

APPENDIX II

Queenborough and Rushenden Indicative Revised Land Use Plan: Addendum to 2010 Adopted Masterplan : Summary of Consultation Responses December 2014

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
QR/001	Tony Lavelle	Object	<p>I am writing personally to express my support for the alternative plan for Queenborough Creek proposed by Messrs Orpin, MacDonald and Bell.</p> <p>Queenborough is a unique location of historic significance due to its particular maritime location and natural harbour (the Creek). The SBC+HCA amended plan abandons provision for maritime use of the south side of the creek for what seems to be a short-sighted valuation based only on the locally depressed price of housing. I strongly feel that the alternative marina plan is more practical and cheaper than that originally proposed. The marina would also add significant amenity value and focus to the local area.</p> <p>There is plenty of other brownfield land locally for house building but such a waterside location suitable for a marina is rare and precious. Apart from the recreational benefits it would bring much needed employment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to proposed amendments to SPD - prefers the alternative Orpin, MacDonald and Bell proposal which retains a marina plan. 2. Waterside location is unique - and should not be used for housing when alternative brownfields available for this. 3. Alternative marina plan is cheaper and more deliverable. HCA plan based on short term evaluation of local depressed housing prices. 4. Marine would to local amenity and recreation value and provide a focus for the area. 5. Marina would generate local employment. 	<p>1,3,4,5. The single most expensive piece of infrastructure in the adopted Masterplan was the proposed marina at an estimated £8m. The original studies showed that although this could be operated on a commercial basis, significant gap funding would be required to support its development. Originally it was proposed that this be cross-subsidised, through SEEDA at the time, either reinvesting capital funds or perhaps foregoing land receipts in order to bring forward this element of the scheme. Clearly all recent work on viability by both HCA's consultants and SBC's own work has demonstrated that viability is a real issue in this location and that sites will struggle to be developed, even without any additional requirements. Build costs and sales values are very close, leaving little room for any developers margins (essential to attract a developer partner).</p> <p>The other significant issue that has changed since the original Masterplan, and one that also affects viability, is as</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
					<p>a result of more recent developments in flood defence requirements. Since the Masterplan was adopted, Government Policy on flood defence protection has been tightened and estimates of future sea levels have been updated requiring further work to render the Q&R sites developable. The sites now require substantial investment to raise levels, which adds some £100,000 per acre to development costs. With an already fragile position on viability taking a standard set of assumptions, this additional abnormal cost would rule out any other land owner other than HCA bringing these sites forward for development, as the cost of development would exceed any future revenues. Therefore any potential to cross-subsidise the development of the marina is lost with any additional funding available to the HCA allocated to site preparation works.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed to strengthen the Masterplan Addendum to highlight that the area to the south of the creek is to be safeguarded for future Creekside leisure, commercial and open space uses. This can be seen in Appendix I to the LDF panel report.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
					<p>This leaves open the possibility of the Alternative Marina Creek Plan being implemented once the promoters gain funding for their scheme. Change Proposed.</p> <p>2. It is agreed that the waterside location is unique; however, all of the proposed housing is on brownfield sites. There are very few brownfield sites available in Swale which are not already allocated for development. Many of these contained previous employment uses and the Council's policy is to not lose employment sites for housing.</p>
QR/002	Simon Pamment	Object	<p>Given the position of Queenborough it should be a focal point for sailing in the area, yet remains little used. I for one have sailed in and out of the Medway for over 30 years and on most occasions pass Queenborough by, as do most of my sailing colleagues. The reason being the lack of facilities and the disproportionately high fees charged. I can get almost the exact level of service in Stangate creek for free, so that is where I and my colleagues go. When I sail the east coast most summers, where do I go, Bradwell / Bightlingsea / Tollesbury / Havingore basin / Maldon / Titchmarsh / Burnham / Shotly/ Ipswich / Wolverston / Levington / Pin Mill / Conyer Creek / Ramsgate to name a few. I go there because I can</p>	<p>1. Objects to exclusion of a marina, as believes a reasonably priced marina at Queenborough with decent facilities would be very popular with the sailing community, as there is no suitable port of call in the Medway / Thames area.</p> <p>2. Would be likely to attract a lot of visitors to the area especially if the expected level of tidal access could be achieved.</p>	<p>1+2. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>moor up, fill with water/fuel, walk ashore, plug into the mains electric and can eat at a local pub or yacht club; all often for only £5/£6 more than I pay on a Buoy at Queenborough.</p> <p>I sail an elderly westerley centaur, but the availability of an electric kettle, electric toaster, a fan, a laptop/dvd player and walk in toilet and shower just make the sailing infinitely more pleasurable. A reasonably priced marina at Queenborough, would make sense. Chatting to sailors around the east coast, most do not sail the Medway or Thames as there is no suitable port of call. Queen borough makes a good jump off point, where do most of my trips start, Standgate creek of course, no sense going to Queenborough.</p> <p>The Idea of a marina in Queenborough Creek, would have my support and would likely attract visitors, especially if the expected level of tide access was achieved.</p>		
