

## **Report on site feedback responses**

### **Introduction**

The Illustrations Exhibition held on Friday 7<sup>th</sup> June and Saturday 8<sup>th</sup> June contained drawings showing indicative proposals for several sites around the Creek including Ordnance Wharf and BMM Weston, Swan Quay, Standard Quay and Standard House. Other sites were represented using photographs as existing. There was also an indicative masterplan drawing showing the creek overall incorporating the indicative site proposals and linkages along and around the Creek.

Site feedback forms were available at the exhibition and via the website for each of the sites asking a selection of questions about the land uses on all or parts of the sites, the heights of buildings and the requirement for walkways and moorings around the Creek. These were intended to ask about the real sites, not just about the content of the drawings.

For most sites, between 100-130 responses were received with most respondents commenting on all of the sites. Several respondents chose to provide more detailed responses relating to the Creek as a whole as well as on the individual sites. The responses have been analysed using matrices to record the most common answers. A large number of alternative answers were recorded for several of the sites. Over 70 respondents also submitted extra responses raising issues such as housing, finance, the content of the exhibition, the bridge and general comments not related to specific sites. Some respondents answered some but not all of the questions on each sites.

### **The responses by site**

#### **Site 1-The Purifier: 113 responses**

Do you agree that the project to re-use this building is important in the context of helping to revive the basin?

Yes	No
110	3

Most respondents were strongly in support of the use by the Faversham Creek Trust in this building for marine based trades including training. There was a suggestion that the Council should help to fund the activities at Purifier Wharf. The barge heritage is identified as what Faversham is for and that the use reflects the passion local people have for the Creek. The use constitutes the start of regeneration of the basin and the main reason for having an opening bridge and working sluices at present. Concern was expressed that the use may not be compatible with any possible residential uses nearby and conversely that the use should not become a

threat to any non-industrial uses in the area. The use could form the core of an area of maritime uses in the basin.

General question: 112 responses

How important is it that a walkway and moorings are provided alongside the Shepherd Neame bottling hall?

Very important	Important	not important	impractical
71	26	9	6

In the additional responses to this question, it was acknowledged that Shepherd Neame had investigated adding a walkway here when they were intending to rebuild their bottling hall a few years ago. They concluded it would be impractical given the present bridge and the change of level to achieve a walkway which would meet the standards required by the Disability Discrimination Act. It is still potentially a long-term aim if the bridge were to be replaced or if the bottling hall were to be redeveloped. Moorings on this frontage could also increase the attraction of the basin for visitors and could generate mooring fees. A further suggestion was to add a floating restaurant in this part of the basin.

Site 2-Ordnance Wharf: 142 responses

Should there be any development on Ordnance Wharf? If not, what should the site be used for?

Yes	no	open storage	open space	maritime
38	24	2	12	46

If yes, what should be the use of any development on Ordnance Wharf?

Covered storage	workshop	w/shop/resid	residential	maritime
2	14	12	9	45

What materials should be used for any development on Ordnance Wharf?

Brick	weatherboard	brick/w/board	in keeping	slate	tile
9	29	15	31	2	2

What is the maximum number of storeys for any development on Ordnance Wharf?

1	2	2 ½	3	more
22	62	9	10	3

How important is it that a walkway and moorings are provided alongside Ordnance Wharf?

Very Important    important    not important    security risk

95                      22                      6                      1

A greater number favoured some development on Ordnance Wharf than not, but the preferred use was for maritime use as a boatyard connected with the use of the Purifier or as a community boatyard. If the site was left open, it should be used as a boatyard or to provide visitor facilities for visiting craft. Concern was raised that any residential development on the site would prejudice the use of the Purifier Building for making boats and other maritime trades.

If the site were to be developed, it should be for workshops, preferably with a maritime use. Other uses could include retail, preferably a chandlery, a cafe and toilets either associated with the maritime uses or associated with the allotments and accessed from Flood Lane. The workshops should take opportunities to train apprentices. The building should be limited in size to allow for carnage and open storage connected with boats. Part of any building could be used as a maritime museum. Another alternative was a microbrewery with a produce stall or market.

Most respondents favoured use of materials either that were in keeping with the maritime character of the area or specifically weatherboarding. Any building on the site should preferably be of one or two storeys, although a smaller number supported a three-storey building or that any new building should be no taller than the east wing of the Purifier. Some commented that it should not harm the setting of the allotments to the west.

