

Minutes of the Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting: Thursday, 25 July 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
Anne Salmon, Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group member
Andrew Osborne, Faversham Creek Consortium Management Group member
John Sell, Faversham Town Council Planning Agent
Tony Fullwood, Independent Planning Consultant

In attendance

David Simmons, Mayor, Faversham Town Council
Jackie Westlake, Faversham Town Council Clerk – Secretary
James Freeman, Head of Development Control, Swale Borough Council

Before the start of the meeting, the Chair introduced Steering Group members and explained the rules relating to Council meetings. He then took questions from the public. These are attached at Annex A.

1. Apologies for absence

1.1 Received from Cllr Mike Henderson and Natalie Earl.

2. Minutes of the meeting of 6 June 2013 and matters arising

2.1 The minutes were presented to the Town Council on 1 July.

2.2 All matters arising had been dealt with.

3. Update on the June exhibition and draft site feedback report

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

3.2 Members thanked AS for her hard work. They discussed the draft report and agreed there was considerable consensus on a number of sites, the creekside walkway and moorings. It was noted that employment figures within the Creek footprint stood at 600, of which 40 could be considered to be in maritime-related industries. The issue was, therefore, complex as to how to attract more of the same sorts of employment.

3.3 AS explained that, within the feedback forms some people had qualified their support for different uses, and had also suggested alternatives. This was the case, for example, for the Oil Depot.

3.4 There was some discussion about how far any development should be away from the water's edge. 4 metres was suggested as a pragmatic approach, which would allow sufficient room for people working on boats.

3.5 Members recognised the importance of considering the site feedback form report with the wider Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire report, currently being pulled together by AMT. It would also be critical for the Group to understand the responses in the context of the use classes to be allocated to specific sites. Tony Fullwood (TF) explained there was no use class that specified maritime use. It could be accommodated under a number of uses (e.g. B1 – light industry; B2 – general industry; B8 – storage and warehouses). The B1 business category was wide and included light industry and offices and when SBC determined planning applications, the government advised that it should not fetter any movement within that category. He also reminded the Steering Group that, for an experimental period of three years, the Government was allowing movement from office use to residential use without the need for planning permission. A number of suggested uses to come out of the site feedback forms included hotels (C category), museum (D category), and sailmaker (B1).

3.6 James Freeman explained that if there was any further delay to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, SBC would look to AAP2 to determine planning applications. He reminded members that they would have to take account of the NPPF when considering use class allocations, which would require evidence of viability and deliverability.

ACTION

- **SBC to produce a 2 page summary of the various use classes for the next meeting**

4. Consultation and engagement

4.1 Jackie Westlake (JW) advised the Group of her discussions with Mr Chesterman concerning meetings with e.g. the Faversham Creek Trust (FCT) to discuss the outcome of the reports and to consider next steps, including membership of the Steering Group. Re: the FCT, this should be considered as part of the follow-up to the meeting held at the beginning of the year with the FCT and members of the Steering Group.

4.2 It was agreed that such a meeting would be helpful, but that similar meetings should be extended to other groups and representatives.

ACTION

- **The Steering Group to seek the Town Council's agreement to expand the Group's membership, delegating exact membership to the Steering Group**

5. Budget

5.1 James Freeman (JF) presented the budget paper (attached at Annex C). The paper would be amended to reflect the role of the Bensted's Charity as well as that of the Faversham Municipal Charities.

6. Any Other Business

6.1 The following were raised under AOB:

- (i) Questions from members of the public.

ACTION

Responses would be collated and placed on the website

- (ii) Re: Mr Harrison's and Dr Percival's letters, TF said SBC had adopted a conservation area appraisal. In addition, a draft Undesignated Heritage Assets paper was also in the public domain. Both would form part of the evidence base for the Neighbourhood Plan

ACTION

AS/John Sell (JS) to consider the letters and report back to the Steering Group as to whether the Undesignated Heritage Assets paper needed to be revised

7. Dates of the next meeting

7.1 The dates of the next meeting were confirmed:

- Thursday, 15 August 2013
- Thursday, 12 September, 2013

ANNEX A

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- 1. Invitation to the Steering Group and the Town Council to an open evening at the Purifier Building**

The Town Clerk to liaise with the FCT representative on a suitable date

- 2. Has the Neighbourhood Plan area been formally designated as such?**

James Freeman to find out at what stage in the process the designation consultation had reached

- 3. If questions were not to be allowed during and after the meeting, would written questions be acceptable?**

Yes

- 4. What was the timetable for the Neighbourhood Plan?**

The timetable can be found on the website (a hard copy was handed to the questioner)

Site Feedback report summary

The Illustrations Exhibition was held on the evening of Friday 7th and on Saturday 8th June. There were indicative proposals for Ordnance Wharf, BMM Weston, Swan Quay, Standard Quay and Standard House. Other sites were represented by photographs. There were 1000 visits to the exhibition over the two days.

Site feedback forms asked questions about land uses on all or parts of sites, heights of buildings and the need for walkways and moorings. These were meant to be about the real sites, not the drawings. There were 100-140 responses per site which were analysed by site and over 70 extra responses which were analysed by category of responses. A small number of further responses also concerned issues that went beyond the content of the exhibition and have not been summarised into the report.

