of reply at the resumption.

DISORDERLY CONDUCT

- 35 . (a) No Member shall misconduct himself at a Meeting by persistently disregarding the ruling of the Chairman, by wilfully obstructing business, or by behaving irregularly, offensively, improperly or in such a manner as to scandalise the Council or bring it into contempt or ridicule.
- (b) If, in the opinion of the Chairman, a Member has so misconducted himself, the Chairman shall express that opinion to the Council and hereafter any member may move that the Member named be no longer heard or that the Member named do leave the Meeting, and the Motion, if seconded, shall be put forthwith without discussion.
- (c) If either of the Motions mentioned in paragraph (b) is disobeyed, the Chairman may suspend the Meeting or take such further steps as may be reasonably necessary to enforce them.

RIGHT OF REPLY

- 36 . The mover of a Resolution shall have a right to reply immediately before the Resolution is put to the vote. If an amendment is proposed the mover of the amendment shall be entitled to reply immediately before the amendment is put to the vote. A Member exercising a right of reply shall not introduce a new matter. After the right of reply has been exercised or waived, a vote shall be taken without further discussion.

ALTERATION OF RESOLUTION

- 37 A Member may, with the consent of his seconder, move amendments to
. his own Resolution.

RESCISSION OF PREVIOUS RESOLUTION

- 38 (a) No Motion to rescind any Resolution passed within the preceding six
. months, and no Motion or amendment to the same effect as one which
has been negatived within the preceding six months shall be proposed
unless the notice thereof given bears the names of at least five Members
of the Town Council and has been delivered to the Town Clerk at least
seven clear days and not later than noon on Monday in the week before
the next Meeting of the Council.
- (b) When a special Resolution has been disposed of, no similar Resolution
may be moved within a further six months.
- (c) This Order shall not apply to rescinding Resolutions moved in pursuance
of the report or recommendation of a Committee.

Neighbourhood Plan timetable (provisional)

Date	Consultation programme	Number of weeks to plan/ undertake activity
	Launch of designation consultation: Publicising of Neighbourhood Plan area (see Regulation 5 of the NP Regs - submission to LPA followed by 6 week consultation period)	6 weeks (in progress)
May 2012	Neighbourhood Plan Options Exhibition	8 weeks
Nov 12	Consensus Building event	8 weeks
End of Feb 13	CPRE facilitated meeting with Faversham Creek Trust	3 weeks
Early March 13	Illustrations workshop with Steering Group	4 weeks
7/8 June 2013	Consultation Feedback Exhibition	6 weeks
8 June - 29 June	Consultation period following exhibition	3 weeks
On-going	Engagement with the press/ media	
Late June	Analysis of Feedback Exhibition Outcomes Commission Viability Study	3 weeks
August/September	Steering Group consider outcomes of Feedback Exhibition and Viability Study and make recommendations on the structure and content of the Neighbourhood Plan	
September/October	Town Council consider recommendations of Steering Group and instruct drafting of Neighbourhood Plan	
December 2013/January 2014	Drafting the Neighbourhood Plan. Sustainability Appraisal/SEA/peer review/Steering Group meetings	10 weeks
January 2014	Town Council approve Draft Neighbourhood Plan for consultation	
January/February 2014 (Dates dependent on information from SBC)	Pre-submission consultation (see Regulation 14 of the NP Regs - 6 week consultation period on draft plan, followed by relevant amendments)	6 weeks
The following dates are subject to revision		
February/March	Collation of Pre-submission consultation feedback	3 weeks

March	Steering Group/Town Council consider Pre-submission consultation feedback outcomes and make recommendations on amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan	
March (ditto)	Make any changes to Plan	4 weeks
April	SUBMISSION of Plan with consultation statement (LPA minimum consultation of 6 weeks)	6 weeks
Summer 14	Plan examination	
Late Summer 14	Examiner's Report	
Autumn 14 (ditto)	Support referendum	4 weeks

Minutes of the Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting: Thursday, 15 August 2013

Present

Nigel Kay, Faversham Town Councillor (FTC) – Chairman

Mike Cosgrove, Swale Borough Councillor (SBC) – Vice Chairman

John Coulter, Faversham Town Councillor

Trevor Payne, Faversham Town Councillor

Mike Henderson, Swale Borough Councillor

Anne Salmon, Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group member

Andrew Osborne, Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group member

John Sell, Faversham Town Council Planning Agent

In attendance

David Simmons, Mayor, Faversham Town Council

Jackie Westlake, Faversham Town Council Clerk – Secretary

Natalie Earl, Senior Planner, Swale Borough Councillor

Before the start of the meeting, the Chair took questions from the public. These are attached at Annex A.