There was general support for a walkway and moorings at Ordnance Wharf. Concern was raised that to achieve moorings, there would need to be extensive dredging in the basin. Any walkways should be wide enough to allow storage of materials on the quayside. Other respondents favoured moorings but no public walkways as they would be a security risk to any boatyard or boats and the walkway should be private for boat users.

Site 3 -BMM Weston: 132 responses

What should be the use of any development on the BMM Weston car park?

Workshop    office    residential    w/shop/resid    car park    open space

14              3              14              7              24              28

How many storeys should any new building consist of?

0	1	1 ½	2	2 ½	more
10	14	2	46	2	11

How important do you consider the view of the listed blast walls from Brent Hill?

This should say Brent Road	V imp.	Important	not imp	no opinion
1	52	26	10	1

How important is it that a walkway and moorings are provided along the Brent Road side of the basin?

Already one	very important	needs dredging
5	94	2

What should be the use of any new development on the BMM Factory (part)?

Residential	workshop	offices	res/workshop
33	7	3	13

How many storeys should any new building consist of?

1	2	2 ½	3	more
7	66	4	21	1

The BMM Weston car park site had the least consensus of any of the sites with regard to its future use. There was significant support for retention of the site as a car park because there was a need for a car park at this location. There was also support for improving the appearance of the site and increasing the amount of public open space and landscaping. Small scale possibilities included facilities for visiting boats on the moorings, a cafe serving the open space and toilets. Another suggestion was a haul-out area for wintering boats.

If the site were to be developed, some respondents suggested industrial or light industrial uses or offices or possibly a mix with some exhibition space. A few respondents supported some residential as part of a mixed development. There was also a suggestion that a new development could include a restaurant. The preferred height of any new building was one or two storeys (with some suggestions that they should be no higher than existing buildings in the area). There was a strong indication that respondents valued the views of the listed blast walls rising up Brent Hill which can be seen from Brent Road.

Most respondents favoured provision of a walkway and moorings along the Brent Road side of the basin. Concern was raised that a pontoon would not provide suitable moorings for larger traditional vessels and that piling with backfill to create a new wharf would be a better solution. There should be a turning circle for vessels near to Ordnance Wharf at the widest part of the basin.

The part of BMM Weston that was identified on the drawing related to only part of the existing factory site on Brent Road. There was confusion as to how much of the site would be affected between this part of the BMM Weston site and the upper part which is the BMM Weston offices, described separately on the feedback form. There was some support for residential use on the site or mixed residential use with workshops. Concern was raised that where workshops or offices have been provided at ground floor level, they have become subsumed within the housing and do not provide employment even for the house occupier. A number of respondents commented it was important to keep the existing BMM Weston factory and the employment that it provides at present. Other respondents were concerned at the potential loss of employment use, and favoured the site being used for industry, light industry or workshops preferably for local businesses. If the site were to be redeveloped for residential, then suggestions included 4-bedroom houses with gardens or affordable housing or apartments. Several respondents suggested a hotel. The majority of respondents favoured 2-storey development, with a smaller number supporting 3 storeys or commenting that any new buildings should be no taller than the existing BMM Weston building.

Site 4-Frank and Whittome: 117 responses

Should all the existing buildings be retained on Frank and Whittome’s site? If not, what buildings should be retained?

Yes	yes, all	except modern one	keep Creek Creative
77	12	1	5

What uses should be made of these buildings?

Keep Creek Creative	offices	workshops	maritime	residential	mixed
22	1	17	11	21	6

The majority of respondents favour all of the Frank and Whittome buildings retained with no differentiation of the parts of the site including the more modern building at the Smack Alley end of the site. Some respondents commented that parts of the site were of historic importance. There was confusion between this site and Swan Quay which also used to be used by Frank and Whittome as part of their joinery works. Concern was expressed that any new development would result in increased traffic in Belvedere Road and Abbey Street and that the junction was overloaded and dangerous to drivers and pedestrians.

There was general support for the retention of the use of the parts of the building running down Quay Lane from Abbey Street by Creek Creative. Suggested uses including extending their use to more of the buildings together with workshops, art and exhibition and performance space for the arts. This could be complemented with craft shops and cafes or an indoor market or a museum. Parts of the building could be used for light industry, possibly for starter businesses. Parts could also be converted for residential use as part of a mix of uses across the site.

Site 5-Swan Quay: 125 responses

Should the existing listed blue former chandlery building at Swan Quay remain visible from across the creek?