The report is set out by site number/questions on the sites and by category on the other responses.

Site 1-Purifier

There was almost unanimous support for the restoration and use of the building by the Faversham Creek Trust for marine apprenticeships and associated trades/skills.

General Question-this asked about a possible walkway from the creek bridge along the frontage of Shepherd Neame bottling hall. The principle of creating such a walkway was strongly supported although it was acknowledged that it may not be practicable at present.

Site 2-Ordnance Wharf

The preferred use of the site was for maritime use. Any building should be no more than 1-2 storeys, using materials in keeping with the creekside such as weatherboard. The rest should be used as a boatyard and there should be moorings, with any walkways wide enough for outside storage of materials.

Site 3- BMM Weston

This site included the west end of the present car park and part of the present BMM factory site. The car park site had the least consensus of any of the sites with regard to its future use. There was significant support for retaining the car park and creating more public open space. There was a range of options for built development. Most respondents favour provision of a walkway and moorings. Redevelopment of part of the BMM Weston site is only a long term possibility. While there was some support for residential, there was concern at any loss of jobs on the site.

Site 4-Frank and Whittome

This relates to the buildings on the town side of Belvedere Road. There was some confusion in the responses between this and site 5. Most respondents wanted the existing buildings retained. It was important to keep Creek Creative and add a mix of workshops, some maritime uses and there was some support for conversion of parts of the buildings for residential.

Site 5-Swan Quay

This relates to the buildings on the creek side of Belvedere Road. The drawing for this site showed buildings of more than 3 storeys and provoked a strong negative response. There was clear opposition to any new buildings, especially tall ones. The existing sailmaker was considered to be a suitable use, supplemented by other craft workshops and possibly retail. A few respondents favoured residential on the upper floors. The majority of respondents supported provision of moorings and a walkway across the frontage of the site.

Site 6-Oil Depot

There was significant support for some residential development, but other possible uses could be workshops or for maritime use. The majority of respondents favour provision of moorings and a walkway. A small majority prefer that the National Cycle Route should be re-routed along Belvedere Road.

7-Coach Depot

The majority were against any residential development on this site. There was a wide range of possible uses including maritime use, workshops or retail. Provision of a walkway with moorings was strongly supported. Most respondents considered that maintaining a gap between any new buildings to allow views of the creek from Abbey Road was important.

Site 8-Standard Quay

The majority of respondents favour returning the black sheds and white building to maritime uses, working on traditional vessels. The provision of moorings and a walkway is also strongly supported but with space for open storage on the quays. The only part of Standard Quay that had any support for residential use was at the rear fronting onto New Creek Road and this was very limited.

Site 9-Standard House

Most respondents favoured restoration of the building to a house. Some respondents suggested alternatives such as a museum or offices. There was little consensus about the use of the land adjacent to Standard House. There was significant support for small scale housing development on the land to the rear fronting onto New Creek Road.

Site 10-Fentiman's Yard

The majority of respondents favoured the use of the site for housing, with a preference for 1-2 storeys to minimise the impact on the Old Granary.

Site 11-Brents Industrial Estate

There was strong support for the retention of this site for industrial use.

Site 12-Iron Wharf

There was strong support for retaining the existing boatyard. Some respondents drew attention that the site boundary also included Oyster Bay House and Alan Staley boatbuilding works and they did not want new development around these buildings.

Extra responses covered a range of issues and these were categorised under the headings:

1-The heights of buildings

2-The bridge, sluicing and flooding

3-housing issues

4-the financing of development

5-the content of the exhibition

6-general comments across several or all of the sites.

1-Height

There was concern that any new buildings should be single storey and that tall buildings should not dominate any part of the creek.

2-the bridge

There was general support for a working bridge and working sluices. Opinions were mixed over whether there should be a swing bridge or a lifting bridge. There should be no restriction on the height of vessels through the bridge. There is a need to make a decision on the bridge as soon as possible and an economic need for it in the basin would help.

3-housing

The general tenor of the comments on housing was that at least there should be no housing in the basin. Some respondents wanted no housing at all. There was concern that the drawings indicated housing on all the sites. Any new housing would generate more traffic. The area should be a working environment in particular with uses that would attract tourists.

4-financing development

The issues raised mainly concerned private development and profit from development. Concern was expressed that any Planning Gain would be small in financial terms and would not generate much money to carry out any improvements around the creek.

5-content of the exhibition

Many respondents appeared to be of the opinion that the Creek Neighbourhood Plan has already been written and the exhibition was to show what was in it. The drawings were considered to be unhelpful as they looked to be developers' schemes and they also did not differentiate between the existing and new buildings. They did not show the context of the buildings. There were no copies of the sites plan to help visitors walking round to identify where the sites were. The print was too small and there was too much to see. The questions were based on what the developers wanted and not what the public wanted. The Neighbourhood Plan should be an opportunity for people to use their imagination as to what should happen around the creek.

