

JW

8 October 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, Professor C Wright, Ms B Chester, Ms J Hennessey, Ms K Northwood,

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 Tuesday, 15 October 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 Steering Group to receive questions from registered electors for the Town before the formal meeting starts.**

**AGENDA**

1. To receive any apologies for absence
2. Minutes of the meeting of 12 September 2013 and matters arising (papers 2.1 and 2.2)
3. Site proposals for Town Council consideration (paper 3.1)
4. Communications and engagement
5. Budget update
6. Any Other Business – update from DCLG workshop (JW)

**Minutes of the Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting: Thursday, 12 September 2013**

Present

Nigel Kay, Faversham Town Councillor (FTC) – Chairman  
Mike Cosgrove, Swale Borough Councillor (SBC) – Vice Chairman  
David Simmons, Mayor, Faversham Town Council  
John Coulter, Faversham Town Councillor  
Trevor Payne, Faversham Town Councillor  
Mike Henderson, Swale Borough Councillor  
Anne Salmon, Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group member  
John Sell, Faversham Town Council Planning Agent  
Professor Christopher Wright, Faversham Creek Trust  
Brenda Chester, Brents Community Association  
Kirsty Northwood, Faversham Traders Group  
Janice Hennessey, Faversham Creek Management Company

In attendance

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

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

**1. Apologies for absence**

1.1 There was one apology for absence: Andrew Osborne. Invitations had been sent to various organisations to join the Steering Group. FATA, the Faversham Society and landowners had yet to respond. [Town Clerk's note: FATA had advised it would prefer to attend on an ad hoc basis when there were matters relating to tourism to discuss.] Shepherd Neame had been invited to join following the Town Council meeting of 27 August. The Town Clerk had not yet had a response to the invitation.

**2. Welcome to new members and procedural matters**

2.1 Nigel Kay (NK) welcomed the following new members:

- Professor Christopher Wright, Faversham Creek Trust
- Brenda Chester, Brents Community Association
- Kirsty Northwood, Faversham Traders Group
- Janice Hennessey, Faversham Creek Management Company

2.2 NK explained that, as a statutory Committee of the Town Council, only Councillors would be able to vote. Other votes taken by all the Steering Group could only be advisory. The Group discussed whether it should continue to be a statutory Committee and, therefore, bound by those legal requirements and the Standing Orders, or whether it should become an Advisory Committee, which could develop its own rules and procedures. It was noted that advice had been received that both options were available for Neighbourhood Plan development and examples were given where the

community engagement had been commended by the Independent Examiner (Littlehampton and Thame. The latter had received an award from RTP1 for best practice in developing a Neighbourhood Plan). Brenda Chester (BC) proposed, seconded by Chris Wright (CW) that the Steering Group should cease to be a Committee of the Town Council, and become an Advisory Committee. On being put to the meeting, the vote was 4 for the proposal and 6 against. The vote being lost, it was agreed the Steering Group should continue as a statutory Committee of the Council.

2.3 Mike Cosgrove (MC) noted the issue of declarations of interest. These should be declared at the start of each meeting.

**ACTION: JW to circulate the definition of declaration of interest (pecuniary and non-pecuniary)**

2.4 Amendments to the Terms of Reference were discussed. They were:

- To refer to the Chair as Chairman
- To include the Mayor, David Simmons (DS) as a member

**ACTION: JW to amend as agreed for presentation to the Town Council**

2.5 The Group discussed the provisional timetable. John Sell (JS) explained there were two issues to be considered: the process and the content. On process, the timetable was important as it needed to take account of the Town Council drafting the Plan, the two statutory consultation periods, the referral to the independent examiner, and the referendum. The Plan would be judged on the processes it had gone through. In addition, on content, the policies had to take note of the draft Local Plan and the existing Local Plan (and it was likely that equal weight would be given to both), as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The latter stressed the importance of sustainable development, an overriding Government objective.

2.6 It was noted that, if there was not a Neighbourhood Plan, then there was the potential for development to take place around the Creek on the basis of appeals to the Planning Inspectorate. This had happened in the case of all development on the East side (Belvedere Road), and Waterside Close. Faversham Reach had been approved by Swale Borough Council. [Secretary's note: Neighbourhood Plans would not prevent appeals to the Planning Inspectorate. Rather, it provided a framework within which any appeals had to be made.]

2.7 The issue of Tony Fullwood's replacement was discussed. Natalie Earl (NE) said a report was being prepared for SBC's Strategic Management Team with a number of options. This would be discussed by the end of September, with a decision, it was hoped, by mid-October. The involvement of the Town Council in the process would be checked by NE. If a replacement was agreed, the individual would need specific competences in strategic planning, policy writing, knowledge of the process, and an ability to understand the challenges on this particular

Neighbourhood Plan. The consultant would be able to advise on e.g. the requirement for sustainable development. The most important element of the work would be to draft the Plan itself. In order to keep to the timetable, it would be important to progress recruitment as soon as possible.