Yes	no
106	3

How important are gaps between future buildings in creating better views from the creek to the town and from the creek to the town?

Very Important	Important
90	13

What commercial uses should be provided in the ground floors of any new buildings to encourage visitors to the creek?

Sailmaker./maritime	retail	cafe	craft workshops
31	20	19	21

How important is it that a walkway and moorings are provided alongside Swan Quay and the walkways link to sites either side of Swan Quay?

V Important	Important	Not important
85	24	6

Most respondents were aware of the blue former chandlery building which is listed and wanted to ensure that it remains visible from the creek. The drawing of the site which was presented showing indicative new development provoked a strong negative response. Whilst there was support for retaining gaps between any new buildings, concern was raised that at present there were good views across the site to the town as the buildings were low. There was clear opposition to any new buildings especially tall ones since they could result in too much shadow, would be too close to the creek frontage and would constitute overdevelopment of the site. The existing buildings on the site were preferable to any new buildings such as those shown on the drawing. Formation of a new square or better public realm at the corner of Quay Lane and Conduit Street was supported.

There was significant support for retention of the existing sail-making workshop which some people thought was a well designed building. This could be supported by other craft workshops, retail and possibly a cafe. A mix of uses including an art gallery, restaurant and a chandlery was suggested. Other alternatives included boat repairs with training in maritime skills, offices or light industrial use. Concern was raised at lack of parking in the area and it was suggested that part of the site could be used as parking with toilets for visitors. Concern was raised that mixed use with residential above workshops would be likely to be converted to all residential as has happened elsewhere around the creek. Residential above commercial could also result in noise complaints. A small number of respondents supported some residential use of upper floors in any new buildings.

The majority of respondents supported provision of a walkway through the site linking to either side. Concern was raised that the existing slipway should be kept and the walkway should go round it. There could also be a pedestrian link out to Conduit Street. Walkways would encourage visitors and form part of a walkway around the creek. Moorings along the frontage of the site were also supported with proper mooring rings so that larger craft could use them. The moorings could be used for vessels waiting for the creek bridge to open to give access into the basin. It was also suggested this area could form part of the creative quarter and that the area should link up with Town Quay.

Site 6-The Oil Depot: 118 responses

Should the oil depot be used for residential development? If not, what do you consider to be a suitable use?

No	maritime	open space	workshops	lower scale housing	yes
21	29	8	10	33	10

How important is it for a walkway and moorings to be provided alongside the oil depot to connect the oil depot to the coach depot?

V. Important	Important	Not important	connects up walkway
85	23	7	2

Do you think that the National Cycle Route should be re-routed from Abbey Street to Belvedere Road which would mean creating a shared surface for pedestrians behind the oil depot?

No	Yes
37	55

There was quite strong support for residential development on this site although most respondents preferred lower scale development on the site. Other suggested

uses involving development on the site included workshops or light industry or buildings providing services to visiting boats. Uses could also include retail and toilet/showers for boat users. Concern was raised that, as a former oil depot, the site was contaminated and would be expensive to redevelop. If the site were to be left open, alternative uses included additional car parking to serve Abbey Street, a garden and marina, or boatyard.

Most respondents supported provision of a walkway and moorings at the site. A few preferred just moorings with no walkway. Concern was raised at any additional traffic in Belvedere Road and Abbey Street and a few respondents suggested opening up the end of Belvedere Road to create a through road, possibly with a one-way system.

A majority of respondents favoured re-routing the National Cycle Route from Abbey Street to Belvedere Road. Some concern was raised that if this change was made, the cyclists would miss the opportunity to see the best parts of Abbey Street. It was also noted that the path that runs between the site and Standard Square was very narrow and would need to be widened if the cycle route were to be changed.

Site 7-The Coach Depot: 133 responses

Should the coach depot include any residential development?

No, harms boat repairs	No	Yes, smaller	Yes
4	64	24	24

What sort of commercial uses should be on this site?

Chandlery	retail	workshops	maritime	tourist office	none	light industry
2	7	14	48	2	10	5

How important is it that a walkway and moorings are provided alongside the coach depot?

V. Important	Important	Not Imp
103	15	7

How important is it to have a gap between any buildings on this site to maintain a view of the creek from Abbey Road?