6-General comments

- There was a need somewhere around the creek for a hotel and for a maritime museum.
- Existing open spaces should be preserved.
- Any new development should be justifiable and viable.
- It would be preferable if the area could provide more industry or employment and that existing employment should not be lost. Any new employment should be artisan based or maritime in character as this would help to regenerate the creek and encourage tourism.
- The distinct areas of the creek should be considered with regard to their mix of uses and the design of buildings and townscape. There should be a fully detailed assessment of the historic character of all the areas around the creek.
- The Vision and Objectives should be used to inform the policies in the Plan and the recommendations for individual sites. The Plan so far does not appear to be paying much attention to policy AAP2 of the 2008 Local Plan.

Faversham Creek Budget Report – July 2013

Pre- Neighbourhood Plan DPD Work - Urban Initiatives Report (SBC Expenditure)

The total cost to produce, publish and distribute the Faversham Urban Initiatives report, published in 2009 was £99,700. The fee was agreed in advance through a competitive tendering process.

This work included - Production of the document, workshops, stakeholder meetings, results analysis and visioning work.

Funding for this report came from –

Bensted's Charity and Faversham Municipal Charities £43,000
Swale Borough Council £26,701
Faversham Town Council £20,000
Kent County Council £10,000

A Feasibility Study for taking the plan forward was then carried out in October 2010 by Tony Fullwood Associates - £4,022

Neighbourhood Plan Process (SBC Expenditure)

Since autumn 2010 when the Neighbourhood Plan process began, to date the Swale BC expenditure on consultants is as follows;

Preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan involving a wide range of tasks, including technical research; planning advice; streetscape work and exhibition and project; preparation for and attendance at exhibitions; preparation for and attendance at steering group meetings; preparation for and attendance at meetings with landowners; support for and answering questions of steering group in person and by email; viability work; reporting to Borough Council officers - Tony Fullwood Associates - £46,225

Legal advice on the financial liabilities for the creek bridge and navigation - DAC Beachcroft – £3,011

£53,258

Faversham Town Council Expenditure on the NP Process

£31,165 has been spent by Faversham Town Council on all work relating to Faversham Creek since 2008. £20,000 was allocated to work delivered by the Faversham Creek Consortium (Faversham Town Council's finance report minutes of 14 January 2008 refers). This allocation was subsequently transferred to support the NP process. £900 was allocated to Faversham Town Council's consultant architect for support to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. £10,265 was spent up to end June 2013 on the Neighbourhood Plan Illustrations Exhibition.

A further £5,000 was allocated in 2012/13 in respect of the Creekscape strategy but not spent.

Grants have been received from:

- Central Government Vanguard Grant £20,000
- DCLG Grant to FTC to cover June 2013 Exhibition £7,000
- Faversham Municipal Charities £43,000 (spent on Urban Initiatives initial visioning exercise)
- Faversham Town Council £20,000 (spent on Urban Initiatives initial visioning exercise)
- Kent County Council £10,000 (spent on Urban Initiatives initial visioning exercise)
- Further Government grants have been announced for 2013-14 and SBC expect to be applying for this (up to £30,000).

This budget excludes officer time spent by both SBC and FTC.

Faversham Creek DPD / NP Budget Summary: July 2013

Table 1: Total Expenditure on Faversham Creek NP to July 2013

Task	2010 - 2011	2011- 2012	2012 – 2013	2013 – 2014 (as at 16th July 2014)	Notes
Feasibility Study	4,022				Consultant led - feasibility study Dec 2010 LDF budget funded
Plan preparation and technical work		12,158	8023	154	Consultant led - LDF Budget funded
Vanguard NP process tasks		7,182	12,880	1806	Consultant led - Vanguard grant funded
Legal Advice – creek navigation			3011		LDF Budget Funded
Printing Exhibition leaflets			287		LDF Budget Funded
Totals	4,022	19,340	24,201	1,960	
Total spent to date on DPD / NP production 2010/11 – July 2013 is £49,523					

(of which £29,523 has been from SBC LDF budget; and £20,000 from Vanguard grant). Vanguard grant now exhausted.

Table 2: Estimated Outstanding Expenditure to Adoption of Faversham Creek NP at July 2013

Task	2013- 2014	Notes
Remaining NP Prep/ plan writing	8,500	Further CLG grant being applied for and monies from SBC Localism Fund (which is yet to be approved)
SA/ AA	7,000	Consultant led - LDF budget
Transport Impact Assessment	5,000	Consultant led - LDF budget
Sites Viability Assess	3,000	Consultant led - LDF budget
Statutory Adverts	2,250	LDF budget
Inspector EIP fees	11,200	LDF budget
Expert witness EIP	5,000	Consultant led - LDF budget
Programme Officer EIP	5,000	LDF budget
Hall Hire	250	LDF budget
Faversham Creek NP Referendum and consultation	25,000	Further Government Grant to be applied for in 2013-14 for this specific task
Printing maps and documents	750	
Totals	£72,950	

Future Funding Available to complete Faversham Creek NP

Committed SBC LDF Budget funding = £47,950 (this figure includes money from the SBC Localism Fund which is yet to be approved.)

Future Government Grants for 2013-14 will also be applied for the referendum stage at £25,000