2.8 In terms of the draft, the vision would need to be reiterated, with detailed policy on the sites, some of which would be challenging. JS advised the Group that the NPPF had specific guidance and it would be helpful to use their headings. It could also include other triggers to meet the overall objectives (e.g. how to encourage maritime industries through means other than the planning process).

#### **ACTIONS**

- **NE to provide fact sheets for new members (to be circulated by JW)**
- **NE to discuss the consultant's recruitment process with SBC HR**

2.9 NK stressed the importance of the expanded Group as a means to ensure as many voices as possible could be heard, and to ensure the community felt an integral part of the development of the Plan.

### **3. Minutes of the meeting of 15 August and matters arising**

3.1 The minutes were agreed. All matters arising had been dealt with except the following:

- To arrange meetings with landowners: There had been one meeting on Swan Quay and Frank and Whittome. The other landowners had yet to contact JW
- The Faversham Youth Forum agreed to take away the issue of the Neighbourhood Plan for consideration
- To draft a paper on site-specific proposals
- Study on maritime-related industry for the Creek. MC said he had investigated this through his membership of the Coastal Communities sub-group of the Local Enterprise Partnership. He hoped to report back at the next meeting

3.2 There was a discussion about the Youth Working Party and to what extent young people were represented on it. JW explained that at least two members of the Faversham Youth Forum sat on the group, and they had links to Swale Youth Forum. MC noted that the Steering Group had previously had representatives from the Queen Elizabeth Grammar School attend a meeting.

3.3 The Group briefly discussed the issues of use classes.

**ACTION: JW to send the Use Class Order pdf to new members**

### **4. Site proposals for Town Council consideration – oral update on meeting with landowners, and next steps**

4.1 NK stated that, at the meeting with the agents and architects, the following issues had been raised:

- the consensus reached at the November workshop
- the use classes for the site
- the importance of the Creek walkway
- current plans for the site

4.2 Anne Salmon (AS) noted that, on the Frank and Whittome site, it appeared that there was not much difference between what the landowners were looking at and the site responses feedback. On Swan Quay, a number of issues were raised, including footpaths, viability of the plans, and what development there should be on the upper floors of the proposed buildings. The proposed pontoon as part of the walkway would be problematic as it would have to be fixed. There would be issues of silting and the angle of the pontoon when the tide was out.

**ACTION: JW to circulate Swan Quay draft plans to the Steering Group**

4.3 In terms of next steps, the Group agreed it was important to discuss the feedback with the other landowners. A draft on use classes for the sites, with the key objectives for the Creek – the bridge, continuous walkway and the opening up of the inner basin – should be prepared. The vision should be the ‘golden thread’ pulling the Plan together. It was agreed the Plan was about the Creek, but the Plan process required the detail to be on specific sites as it was part of the wider planning process. The vision had been agreed by the Steering Group and had been developed through public consultation. The key test for the Plan was viability. It was important to begin drafting something for the Town Council’s consideration, irrespective of the potential recruitment of an independent planning consultant, although this was an urgent priority.

4.4 BC asked how the draft would reflect the views flowing from the public responses. The Group agreed this was critical but, where it was not possible to do so, on planning grounds, a clear explanation would have to be provided. The Plan needed to consider what was viable as well as what was deliverable. JS advised there were three strands to consider: what the community wanted; what was viable; and what was deliverable. A Plan could be viable but not be deliverable. If it was not deliverable, the key would be to work with key stakeholders to find a negotiated agreement.

**ACTION: JS, JW and AS to prepare draft papers with an outline of the Plan in relation to specific sites, the key objectives and, e.g. objectives from the Streetscape Strategy**

## **5. Budget**

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

## **6. Any Other Business**

6.1 The following was raised under AOB:

(i) Brents Community Association

BC advised that the Brents Community Association (BCA) had asked her to make the following points about the Association's priorities and concerns:

- The Creek to be treated in the Plan as a waterway and not as a residential street, with full maritime activity
- Standard Quay for boat repair/ restoration and mooring quay, which would provide skills training and job opportunities for local people
- No more housing on the creekside (affordable housing was key)
- Flood risk
- Open public spaces, free access to the waterfront, natural areas and wildlife
- Facilities on the creek for local people, including a community boatyard with facilities for young people and youth groups
- Visitor facilities – public toilets, showers, and better signage and information for people arriving by boat
- Community facilities and meeting place (the disused church could be an ideal site).
- Total support for the replacement of a new opening bridge, and the work the Faversham Creek Trust was doing at the Purifier building

The BCA would continue to consult local people. An ideas box had been placed at the Brents Tavern, and an e-mail address set up for people to be in touch.

**7. Dates of the next meeting**

7.1 The date of the next meeting would be arranged in correspondence.

**ACTION: JW to circulate grid for October and November**

**QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

**1. Could questions be asked at the end of the meeting?**

As the meeting was a Committee of the Town Council, questions could only be asked at the start of the meeting, in line with Standing Orders.