V imp.	Important	Not imp
81	24	5

A majority of respondents would prefer to have no housing development on this site. There was some support for smaller scale residential development that would not be any taller than the existing buildings on Standard Quay and would be vernacular in



style and materials. Concern was raised that additional housing on this site would result in traffic problems as the access to the site is from Abbey Street. Housing could form part of a mixed development of the site.

The majority of respondents favoured use of the site for maritime purposes, workshops or light industry. The maritime uses would form an extension to similar uses at Standard Quay. Other suggestions for commercial uses included craft and small business uses, retail with restaurants, a boutique hotel and a brewery. If the site were left open, a garden and marina or additional car parking with toilets were suggested.

Most respondents supported provision of a walkway and moorings along the site frontage to the creek. These could improve access for pedestrians and encourage visitors to see this part of the creek. It was suggested that any walkway should be wide enough to allow boat owners to work on their boats. The walkway here would need to be part of a wider context around the creek. A further suggestion was to add a floating walkway with moorings.

The majority of respondents supported provision of gaps between any new buildings to allow views of the creek from Abbey Road. Such gaps were considered important to visitors as they help them to locate the creek. For this reason, some suggested that the gaps between the buildings should be generous. A further comment was that asking this question implied taller buildings were envisaged but no taller buildings would be acceptable. Concern was raised that attention should be paid to the wider context around this part of the creek including the use of the area in Roman and Medieval Times for villas and the abbey. Those aspects should be addressed when any new development was contemplated.

Site 8-Standard Quay: 135 responses

What do you consider to be acceptable uses of the black sheds and white building on Standard Quay?

Boat repair/maritime	craft workshops	workshops/restaurant	any reasonable use
86	12	5	2

How important is it that a walkway and moorings are provided alongside Standard Quay?

Important	not important	already there
114	1	2

Should any part of Standard Quay be for residential use?

No	only part near New Creek Rd	Any other part
109	4	2

The majority of respondents favoured returning the black sheds and white building to maritime workshops connected with boat repairs. These would include shipwrights, block-makers and sail-makers. There was some support for other types of craft workshops. Concern was raised that upgrading the buildings would price them out of the reach of artisan craftsmen. It would also harm their historic character, since they were built as warehouse buildings as traditional sheds in low key uses (grain storage) Other suggestions included some retail activity and exhibition space, possibly with a maritime museum in the Monk's Granary. A few respondents supported the provision of a restaurant as part of a tourist-related use of the site.

Most respondents favoured provision of a walkway and moorings along the frontage. Any walkway should be set back from the quayside to allow open areas for work on vessels and for the outside storage of materials such as timber. Moorings should be constructed as mooring rings rather than stanchions to be suitable for large, traditional vessels. A few respondents favoured provision of moorings but no walkway on the quay side of the black sheds so they would not inhibit work on boats between the sheds and the creek.

Most respondents opposed any part of Standard Quay being used for residential. There was limited support for a small amount of housing fronting on to New Creek Road. There was also a suggestion that the white building might be suitable for a house. The housing at the rear could be social housing. Any housing should be kept away from the maritime uses to avoid conflicts of interest. There should be no housing in the black sheds or the white building.

Site 9-Standard House: 80 responses

What should be the use of Standard House?

Residential	offices	pub/restaurant	part of boatyard	museum
45	10	5	1	10

What would be an appropriate use for the land alongside Standard House?

Open space	residential	workshop	boatyard	garden
13	21	5	9	8

What would be an appropriate use of the land behind Standard House fronting onto New Creek Road?

Open space	residential	boatyard	garden
13	36	4	6

The majority of respondents favoured restoring Standard House and returning it to residential use. Some commented that it was listed and fallen into disrepair and the Council should encourage the owner to restore it. Possible alternatives were museum or exhibition centre including local information (this could include a tea room), visitor accommodation as either a youth hostel, bed and breakfast or hotel possibly using some of the area of the green shed to the south of the building or using its garden as part of the use, or offices or the manager’s house for a boatyard.

The land to the side of Standard House was currently separated from the creek side by the public footpath and land in different ownership. That area was sometimes mistaken in responses. There was little consensus on what the land should be used for. Suggestions included a garden for Standard House, public open space, part of the grounds of a museum, a car park or a public access to the creek from New Creek Road. If there were to be any built development, alternatives included residential or workshops, possibly as part of a new boatyard.

The land behind Standard House had a frontage to New Creek Road and at present there was a single storey industrial- style building on the site. The majority of responses supported use of this part of the site for small-scale residential development with access from new Creek Road. Alternative suggestions if the site were kept open included allotments, a garden for a public house, a garden for Standard House, a garden centre or as part of a boatyard occupying the whole of the site and taking in land closer to the creek as well for slipways and moorings.