1. Apologies for absence

1.1 There were no apologies for absence. Cllr Kay (NK) advised the Group that, since the last meeting, Tony Fullwood had resigned from his position as independent planning consultant to the Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. NK read out the following statement:

“Following the recent round of consultation on the Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan, our independent planning consultant, Tony Fullwood, has indicated to the Steering Group that there is now a significant gap between the consultation responses and the recommendations of his 2010 report.

Whilst he remains convinced that his report contains viable and deliverable benefits to Faversham Creek and provides a sustainable future for the area, he is keen to see the Neighbourhood Plan progress to examination and referendum and he has recommended a review of the composition of the Steering Group. As part of this review he feels that it would be more helpful if he no longer advised the Steering Group and, therefore has decided to withdraw from the process.

Tony has sent his thanks and best wishes to the Steering Group in drawing the process to a successful conclusion.”

NK thanked Tony Fullwood for his work on the Neighbourhood Plan process to date, and the Group agreed a formal letter of thanks should be sent.

ACTION: Jackie Westlake (JW) to send a letter of thanks to Tony Fullwood on behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

2. Minutes of the meeting of 25 July 2013 and matters arising

2.1 Cllr Cosgrove (MC) asked that one amendment be made: paragraph 3.2 to read 600 rather than 500. The minutes were then approved.

2.2 All matters arising had been dealt with except that relating to the public question seeking information on the consultation on the designation of the Neighbourhood Plan area. Miss Earl (NE) explained that the designation would be out for consultation in the next two weeks. There was a statutory requirement only for the consultation to be placed on the planning authority's website, but it had been agreed it would be linked to the Town Council website, and letters would be sent to all those living in the designation area.

3. AMT Report

3.1 Anne Salmon (AS) gave a short presentation on the report. This is attached at Annex B.

3.2 Members thanked AS for her hard work and agreed they needed more time to study the report and consider its implications. The Group noted there was strong support for a range of issues on the continuous Creekside walkway, the operation of the swing bridge, and the opening up of the Inner Basin. There was a strong response indicating maritime-related industry and tourism for the Creek with very limited, if any, housing being sought.

3.3 There were two aspects of the report to take into account: one related to the actual numbers responding in similar ways to the questions; the other related to how the wider comments could be incorporated and used to develop the Plan. The number of returned forms, both on specific sites and on the wider questionnaire did not reflect the actual number of recorded visits to the exhibition.

3.4 In discussion, the Group agreed that options presented had to be deliverable. If there were significant numbers seeking a particular option for a site which was not deliverable, the Group had a duty to explain why that was not feasible, and to offer alternatives in the draft Plan.

3.5 It was agreed that a full and final summary should be produced to go on the website. Members would use AS's summary as the template.

ACTION

- **Members to amend AS's summary report. Amendments to JW by Thursday, 22 August**
- **Summary to go on the website**

4. Next Steps

4.1 JW presented the paper on next steps. Members agreed the following actions on communications and engagement:

ACTIONS

- **To send the feedback summaries (site feedback and AMT report) to landowners**
- **To subsequently arrange meetings with landowners/their agents to discuss the feedback and to investigate what impact, if any it would have on their plans**
- **To send the feedback summaries to various organisations (Faversham Creek Trust, Faversham Society, Traders Group, Faversham Area Tourism Association (FATA), FEP)**
- **To invite Faversham Creek Trust, Faversham Society, Traders Group, FATA, residents' association (one from each side of the Creek: Belvedere Road, Brents Community Forum, both to liaise with other residents' associations to ensure comprehensive representation), and a landowners' representative, with an accompanying note explaining the Neighbourhood Plan, the current state of play, next steps, and their role in the work to referendum**
- **To seek the Town Council's views on whether Shepherd Neame should be invited to sit on the Group**
- **To seek the views of the Faversham Youth Forum on the Neighbourhood Plan**

4.2 Members discussed whether the Group should approach SBC for a replacement for Tony Fullwood (TF). There was some concern about the need to do this, given that SBC had not identified there was an issue with continuing to employ TF. However, it was agreed that it was important for SBC to understand the financial implications, which would require the Steering Group to be clear about the workplan for a consultant, the timetable up to referendum, and to what extent the Steering Group would be taking on particular tasks.