## 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 Association**: 1 Member
- **Faversham Creek Management Company**: 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 Chairman from Faversham Town Council and a Vice Chairman 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 below 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.

Paper 2.2

**FAVERSHAM CREEK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING:  
12 SEPTEMBER 2013: MATTERS ARISING**

Jackie Westlake (JW) to circulate the definition of declaration of interest (pecuniary and non-pecuniary)	Done.
JW to amend (Terms of Reference) as agreed for presentation to the Town Council	Done.
Natalie Earl (NE) to provide fact sheets for new members (to be circulated by JW)	Done.
NE to discuss the consultant's recruitment process with SBC HR	
JW to send the Use Class Order pdf to new members	Done.
JW to circulate Swan Quay draft plans to the Steering Group	Done.
Anne Salmon, JW, John Sell to prepare draft paper with an outline of the Plan in relation to specific sites, the key objectives and, e.g. objectives from the Streetscape Strategy	Done.
JW to circulate grid for October and November (for date of next meeting)	Done. Tuesday, 15 October Tuesday, 12 November Tuesday, 10 December

## **Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan: land uses for sites and streetscape requirements**

### **Introduction**

This report sets out the existing uses on the sites around the creek as identified on the sites map. In some cases, the report identifies where the boundaries of the sites need to be modified. Suggested uses for the sites are discussed, in some cases based on there being general agreement in the feedback and others following meetings with the landowners to discuss the feedback with them. At Standard House, the recommendation is based on the landowner's discussion with Swale Council and at the oil depot based on a meeting held with the most recent owner in spring 2012. The report sets out whether the recommendation is in line with the feedback or not, and if not why the landowner's preferred use is suggested. The Creek Streetscape Strategy (adopted June 2012 by Faversham Town Council, Swale Borough Council and the Swale Joint Transportation Board) has been used to indicate what streetscape improvements are desirable at each site, in the near vicinity of sites and at other sites around the creek. The report suggests possible sources of funding for such improvements to the streetscape. The report also identifies where Streetscape recommendations help to achieve the Objectives agreed in earlier consultation and what items from the Streetscape Strategy developments should include to assist in meeting the Objectives.

It is generally accepted from the site feedback and questionnaire responses that there is a desire to achieve a continuous footpath around the creek, joining up footpaths and quaysides along the frontage of existing sites. It is also generally accepted that there should be an openable bridge, working sluices and access for large vessels into the creek basin. Negotiations with Peel Ports and KCC are ongoing and the question of funding for repairs to the sluice gates and a new bridge forms part of these negotiations. The enhancement of sluicing and provision of an opening bridge are in accordance with Objective 1.

### **Shepherd Neame bottling hall (not one of the identified sites, but affects the basin)**

The site is used as a bottling hall for Shepherd Neame (class B2).

A footpath or walkway would be desirable alongside this site as a long term aim. This depends on the building being redeveloped and could only be achieved if the existing changes of level can be resolved by installation of a new bridge and is at present impracticable.

This is in accordance with the site feedback report.

Its provision would be in accordance with Objective 8 to improve links between Davington via the creek to the town.

No recommendation as to how this should be funded.

### **Site 1 –the Purifier**

The present use by Faversham Creek Trust is as workshops with training in maritime skills and it is their intention to use more of the building for workshops. The building is tightly contained within the Morrison's site and it may be desirable in the future to negotiate a slightly larger area of land. It also owns no adjacent water but has the potential for mooring on Morrison's wharf. This use should be the subject of a planning permission so that its hours and the nature of the use can be regulated. This use falls within class B1 but with the potential for some B2 because of noise generated and includes an element of class D1 (depending on the extent of

training.) It is understood that two marine-related craftsmen are intending to use the building as a workplace.

Preferred use-as existing B1/B2/D1 but with a planning permission. This is in accordance with Objective 3 which seeks to reinforce the area's importance for maritime activity and to provide training opportunities and also with Objective 6, to find a sustainable use for the Purifier.

The continued use of this building by the Creek Trust is strongly supported by the site feedback.

Close to this site is the section of footpath from the access road to Morrison's to the quayside public walkway, part of the creekside footpath. This should be better defined with a ramp at each end and screened over as shown on page 64 of the Creek Streetscape Strategy from the pooled funding or possibly with a contribution by negotiation with Shepherd Neame. This is in accordance with Objective 8 which seeks to improve links from Davington to the town centre via the creek.

### **Site 2-Ordnance Wharf**

The site is currently vacant, probably with a nil use. It has been used for storage of oil and may be contaminated.