Site 10-Fentiman’s Yard: 120 responses

Should this site be developed for residential use? If not, what do you consider to be a suitable use?

Yes	no	workshops	social housing
67	15	6	5

What is the maximum height in storeys that should be developed here due to the proximity of the Old Granary?

0	1	1 ½	2	2 ½	more
7	20	4	64	2	6

The majority of respondents were in support of residential use on the site, which had access to New Creek Road and Abbey Road. Several respondents commented that any new housing should be similar in design to that in New Creek Road.

The site extended towards the Old Granary at Standard Quay which had an extensive tiled roof visible across the site. The preferred height for any new housing would be two storeys, with a number preferring one storey only so that any new housing would not be visible above the Granary or from Standard Quay. A small number of respondents commented that any housing on the site should be affordable. Concern was expressed that any additional housing would add to congestion in Abbey Street and suggested that the site could be used as a car park. Alternative uses included a public open space, offices or light industry or as a boatyard.

#### Site 11-Brents Industrial Estate: 128 responses

Would you agree with keeping all of this site for industrial use in line with the results of previous consultation?

Yes      no      develop part as housing

116      4      2

Most respondents agreed this site should remain in industrial use. It was regarded as important as it provided for a number of commercial enterprises. It gave employment to local people. It was suggested the site should be extended down to the creek. Another suggestion was that the site could be used more intensively as some of it was vacant. There was support for a walkway along the frontage of the site which would be along the outside of Waterside Close. If there were to be any new development, it should be well-controlled because the access to the site was difficult and the road was not in good condition. Any uses should fit with the needs of the town. A minority view was that the site was not well-located and it offered scope for redevelopment on part of the site, including housing, largely because of the poor access for industrial traffic.

#### Site 12-Iron Wharf: 132 responses

Would you agree with keeping all of this site as a boatyard in line with the results of previous consultations?

Yes      no

126      3

There was substantial support for retaining the area as a boatyard. It provided employment for craftsmen including shipwrights, welders, carpenters and administrative staff. It was suggested that the boatyard should provide opportunities for training in maritime skills, and also that better facilities should be provided for

people working on the site. Some respondents commented that the site would benefit from being tidied up while others thought that its existing slightly ramshackle appearance added to its attraction for visitors. Some of the vessels at the site were residential, especially in Chambers' Dock and some respondents were concerned that there was residential use on the site (this has been the case for over 40 years).

Several respondents commented that the site as shown on the sites map also included Oyster Bay House and the land around it and that the land around it should not be developed. The site as shown also included Alan Staley's boat building shed and yard which had a slipway. This was an important maritime use and an award-winning business and should be protected from development.

### Extra Responses : 75 responses

These varied in length from a few lines to several pages and covered a wide range of topics including:

1. The height of buildings around the creek
2. The bridge, sluicing and flooding
3. Housing issues
4. Financing of development
5. The content of the exhibition
6. General comments across several or all of the sites around the creek.

The comments are discussed under these headings. It is worth noting that many respondents assumed the Neighbourhood Plan had already been written, and what they were commenting on was a draft Plan. There was some concern about the Plan needing to be set in an historical context, which was not apparent from the exhibition.

#### 1.The Height of buildings

Concern was raised that there should not be any four storey buildings at Swan Quay or Standard Quay. Tall buildings should not dominate any part of the creek. The three buildings at Swan Quay should not be developed. Any new buildings should be single storey especially on the waterfront.

#### 2. The bridge and sluices

There were greater implications from the bridge than just choosing a design. Medway Ports and Kent County Council should be involved in resolving these issues. It was suggested a forum should be held including the Kentish Sail Association and boat owners' organisations to discuss the subject. The costings of the bridge were not given. Some people supported a swing bridge and others a lifting bridge, with a suggestion that a landmark bridge would be an attraction for visitors. Any new bridge should not have any restrictions to the height of boats going through it. The provision of new moorings would depend on the condition of the waterway

and its navigability. It would need to be managed in the future and there may be a need for a Creek Conservancy to do this. There was a need for an opening bridge to revive the basin which would only be economically justified if there were maritime uses in the basin. The creek bridge needed to be replaced/repared within the foreseeable future and there was no agreement about what sort of bridge or how the funding will be generated. There was a general desire to get a working bridge and gates that opened, together with sluices that worked. Concern was expressed that there needed to be good protection against flooding around the creek: a possible solution could be a flood barrier. Several respondents commented on the change to the flood status designation of the creek. The duties of KCC and Medway Ports with regard to replacing the bridge and sluices and/or sluice gates and the ongoing maintenance of these and of the waterway itself would need to be properly identified to ensure that suitable arrangements were made that worked in the long term.