ACTIONS

- **JW, with the Steering Group, to draft a letter to James Freeman setting out the Group's requirements for an independent planning consultant**
- **NE to provide SBC papers (including Terms of Reference) where necessary**

4.3 The Group discussed the need to present a set of site-specific alternatives to put to the Town Council for its September meeting. This would have to be before the next Steering Group meeting on 12 September.

ACTION

- **JW, with the Steering Group, to draft a paper on site-specific proposals**

5. Undesignated Heritage Assets Paper

5.1 AS presented draft replies to two consultation letters which were particularly detailed and required separate responses. These were from Mr Harrison and Dr Percival. These had been drafted by AS and John Sell (JS).

5.2 The Group agreed the responses and thanked AS and JS for their work.

ACTION

JW to send the letters out on behalf of the Steering Group

6. Budget

6.1 There had been no further expenditure on the NP budget since the last meeting.

7. Any Other Business

7.1 The following were raised under AOB:

- (i) Induction for new members

ACTION

Steering Group members to offer to run through the NP etc on an informal basis

- (ii) To consider a report on the potential for maritime-related activity in Faversham Creek

The Steering Group agreed this could be a useful study for the NP. It would be important to understand what levers there were, outside the use class orders, to encourage maritime-related industry

ACTION

MC to explore the potential for such a study

8. Dates of the next meeting

8.1 The date of the next meeting was confirmed:

- Thursday, 12 September, 2013 (7pm, Guildhall)

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

1. Whether the Brents Community Forum could be invited onto the Steering Group? (This was in the form of a letter from Angie Simmons, Brents Tavern, read out by Teresa Luck)

It was agreed, in the body of the meeting, to invite a representative from the Brents Community Forum onto the Steering Group.

2. Could the Standing Orders be amended so that questions could be asked at the end of the meeting?

Standing Orders for the whole of the Town Council would be reviewed.

3. Why were public questions at the meeting limited to registered electors only, when residents from the wider Faversham area had been encouraged to complete the site feedback/questionnaire forms?

Town Council Standing Orders limited public questions at meetings (including Committee meetings) to registered electors. This was standard practice among parish and town councils. The NP was likely to be of interest and concern to a wider group of people, and it was important that they could express their views.

4. Could there be more clarity about the leadership role of the Town Council? How did the approach of the Steering Group fit with the way other NP groups had formed groups and consulted with the community?

There were no particular benchmarks for Neighbourhood Plans. Each vanguard group approached consultation and engagement differently.

5. What impact would the Perry Court development have, if it went ahead, on the need to build housing on the Creek?

It would not affect sites within the Creek area. The requirement to build more houses had to be considered holistically within the Local Plan which would be out for consultation on 19 August.

6. How would the NP fit within the Local Plan?

When a Local Plan is emerging it is increasingly given more weight, depending on what the reference is to the NP. If the reference is not substantial, it has little weight until the NP is agreed at referendum. AAP2, being a saved policy, will take precedence. When it is no longer saved, if the NP is not agreed, the National Planning Policy Framework will take precedence. In any case, the NP has to fit with the NPPF and the strategic policy of the Local Plan.

7. What will happen if there is no NP?

The NP needs to represent Faversham's aspirations, whilst being viable, deliverable and compliant with the NPPF. There will be two lots

of statutory consultation once the NP has been drafted. If the NP is not agreed either at the inquiry or the referendum stage, the Local Plan (see 6. above) and the NPPF take precedence and will be used to determine planning applications. If applications are refused, the applicant has a right to appeal.

AMT report summary

Introduction

The report is based on the results from 278 questionnaires completed at the Illustrations workshop or in the consultation period following.

79% of the respondents were over 51, 38% had lived in Faversham over 25 years, 43% were retired and 38% employed or self employed full time. 43% live in couple households.