The site is located at the head of the creek and has access from Flood Lane. Any vehicular access should remain from the Brent Road end of Flood Lane. It is separated from Purifier Wharf by an arm of the creek which is in the same ownership as Ordnance Wharf. There is a second arm of the creek between the site and Brent Road. The recommended use of the site is for a workshop at ground floor level which is for a separate user from those in the upper parts and the remainder for parking. Above this, housing in the form of separate housing units with the windows to the principal rooms facing towards Brent Road and no gardens. The building should comprise an angled terrace in traditional materials such as brick and weatherboard with pitched roofs and should be three storeys with accommodation in the roof lit by rooflights. This would be in accordance with Objective 11 which is to provide housing as part of a mixed use environment and would redevelop a disused site.

This is not in accordance with the site feedback or questionnaire responses. This is because the suggested uses for a workshop and community boatyard would rely on alternative ownership of the site which is not likely to take place. It is likely that such a use would need to rely on voluntary funding rather than operate commercially. To form a workshop only even if it were on a greater part of the site than envisaged in the feedback with no residential use on the upper floors would not be a viable or efficient use of the land and would not be deliverable.

There should be walkways on both sides and the walkway to the end of the wharf should be wider on the Purifier side to reduce any impact of noise generated in the Purifier on the occupiers of the buildings on Ordnance Wharf and to create more extensive public access to this area. Any new moorings should have heavy duty mooring rings suitable for all sizes of craft and should be publicly managed so that they are not limited to vessels of the occupiers of the buildings on the site. Moorings could also be provided along the Morrison's frontage. This would accord with Objective 3, to improve the area's capacity for maritime activity.

Close to this site is Flood Lane where the Creek Streetscape Strategy suggests a compacted aggregate surface to the section of Flood Lane between West Street and the end of the Purifier, re-alignment of the timber posts to limit the parking area and provision of a sign to the creek at West Street. This could be achieved by using the existing town streetscape funding as it does not relate to an identified site and is

slightly away from the creek itself. At the other end of Flood Lane, a combination of some pooled funding and funding from Ordnance Wharf development should contribute to provision of a compacted aggregate surface to the lane and design as a shared space for vehicles and pedestrians as far as the entrance into Ordnance Wharf including a speed restriction surface at the entrance onto Brent Road. The bridges over the two creek channels are also in need of inspection and repair. (page 62-3 of Streetscape describes). These Streetscape alterations would comply with Objective 8, to improve links from Davington via the creek to the town. The biodiversity of the open land at Flood Lane could also be improved which would assist in providing a better range of habitats in accordance with Objective 7.

### **Site 3 BMM Weston**

#### Car park area

Currently a car park enclosed by a wire mesh fence and tarmac surfaced with a partially surfaced footpath along the creek. (car park ancillary to Class B2)

In the longer term, this car park should be landscaped to provide parking with a more attractive surface and some planting to create a better environment around this part of the creek basin. The existing footpath could also be resurfaced and slightly widened to make it more suitable for a wider variety of users including people with disabilities and families with pushchairs. It would be desirable if funding could be found from pooled funds or from development on parts of the BMM Weston site to create a quayside by piling and backfilling to create moorings onto a quay rather than a pontoon which would then suit all sizes of craft and to improve the width and surface of the footpath/quayside. This is in accordance with the site feedback.

Close to the site is the entrance from the creekside footpath around the basin and this should be better defined. (see page 62-3 of Streetscape). The Streetscape works would be in accordance with Objective 8 to improve access from Davington to the town via the creek. The additional moorings would be in accordance with Objective 3 which is to raise the maritime importance of the basin.

BMM factory tall single storey factory buildings of mixed age used as engineering/manufacturing works, Class B2

There is an existing planning permission for the rebuilding of the northern part of this as offices for BMM (dates from 1980s scheme with the housing on the office site but never constructed) Any new mix of uses to be achieved on this site should be in accordance with Objective 12, which is to create a living and working environment that responds to the creek's outstanding industrial and maritime heritage, the demands for high performing standards of sustainable development, whilst supporting existing business and their aspirations.

Close to this site is the open green at the north end of the creekside footpath around the basin where it emerges onto Bridge Road. A new footpath with timber edging and compacted gravel should be provided across this grass area as identified in Streetscape page 62. This could be achieved by using pooled funding. This would be in accordance with Objective 8 to create better links from Davington to the town via the creek and Objective 15, to improve community safety by creating natural surveillance around the basin.

BMM Weston Offices White rendered two storey building with flat roof in landscaped grounds with trees and parking area. Class B1

There is a planning permission to replace this building with a block of housing. This has been implemented but never constructed. Any new scheme would need to be carefully designed with regard to scale and massing and also with regard to the



materials and overall appearance as this site is visible from many areas around the creek, North Lane and West Street. It is likely that any new housing on this site would be expected to comply with the requirement in the Draft Local Plan to provide affordable housing. New development on this site should be in accordance with Objective 11, which is to provide a range of housing types and tenures that support delivery of area-wide objectives. It should also be in accordance with Objective 13, to maintain and enhance the surrounding townscape, setting of the creek, its roofscape and higher ground. This is in accordance with the site feedback and questionnaire responses.