### 3. Housing issues

Concern was raised that all of the sites around the creek were intended for additional housing. This was of particular concern at Ordnance Wharf where the possible schemes shown in the drawings all included housing. If there were to be any housing, then some of it should be social housing and for local people. The housing that was likely around the creek would only benefit a few people. There should be no housing in the basin. Some respondents commented that there should only be housing on the higher ground around the creek or that there should be no housing in the waterfront zone. The Neighbourhood Plan should get away from building housing as an idea. At most there should only be any housing when the water activity has been provided. Live-work units tended to become solely residential as had happened at Faversham Reach. Concern was raised that any additional housing would deter maritime uses around the creek and would deter tourists visiting the area as it would appear too built up and have a wider negative impact on Faversham as a tourist destination. The proposals shown on the illustrations made it appear that residential development was the best idea and this made people think that it was inevitable.

Housing should not be increased around the creek and it should become a working environment. Housing would also create additional traffic which would be a problem in Belvedere Road and Abbey Street as there was too much traffic already. Local authorities should not be contemplating any more new housing around the creek. Some of the new housing would be expensive to build as some of the sites were former industrial ones and would need de-contamination before they can be developed. This could make the housing unviable. It was suggested the Steering Group had been misled by the requirement in the Strategic Housing Land Appraisal for 100 houses and the Neighbourhood Plan should take precedence over this. There was a suggestion that all of the new housing, up to 200 units including 50 for social housing should be on the BMM Weston site. The housing schemes that were shown had not been assessed for their impact on traffic generation.

#### 4. Financing of Development

It was suggested that there would be no desire for regeneration around the creek if it was to make large profits for developers. Any planning of the creek area should be by the public sector and not by the private sector. There was no reference to how the options would be funded, but it was assumed that this would be by private developers. Priority should be given to the views of local people, especially those with maritime connections rather than people who want to make a quick return on their investment.

There should be multiple sources of funding. The regeneration should not just be reliant on developers to get any benefits to spend around the creek. The amount of Community Infrastructure even from 100 houses would not be enough to do very much with around the creek. It was suggested that alternative funding for projects around the creek could be obtained from the Heritage Lottery Fund. Action for Market Towns had a fund to help communities to buy assets which should be applied for to buy Standard Quay and return it to maritime use.

#### 5. The content of the exhibition.

Many respondents appeared to be of the opinion that the Creek Neighbourhood Plan has already been written and the content of the exhibition was to show people what was in it. It was suggested that the drawings look like artists' impressions of buildings that developers want to build and that the Steering Group should not be helping to design their buildings for them. Some respondents had difficulty identifying the new buildings among the existing and would have preferred to see photographs of the existing sites. Also, some people were not familiar with the names of particular areas around the creek. The drawings showed the creek looking wider than it was and showed no buildings in the background to help people to assess their size. There was no differentiation in the drawings between the new buildings and the existing ones as they were all shown in the same sepia tone. There should have been copies of the sites plan to take around the drawings so that people could work out where the sites were. The drawings looked like they were done by development companies on behalf of the developers. One respondent asked what company had designed the questions about the sites.

Concern was raised that there was too much material in the exhibition and it was difficult to understand. Others commented that there should have been more maps and key views together with details of routes around the creek. Some respondents commented that the text of the exhibition boards was too small. Also, it was not designed to be suitable to look at online as some thought that it was not clear when blown up. Even if respondents looked at the material online, if they printed it out, it was too small as they only had A4 printers.

Several respondents commented that the displays were useful or that they were realistic and the presentation was not biased. One commented that it was good to see footpaths all around the creek area.

It was suggested that the drawings and the wording of the questions implied that all people were being asked was to comment on what the developers wanted and not what the people wanted. The questions were skewed towards residential use of the sites around the creek. The Neighbourhood Plan process should be an opportunity for the people of the town to use their imagination about the uses of sites. Some respondents commented that the Council had not consulted with people who knew the creek area, and had only consulted with the developers.