Section A Business and employment

80% of respondents did not own a business. Of those who did, 90% owned one business. Most of these responded and 57% of the businesses were outside the creek area. The most popular elements identified as required in the creek area which would help businesses were faster broadband and that there is a lack of suitable premises. Numbers answering the questions on requirements for businesses were very small. Most respondents were not intending to start a business. Responses to the questions about the need for premises were in single figures.

The only question in this section that generated a high level of response was what sort of business should be encouraged in the creek area over the next 20 years. The three most popular answers were maritime industry (92%), tourism and leisure (75%) and small scale industrial/artisan workshops (76%). Most of the answers in the 'other' responses fell within these three use categories.

Section B Open Spaces

A large number of respondents completed this section. Approximately half of respondents use the open spaces around the creek more than once per week. Other elements required in public open spaces were, in order of popularity more footpaths (69%) more public seating (68%) creating wildlife meadows (63%) planting more trees (58%) landscaping of public areas (47%).

There was a wide variety of responses to the question about which open spaces respondents wanted to see protected. Several areas which are not existing public open spaces were identified including Ordnance Wharf and Standard Quay. Many respondents wanted to protect the open land at the Upper Brents, Crab Island, Town Quay, Flood Lane and the Stonebridge Allotments.

81% were in favour of lower energy street lights

92% in favour of keeping light pollution to a minimum

86% supported improving the connectivity of rights of way

94% supported improving the usability of rights of way around the creek

81% favoured improved cycleways.

In the free comments section, several respondents commented on the importance of better signage so that people are directed towards the creek from the town and around the area. Concern was also expressed that areas that attract wildlife should be protected as they provide important natural habitats. The character of the area as a maritime area for traditional crafts and provision of facilities for boat owners and the issue of dredging to remove silt were mentioned frequently.

Section C Young people

The majority indicated that they would not use a children's play park if provided. There was substantial support for improved footpaths (72%) and traffic-free cycleways around the creek (62%) and measures to slow traffic (50%) and better access to current open space (42%).

Suggested locations for slowing the traffic in areas around or approaching the creek included South Road running into North Lane, Conduit Street and Quay Lane, Belvedere Road and most commonly Abbey Street with a few respondents also mentioning the Upper Brents. Controlled crossings to help people to cross the roads more easily were suggested in North Lane from the bridge side to reach Partridge Lane, at the junction of Quay Lane with Court Street, across Bridge Road/Church Road to Bramble Hill Road near the creek bridge and across Church Road, the Brents from Faversham Grill to the nursery in the Brents schoolroom.

This section of questions gave a further opportunity for comment on footpaths, and many respondents supported the provision of footpaths all around the creek.

Many people considered that the creek should be used to provide facilities for young people. 88% supported craft skills and apprenticeships, 87% sailing and canoeing, 84% sea cadets and maritime activities and 74% access to open spaces and the countryside.

The question of location of craft skills and apprenticeships provoked a wide range of responses. Many respondents identified the Purifier building which is owned by the Creek Trust. Other respondents suggested Standard Quay and Ordnance Wharf. A smaller number mentioned Iron Wharf and Alan Staley's boatbuilding works. A few commented that these activities should happen all around the creek.

The question of socialising in pubs and cafes also produced a wide variety of answers. Many respondents commented that there are already a large number of pubs, cafes and restaurants in the town which is not far away. Other suggestions included at Standard Quay, the disused building on the West Street side of Morrison's or at the coach depot.

Section D Housing

90% of the respondents have not experienced any problems finding suitable accommodation with the creek area.

The Local Plan policy as set out in the Strategic Housing Land Appraisal indicated that there should be up to 100 houses within the Creek Neighbourhood Plan area.

The most popular answer was 31% for fewer than 10 houses, 10-20 at 12%, 21-30 at 11%, 31-50 at 9%, 51-70 at 7%, 71-100 at 12%, more than 100 at 7% and No strong opinion at 12%.

Among responders for fewer than 10 houses, concern was raised that any new housing would be too expensive for local people. There are a lot of other places around the town for housing development not in the NP area. There are too many new houses around the creek already. There should be no more new housing. The area will turn into a dormitory with the occupiers commuting out of town. Abbey Street cannot sustain any more traffic. All areas of the waterfront should be used for maritime industry or public amenity. The area is prone to flooding and is not suitable for housing.