#### **Site 4 Frank and Whittome**

Currently Creek Creative in Abbey Street end (Class B1/A1/A3) and the rest on Belvedere Road frontage mostly B1 or ancillary storage for B1.

The site should be re-defined on the sites map to include the whole site up to the rear of 5 Abbey Street and including the building adjacent to Smack Alley.

The buildings are described in detail in the Undesignated Heritage paper, but there is a single storey building at the front which is not of architectural merit and a modern part at the end nearest Smack Alley where a building of similar scale could be appropriate. All is 2 storey at least in height, some arranged as 1 tall storey and there are taller sections in the parts rising up Quay Lane. Any replacement of the new part of the building close to Smack Alley should be of similar scale (two storeys, no roofspace), using yellow stock bricks, windows which are more warehouse style than domestic and a slate roof. Extension of the older part as indicated in the earlier scheme from Lee Evans of brick and black weatherboarding to create a new entrance block and toilets for Creek Creative and extension of their studio spaces would be acceptable.

It would be preferable for Creek Creative to be retained (B1 with ancillary A1 and A3 uses) with the extension to the rear as described above and in the existing parts. Other parts of the building should be used as units suitable for class B1 offices or workshops or for residential (C3), but ideally a limit should be set on the proportion so that it does not all become residential. If Creek Creative ceases to use their areas of the complex, then those parts could be used for B1 (workshops or offices) or C3 (residential) but again ideally not all C3. Use of parts of the building for Creek Creative and a mix of workshop and residential uses is supported by the site feedback responses. The use of this complex should be in accordance with Objective 6, to provide a sustainable future for the building and with Objective 9 to create a greater diversity and vibrancy of land use.

Along the roadway outside the Creek Creative part of the building in Belvedere Road is an area of blue scoria paving which is described in Streetscape as needing to be retained and in Undesignated Heritage paper as an asset.

#### **Site 5 Swan Quay**

Currently open shed which is empty with attached building which was formerly an office (B1) Class B1 offices in blue building, vacant workshop behind (B1) and sailmaking workshop.(B1/ancillary A1)

The blue building is listed grade II. The building to the rear is modern, but as an attached building would require listed building consent to remove. The sailmaker building is modern as is the office attached to the open shed (both built for Frank and Whittome in around 1990). The shed is not considered to be of significant architectural merit.

A scheme comprising three main blocks of development running at right angles to the quay is preferred as it reflects the character of existing warehouse buildings

around the creek. The shortest one would be to the rear of the blue building. This would enable the blue building to be visible from across the creek as at present. Uses could include a gallery (D2), craft workshops (B1), starter business units (B1) specialist shops (A1) parking for the residential uses and possibly a cafe at ground floor level. The upper floors would need to be used as residential to ensure the viability of the scheme as a whole. Other parts of the site could be in residential use as houses. The housing to be provided should be in accordance with Objective 11, being part of a mixed use environment and should support the delivery of area wide objectives. The site as a whole should be developed in accordance with Objective 12, to create a living and working environment that responds to the creek's rich industrial and maritime heritage and the demands for high performing standards of sustainable development. The mix of ground floor uses would be in accordance with Objective 4 by providing additional arts, retail and leisure opportunities to make the creek more of a destination.

A set of single storey buildings on the site including workshops, galleries, shops and a cafe with no residential upper floors as indicated in the site feedback and in the comments on the questionnaires would not be considered by an Inspector as a viable or efficient use of the land and would be unlikely to be deliverable as a land use mix.

The three main ranges of buildings should be designed to reflect the existing creekside character, using stock brickwork, slate roofs, possibly timber lucarns and windows with a warehouse character. Modern elements should be carefully designed to add visual interest.

A creekside walkway should be provided along the frontage of the site in front of the all the buildings accessed via pedestrian walkways through the site and from the sites to either side and should be on the site in front of the buildings rather than on moored pontoons. At the town quay end, this should link around the back of the existing slipway onto town quay breaking through the existing fence. Moorings should be provided to the frontage of the site suitable for all sizes of craft, using heavy duty mooring rings set into the quay wall. This would be in accordance with Objective 3, to reinforce the area's importance for maritime activity.

Close to this site is the junction of Quay Lane and Conduit Street. The scheme to re-model this corner is shown on page 60 of Streetscape and involves formation of a sitting out area for the Swan and Harlequin and formation of a square with better quality paving and measures to encourage slower traffic including a shared surface. The scheme could also include replacement of the existing poor quality enclosure to the Shepherd Neame site. This could be achieved from pooled funding, possibly and with contributions from adjacent developments and negotiation with Shepherd Neame. This would be in accordance with Objective 8, to improve the safety of drivers and pedestrians.

### **Site 6-oil depot**

Currently vacant cleared site was sui generis use as an oil depot. It has housing to the south at Provender Walk and to the east at Standard Square and is separated from the existing public footpath by land in a different ownership which is used for car parking associated with Standard Quay.