The exhibition did not tell people what they needed to know to make informed comments. There was no connection between the proposals and the vision statement or the evidence base.

Concern was raised that the questionnaires and response forms could be tampered with to alter the answers that people had given.

#### 7. General comments and comments across several sites

Several suggestions for additional uses around the creek were made including the need for a hotel around the creek and a maritime museum. Both of these were suggested on several different sites. Another suggestion was a museum for the Graveney Boat and possibly some art galleries.

It was suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan needed to pay attention to parking and access to sites. There was too much traffic in Abbey Street and Belvedere Road. A new access into Belvedere Road could be formed from Abbey Road. The Belvedere Road junction with Quay Lane was overloaded and dangerous. There should be parking retained for any new uses at Ordnance Wharf but not on it.

Existing open spaces should be retained. The Stonebridge allotments should only be open during Secret Gardens and should not have general access. The amenities and heritage of the area should be protected. Attention should be paid to the silt in the basin which resulted in algal smells at certain times of year and states of the tide.

Any new development needed to be justifiable and viable. There needed to be an evidence base to identify what types of commercial uses were needed around the area. There had been no proof that there is market demand for any particular commercial ground floor uses. It would be preferable if industry could be provided or employment generally. This was to ensure that Faversham does not just become a dormitory town. There should be more opportunities for training and for start-up businesses. There should be training or educational opportunities linked to one of the local universities. Existing employment and industrial uses around the creek should be kept.



Other respondents commented that any new industry should be artisan-based or maritime in character and there should be visitor attractions to encourage people to come to the creek area. People liked to watch things being made, so boat repairs would be an attraction. The regeneration of the creek should unlock its tourism potential which was based on its maritime heritage. This should be exploited in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan should look at the creek as a whole and not just as isolated sites. However, the area should be refined so that each area could be considered for the design and uses of the buildings. It was also suggested that some sites in the Plan should include an option of having no agreed option for future development. Existing maritime uses such as Iron Wharf and the Alan Staley boatbuilding works should be kept. There should be more moorings around the creek. The creek could also be used for delivery of cargoes if economic circumstances change. Walkways should be provided around the creek so that people can enjoy the views around the area and access the sites around the creek on foot.

It was suggested that the proposals did not meet the needs of Faversham in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. There was no account at the exhibition of what development had taken place in the recent past and what lessons could be learned about whether they have made a positive or negative impact in meeting the needs of the area. The creek was not set in the context of the town. There had not been a fully detailed assessment of the historic fabric and assets around the creek before any moves to remove any of it. This should have been done for all the areas around the creek. The Undesignated Heritage Paper is too selective and does not address all of the historic structures on all the sites around the creek that were likely to be affected by development.

Concern was expressed at how closely any design requirements could be specified in the plan without being considered unacceptably restrictive. Concern was also expressed at how the Vision and Objectives would be used to inform the policies in the Plan and the recommendations for the individual sites. Concern was also raised that the Plan so far does not appear to be paying much attention to policy AAP2 of the 2008 Swale Local Plan. This sought to stop any further housing and retain sites in industrial uses including those that were in maritime use.

## Other Responses

A number of other representations were made in the form of documents that cover issues other than those raised by the exhibition:

Initial conclusions from a survey of local shopkeepers. (Griselda Mussett)

Submissions on behalf of Ordnance Wharf Ltd in response to consultation-June 2013- in respect of emerging Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan. And in respect of Ordnance Wharf, Flood Lane, Faversham Kent-Site 2 (Lee Evans Planning Reference P3121, Jeanne Taylor)

Submissions on behalf of Swan Quay LLP and Hilary Riva in response to consultation-June 2013- in respect of emerging Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan. And in respect of former Frank & Whittome buildings, Belvedere Road, Faversham-Site 4 (Lee Evans Planning Ref: P3107, Jeanne Taylor)

Submissions on behalf of Swan Quay LLP in response to consultation-June 2013-in respect of emerging Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan. And in respect of land and buildings at Swan Quay, Belvedere Road, Faversham-site 5 (Lee Evans Planning Ref: P2838, Jeanne Taylor)

Town Quay/Swan Quay Faversham. Summary of May 2013 Character Area Appraisal and alternative development proposals. (J. Ray Harrison)

Thamesbank – Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan 2013 (Lady Dido Berkeley)

Personal representations (Dr Arthur Percival, MBE, MA, DLitt, FSA, FAHI)

Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

25 July 2013