10-20 responders wanted new housing to be minimised. If there is any, it should be further away from the creek. Any new housing is likely to be too expensive. The housing shown on the drawings at the exhibition is too dense and there is no parking shown. The creek would become a middle class enclave. It would be preferable to have maritime industry. There are not enough jobs available in the town and too many houses.

20-30 responders' comments included that new housing is likely to become second homes and not meet local housing need. The creek area should not be turned over to housing. Flats on Ordnance Wharf and the oil depot would have a very negative impact. There should be no housing in the basin. There is a need for some affordable housing. Some housing could be built on the BMM Weston site and Fentiman's Yard. Large -scale housing development would cause noise and light pollution.

31-50 responders' comments include that the area should be for affordable housing for local people. The existing houses create a lot of dead space around the creek. Exclusive developments (those people cannot walk through) provide no benefit for local people. There could be some growth but it would cause a significant impact on traffic.

51-70 responders' comments include that any more than 70 units would not be compatible with the area being a leisure and tourism destination. Much above 50 units would be too intensive for the land available.

Comments from the 71-100 responders included that some housing must be included in the Plan but what was shown in the drawings at the exhibition indicate a creek dominated by housing. There is a high housing need in Faversham. Housing should not inhibit access to the creek for all residents of the town and visitors but there should be employment opportunities, especially maritime. The Brents Industrial Estate could be redeveloped for housing as it is poorly located and not well-suited for business. There could be limited housing at Swan Quay and the oil depot and on the top part of BMM Weston and possibly part of Frank and Whittome site.

Some respondents stating that they had no strong opinion comment that the Creek Neighbourhood Plan is not the place to solve the town's housing shortage as waterfront housing is too expensive. There are areas that are not already developed that they would not like to see developed. Housing does not need to be beside the creek where it might get flooded. Waterside housing has to be raised to avoid flooding and is therefore often too tall. The waterside housing that has been built has taken up former employment sites.

The questions on the potential importance of new housing were covered by a high number of respondents. There was an even split between respondents who thought that new housing would or would not enable young people to live around the creek. 61% agreed that new housing would support local businesses, community groups or facilities. There was a roughly even split on whether new housing was acceptable to help to pay for new infrastructure such as streetscape and the bridge while 55% supported the view that new housing would help to meet housing need.

88% considered that more housing would harm the landscape and views.

89% consider that new housing would harm the character of the creek

76% consider that there would be increased parking problems.

79% consider that there would be increased traffic problems.

Four-storey flats and holiday lets would not provide any social housing for local youngsters. New housing would destroy the whole essence and beauty of the creek. Housing would result in the loss of the heritage of the creek and its cultural identity. There will be additional traffic in Abbey Street, West Street and Flood Lane. If there is more housing, it will dominate the creek. There should be no housing around the basin except possibly at BMM Weston. Some might be acceptable at Swan Quay or the oil depot.

The question on what sort of new housing attracted a high number of respondents.

57% favoured small family houses

41% Starter homes (1 bedroom)

41% small homes for older people

32% homes with designated office or workshop space (live/work units)

67% were in favour of providing affordable homes for sale

66% were in favour of homes for sale on the open market

53% said that new housing should be on former commercial sites

63% said that new housing should be achieved by the conversion of redundant or derelict buildings

87% supported that housing should be designed to be appropriate to the creekside character

75% agreed that housing should have a low environmental impact

63% considered that new housing should be low cost to run

71% considered that housing with gardens was very important or quite important

77% considered that off street parking was very important or quite important.

Other comments regarding the location and design of housing included comments that there are too many questions about housing. It is important that housing should not be more than two storeys high as there are enough tall buildings around the creek. A new bridge would improve the overall visual effect and impact of the creek. Any new housing should be in keeping with the surroundings and should not be too large. Residents should be made aware of any new or existing rights of way to avoid the recent disagreements over these. People should be encouraged to use public transport: there are good train and bus services and this will help to reduce the need for large parking areas. Decisions on whether there should be housing should not be made on a financial basis. Maritime heritage should have priority over housing. Housing should not be designed with retail or workshops underneath as such uses are likely to fail and blight the appearance of the area. Housing should be in keeping with the area; individual looking houses and not blocks of flats. Most of the questions are angled as if there is no alternative to housing development around the creek.