The land is in the process of being sold and there has been no opportunity to meet with the new owner. The previous owner prepared a scheme in 2006 which was not submitted as a planning application. This recommended 18 houses with parking at ground floor level and two storeys of residential accommodation above in a small courtyard and set back from the frontage. These were designed in traditional

materials comprising brick and weatherboard with pitched roofs. Given the present residential setting of the site, it is considered that this use would be appropriate and would comply with Objective 11 to provide a mix of housing types as part of mixed use environments to support the delivery of area wide objectives.

A walkway along creek frontage should be provided to link up with the existing walkway along Provender Walk and with a new walkway to be provided on the adjacent coach depot site. Moorings are also required including moorings in the existing inlet, with heavy duty mooring rings to suit all sizes of craft. Capital dredging is required here and would need to be discussed with the Environment Agency as there has been no recent use to stop the site from silting up heavily. This would be in accordance with Objective 3, to improve the area's importance for maritime activity. The provision of a walkway and moorings as described is in accordance with the site feedback. However, views on the land uses of the site were more mixed with some support for housing and other respondents preferring workshops or open space on the site. It is considered that neither open space nor workshops without any housing would constitute a viable or efficient use of the land. For these reasons, such uses are unlikely to be deliverable.

### **Site 7 Coach depot**

Currently car wash (SG) and a single storey workshop building comprising car repairs (B2) with architectural salvage storage (class B8) together with a single storey building used as an office. The car wash does not benefit from planning permission and is not a suitable permanent use for part of the site.

It is recommended that the site should be redeveloped to create buildings of better design than the existing buildings and a permanent use of the site. Any new development should be designed as two separate buildings with a gap between them in line with Abbey Road to allow views of the creek when approaching from Abbey Street. The provision of a gap to allow such views was supported in the site feedback. The building nearer to Standard Quay should have active uses to the Standard Quay elevation and Abbey Road elevation which could include a chandlery or other retail shops (A1) and other uses could include craft workshops (B1), showers and toilets for boat users and an office to replace the existing office. All of these uses were suggested in the site feedback. The building closer to the oil depot should include car parking at ground floor level with other small commercial uses if possible. The upper floors of the first building should be residential in the form of flats, with the building comprising two and part three storeys above ground level. The second building should comprise flats or holiday lets on two upper floors. There is a shortage of holiday accommodation of this type in the town. The buildings should be constructed in traditional materials including brick and weatherboard with a varied roofline including characteristic waterside elements and could include a higher element on the waterside end of the Standard Quay elevation. The development would create housing as part of a mixed use environment which could support delivery of area-wide objectives in accordance with Objective 11 and would create a living and working environment that would respond to the creek's rich and outstanding industrial and maritime heritage in accordance with Objective 12. The mix of ground floor uses including the showers and toilets and retail activity would be in accordance with Objective 4 and improve the creek's role as a destination.

A walkway should be provided across the creek frontage of this site a minimum of 3 metres wide and wider where parts of buildings have suitable recesses or between buildings. This should connect with the walkway along the oil depot and with Standard Quay. The new walkway should be designed to retain the existing

exposed railway tracks at the south end of Standard Quay which are identified in the Streetscape and in Undesignated Heritage as part of an asset. Moorings should have heavy duty mooring rings to suit all sizes of craft. Provision of additional moorings would be in accordance with Objective 3.

The walkway and moorings together with the ground floor uses in one of the buildings and the provision of gaps between any new buildings were supported in the site feedback. There was limited support for any residential use on the coach depot in the site feedback and heavier opposition to any new residential development on creekside sites such as this in the questionnaire responses. It is considered that the provision of the range of commercial uses suggested without any upper storeys providing residential accommodation would not constitute an efficient use of the land. It would also not be a viable set of uses and for both of these reasons such uses are unlikely to be deliverable. Only with the added residential accommodation would there be finance available to deliver any other required elements such as walkways and additional moorings as were strongly supported in the site feedback.

### **Site 8-Standard Quay**

The boundaries of this site should be amended on the sites plan to include the land in front of Standard House extending to Oyster Bay House which is in the same ownership.

Currently a mix of craft workshops and storage in the black sheds. There are 5 workshops in building 2 (one let as a beauty shop in Class A1) and others used as storage for the barge Greta (B8) and one to a welder (B1). A second welder has moved from this building to a container on the quay. There is an upholstery workshop (Class B1) in building 4. Building 1 contains Cambria museum (D1 but unauthorised) and currently retail sales of furniture (A1) in the area of a proposed restaurant (A3) and there is a proposal for the upper floors as a gallery/function room (D1/D2) currently at appeal as part of the restaurant scheme. This building is also intended to provide public toilets. White building (Baltic House) contains unauthorised champagne bar (A4) and this is likely to be the subject of a retrospective planning application to regularise the use with staff accommodation above. The unauthorised signage and external alterations are under discussion with the conservation officer and what has been agreed would be included in the planning and listed building proposal. Minor alterations to the layout of the buildings were approved two years ago to subdivide them into the present units. Any new uses in the buildings should preserve their external appearance.

Also Old Granary mostly retail on both floors plus garden centre (A1 with ancillary A3 cafe) and open space used as part of the garden centre. It is intended to retain this building in the same uses which all benefit from planning permission.

There is an antique warehouse (A1) in one of green sheds which it is intended to retain. This is acceptable as it avoids any additional residential development in close proximity to the exposed side of the Old Granary. The site is also used for regular weekend antique markets. There is specialist vehicle repair in part of the other (B1/B2) This building is intended to be reduced in length retaining workshop uses to the west end facing onto Standard Quay. At the rear, five units of two storey housing are suggested facing onto New Creek Road. Car parking ancillary to the retail and workshop uses is located at present in area known as Hucksteps Wharf, plus three lived-in houseboats on moorings identified in the landowner's site plan as moorings

where repairs can take place to vessels. This was the former Goldfinch Yard and there are barge blocks on the mud. There is a variety of boats on the existing moorings including two Thames barges and it would be desirable to ensure that larger craft such as barges remain a part of the mix of vessels to be moored here but this cannot be controlled under planning legislation.

The provision of a walkway and moorings is supported by the site feedback. The mix of uses in two of the black sheds comprises mainly B1 uses. This is the same use class as maritime workshops such as shipwrights and other boat repair crafts that the site feedback favours and several of the existing users work on boats that are moored at the wharf or elsewhere such as the two welders. It would not be possible under planning legislation to ensure that the buildings are only used for maritime crafts. Two of the buildings have current planning proposals, one an application and one an appeal due to be heard in December. The provision of housing only on the rear of the site at the rear of the longer green shed is also supported by the site feedback.

The mix of uses that presently exists at Standard Quay already attracts visitors including tourists to the site and is one of the most used sites along the creek especially at weekends. The uses included in buildings 1 and 3 if approved are of a type which would attract further visitors to the site and encourage them to stay longer. Provision of a continuous creekside walkway through the site and provision of moorings suitable for barges and other large craft would create more of an attraction for tourists. This would be in accordance with Objective 4 which is to reinforce the creek's public destination potential by including tourism facilities, leisure, toilets, retail and moorings. The uses of the buildings would create viable uses in accordance with Objective 6.

The Creek Streetscape Strategy proposal (page 67) is for brick pavers between the buildings and shared surface in aggregate on macadam inside the line of the sheds. This could be achieved from pooled funding or from developer contribution from any additional development at the rear of the site. Moorings should be fitted with mooring rings to allow all sizes of vessels to moor. The additional moorings would be in accordance with Objective 3 which is to reinforce the area's importance for maritime activity.

A wider and better surfaced footpath from the boundary with the Standard House to the boundary of the Oyster Bay House land should be created and a path along the quay at Hucksteps Wharf around the edge of the car park would be desirable. This would be in accordance with Objective 14 to improve pedestrian links to marshland landscapes.

### **Site 9 Standard House**

This site is at present separated off from the creek by a car park ancillary to the B1/A1 uses at Standard Quay and a footpath but this part is in the same ownership as site 8. It would be desirable to move the fence of either the curtilage of Standard House or the car park to allow widening and resurfacing with an all weather surface of the footpath (Saxon Shore Way)

Currently vacant but has been residential (C3) and former offices for fencing company(B1) and has a separate single storey vacant workshop backing onto New Creek Road and vacant overgrown land between the end of the house and the boundary with 9-12 New Creek Road.

The house which is listed grade II should be refurbished with new front steps and new slate roofing and all necessary internal works for use as a house (C3)

Streetscape (P 67) suggests York stone paving outside Standard House to create a paved apron. Ideally, this should not be fenced as it would harm the open character of the area.

Access to the remainder of the site and for any parking for the house itself should be from New Creek Road. The remainder of the site could be used for housing (Class C3), but kept away from the north side of the building itself especially at the front of the site as the building is very prominent and visible from long distances and this is part of its character. There was a former black weatherboarded building on the frontage to the north of the house. New development should provide housing as part of a mixed use environment and support the delivery of area-wide objectives in accordance with Objective 11. Its scale and design should maintain and enhance the townscape setting of the creek and landmark buildings in accordance with Objective 13.

There was no consensus on land use for the land to the north of Standard House, but there was significant support in the site feedback and some in the questionnaire responses for development for housing of the land to the rear fronting onto New Creek Road

### **Site 10 Fentiman's Yard**

Currently storage yard associated with former business B1/B8

Preferred use –residential C3

Height- 2 storeys, kept lower than the Old Granary and with parking on the site, probably only two or three houses to ensure that not increase the density of this fairly informal area of the town. New housing should maintain and enhance the surrounding townscape setting of the creek and the setting of landmark buildings in accordance with Objective 13.

Materials: like houses in New Creek Road or Abbey Road, that is brick and weatherboard, timber windows, with tiled or slate roofs

This is in line with the site feedback and questionnaire responses.