Section E The bridge and sluices

Almost all respondents answered the questions concerning the bridge and the sluice gates.

97% supported the statement that the creek bridge should be an opening bridge to let vessels into the basin.

95% considered that an opening bridge would improve the attraction of the town to tourists and residents.

98% supported the provision of working gates and sluices to maintain the creek channel for navigation.

97% considered that the gates and sluices should work to allow vessels into the basin.

Section F Best/Worst, hopes/fears

Most comments in the section on the three best things about the creek related to its maritime character and the presence of large boats or

barges, and of boats coming and going, the presence of wildlife and open space around the creek right into the town centre for walking, that the creek is a unique asset or has a unique character and that the area has a wildness and beauty.

Most common themes for answers in the three worst things about the creek were that the bridge and sluices are not working and that the creek has silted up, with lots of mud, there is no public access all around the creek and the existing footpaths do not join up and that the creek area appears neglected and forsaken.

The most common responses to a main hope for the future of the creek were on the themes of bringing back more maritime use in the form of workshops to repair vessels and moorings for traditional vessels to create a maritime character, better access around the creek on footpaths and better access up the creek by water and use of it for leisure for all sorts of vessels.

The most common responses to a worst fear for the creek were that the creek area would be surrounded by housing and that there would be overdevelopment. This would result in harm to the unique character of the area. Provision of shops and cafes would make the area like any other tourist town. The creek would just become like everywhere else and lose its distinctiveness. Access to the creek would be more restricted. This could happen whether the Plan was adopted and this is what the Plan included or if it failed and the developments were granted on appeal. A minority view was that no agreement would be reached and nothing would happen, leaving the creek to silt up and die.

**FAVERSHAM CREEK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING:
15 AUGUST 2013: MATTERS ARISING**

ACTIONS	PROGRESS
Jackie Westlake (JW) to send a letter of thanks to Tony Fullwood on behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Done. Letter sent on 21 August 2013.
Members to amend AS's summary of the AMT report. Amendments to JW by Thursday, 22 August	Done.
Summary to go on the website	Done.
To send the feedback summaries (site feedback and AMT report) to landowners	Done. Letters, including invitations and summaries sent on 23 August 2013.
To subsequently arrange meetings with landowners/their agents to discuss the feedback and to investigate what impact, if any it would have on their plans	Arranged week beginning 2 September 2013.
To send the feedback summaries to various organisations (Faversham Creek Trust, Faversham Society, Traders Group, Faversham Area Tourism Association (FATA), FEP)	Done. Letters, including invitations and summaries sent on 23 August 2013.
To invite Faversham Creek Trust, Faversham Society, Traders Group, FATA, residents' association (one from each side of the Creek: Belvedere Road, Brents Community Forum, both to liaise with other residents' associations to ensure comprehensive representation), and a landowners' representative, with an accompanying note explaining the Neighbourhood Plan, the current state of play, next steps, and their role in the work to referendum	Done. Letters, including invitations and summaries sent on 23 August 2013. Responses received from Faversham Creek Trust, Faversham Traders Group and Brents Community Forum.
To seek the Town Council's views on whether Shepherd Neame should be invited to sit on the Group	Done. Agreed at Town Council meeting of 27 August 2013 and letter sent on 28 August 2013.
To seek the views of the Faversham Youth Forum on the Neighbourhood Plan	To be presented to the Youth Working Party meeting of 10 September 2013.
JW, with the Steering Group, to draft a letter to James Freeman setting out the Group's requirements for an independent planning consultant	Done. Letter sent on 28 August 2013.
NE to provide SBC papers (including Terms of Reference) where necessary	As and when required.
JW, with the Steering Group, to draft a paper on site-specific proposals	Outstanding.

JW to send the letters (to R Harrison and Dr Percival) out on behalf of the Steering Group	Done. Letters sent on 22 August 2013.
Steering Group members to offer to run through the NP etc. on an informal basis	Ongoing.
MC to explore the potential for such a study (what levers there were, outside the use class orders, to encourage maritime-related industry)	Mike Cosgrove to report.