### **Site 11 Brents Industrial Estate**

Present B1/B2, quite a lot of B2 but some vacant and is located behind Waterside Close, a later residential development on the site of the front of the former shipyard. Some of the buildings are previous shipyard buildings dating from around 1920.

Access is via the Upper Brents, which is residential on one side and open space where it would be desirable to improve the amenity and biodiversity as part of the Plan.

Preferred use-industrial estate B1/B2.

This is in line with the site feedback and questionnaire responses.

Between Waterside and the creek is a footpath created pursuant to a legal agreement when the development was built. Streetscape (page 66) sets out a scheme for a ramp to connect this with the sea wall to create a footpath link from the urban creek onto Ham Marshes. Funding for this is already available and the scheme is under discussion with Swale Council. Provision of this footpath would be in accordance with Objective 8, to improve links between North Preston and the town via the creek. It would also be in accordance with Objective 14 which is to improve pedestrian connections to adjacent marshland.

The footpath from the marsh at present runs around the rear of the industrial estate round to Upper Brents and then round the outside wall of the former shipyard

extension at Faversham Reach to get to Crab Island. Streetscape (page66) (and an ongoing appeal process) seeks to re-locate the footpath so that it enters the Faversham Reach estate from the town end through a gap in the wall from Crab Island, runs through the gap between the short terrace and middle group, along the creek frontage outside the fenced gardens of the middle group of houses and back out past the second short terrace and either through a second gap in the wall or via the gate out of Faversham Reach. The former would give a better connection with the Waterside section. Funding would be put in place depending on the outcome of the Inquiry expected later in the year. Provision of this footpath would be in accordance with Objective 8 to improve pedestrian links from North Preston to the town via the creek and also Objective 14.

### **Site 12 Iron Wharf**

The boundary of the site includes land in three ownerships and its description needs to be changed on the sites location plan

The boatyard (sui generis) extends from the creek frontage to the old sewage works at the bottom of Abbey Fields and includes Chambers Dock where there are houseboats and containers to both sides of the head of the dock and further houseboats for most of its length as far as the white bridge (a lifting bridge) The roadways through the site are mostly former railway lines from the creek branch line and sidings and there are a number of former railway wagons and containers on the site. The railway lines are identified as an undesignated Heritage Asset. The use includes a chandlery in a block of containers. The boatyard has a secondary access to New Creek Road.

Preferred use: boatyard, with all existing elements including boat repairing, chandlery, mooring, storage and habitation on the houseboats as at present.

The area drawn as site 12 also includes Oyster Bay House (C3 and ancillary C3 garden area) plus footpath between. It would be desirable to widen and provide an all-weather surface to the footpath which is the Saxon Shore Way.

Alan Staley boatbuilding shed and associated yard to the rear yard and slipway B2 and ancillary to B2. There is a footpath between the boatbuilding shed and the slipway with a narrow pinch point at the entrance to Iron Wharf boatyard.

Preferred use: both sites as existing, but if possible with widening and surfacing of the public footpath. The improvement of the footpath through the Oyster Bay House site would be in accordance with Objective 14, to provide better pedestrian connections to the marshland landscapes.

This is in line with the site feedback and questionnaire responses.

### Other Streetscape improvements

There are a number of other Streetscape improvements that it would be desirable to achieve via pooled funding:

Replacement of the bridge onto Crab Island with a more attractive arched bridge rather than the existing pipe taking the water from the former channel into the main creek (page 65). Work on Crab Island could also include planting to improve biodiversity. Improvement of biodiversity at Crab Island would be in accordance with Objective 7, to ensure that a network of habitats is provided. Better landscaping at the Upper Brents open space could make this area more suitable for use by residents of North Preston in accordance with Objective 5.

Improvement of the fencing around the feeding area at Stonebridge Pond and formation of a new pedestrian crossing and gate at the allotment end of the feeding area onto Davington Hill (Page 63). Biodiversity could also be improved on this part

of the pond site although it already contains a number of trees. The allotments already provide a wide range of habitats for wildlife and flora and water management could be improved in accordance with Objective 5.

Formation of a paved walkway from Town Quay along the frontage of the existing Shepherd Neame car park and access from it onto Bridge Road and improvement to the paving in Bridge Road and Conduit Street. Improvement of the paved environment around the TS Hazard including refurbishment as necessary of the cobbled paving which is identified as an Undesignated Heritage Asset and other surfacing (page 58)

In North Lane, near to the junction with Partridge Lane, traffic calming measures including a new pedestrian crossing are recommended. In addition, paving improvements are recommended in Partridge Lane improving the environment between the town and the creek. (page 69 of Streetscape) This could be funded from the town streetscape funding. This would be in accordance with Objective 8 to improve the safety of drivers and of pedestrians using routes from North Preston to the town

New signage to various access points from the town to the creek and from the town to the creek and where the creek path is unclear as a concerted project. This could be from extended townscape funding.