QR/003	Will Pretty	Object	<p>I understand that it is proposed to change the proposal for the development of Queenborough creek so that marina facilities are no longer included.</p> <p>I am the race captain at Hoo Ness Yacht Club. We organise cruises for our members to Queenborough. Currently these are of short duration as there are no facilities other than for a temporary stay. Were Queenborough Creek to be made more suitable it is likely we would visit more.</p>	<p>1. Objects to exclusion of marina as believes this would be very popular with local sailing community. Currently not possible to organise anything other than very short trips to Queenborough, as there are no suitable facilities. Improvements would bring more visitors.</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>2. Noted. This is part of longer term aspirations by Peel Ports and is not part of the emerging Swale Borough Local Plan Part 1: December 2014.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			I know there are plans by Peel Ports to consider a marina at Sheerness in the long term future. These are at an early stage and it looks to be more suitable for continental visitors on their way to and from London than for those that would see Queenborough as their destination.	2. The longer term potential for a marina at Peel (Sheerness) would be more likely to cater for international visitors heading for London, than local sailing.	
QR/004	Queenborough Town Council	Object and comment	<p>Queenborough Town Council objects to the Addendum to the adopted Queenborough & Rushenden Regeneration Masterplan and the inaugural Masterplan as presented.</p> <p>We object strongly to the changes proposed, particularly the reduction in the number of dwellings and in the removal of the proposed marina.</p> <p>We also have sympathy for the current business users on the Klondyke Industrial Estate who have been told to vacate the land rented without the provision of adequate alternative accommodation.</p> <p>There are also queries regarding ownership of the land and the Town Council is in the process of contacting HM Land Registry to ascertain the legal ownership of all relevant parcels of land.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to the reduction in dwelling numbers. 2. Object to the removal of the marina from the regeneration plans. 3. Klondyke Industrial Estate businesses have been given notice to vacate without provision of suitable alternative. 4. Unclear land ownership of some land parcels which the Town Council is investigating via the Land Registry. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dwelling numbers have been reduced as Government guidance now promotes a lower density of dwellings than was the case when the Masterplan was adopted. 2. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed. 3. The Economic Development team at SBC has previously offered help to tenants to try and assist them with their relocation and the HCA are also in talks with the primary leaseholder, Charles Stevens, about extending the lease for 1 year. 4. Noted.
QR/005	Patricia Roberts	Object	<p>I have spoken to Tim Hill this morning and he has persuaded me to vote in favour of the Marina at Queenborough, which was proposed and then dropped in favour of nothing useful.</p> <p>Please reconsider and approve Queenborough Marina for boats because the foreign business</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to loss of marina from the plan as believes this will attract foreign boats and the business they bring will be good for the local economy. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			they attract can only be good for the Borough.		
QR/006	David Thurman-Newell		<p>I write to add my support for the above plan. For a long time now Sheppey as a whole has been treated as a poor relation regarding developments benefiting the residents of the island.</p> <p>I strongly believe that the current plans for an inbound marina on the creek are a massive step forward for the creek the surrounding area and economy.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that with the right backing from yourselves and the continued support of the area population this plan can and must be implemented.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects the Swale / HCA plan to delete the marina and support the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell). 2. Believes that this marina would be a great step forward for the Creek and surrounding area and the local economy. 3. Believes this version of marina is deliverable with plan and local backing. 	1-3. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/007	Giacomo De Stefano,	Object	<p>My name is Giacomo De Stefano, I work and sail to promote a sustainable way of living and travelling. In 2010 along my project called Man on the river, on a open, engineless 18 foot long wooden boat from London to Istanbul I was trying to sail and enter the Queenborough harbour but, being engineless, I could cope with tide and wind against me so I headed to Sheerness beach were I saw a Yachting Club and some boats.</p> <p>I received a wonderful hospitality and Tim Bell helped me and my friend so much (he capsized on a little dinghy in the meanwhile).</p> <p>I see that a very important project is going to be undertaken and I really hope you will listen to the wisdom of those who would like to bring more</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Believes the sailing community would make good use of a marina at Queenborough. 2. Marina would be better for the long term environment of the area than more housing. 	1-3. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>boats to Q.</p> <p>The housing project is simply a nonsense in that area. I was an architect before and it seems that in a medium term only an activity full of clean energy and less impactive than other concrete on the Sheppey Island would be acceptable. Please do not listen to the money greed of the investors. You would be remembered like thieves and corrupted persons. All the reasons already written by the Q. harbour trust are so true and simple than would be simply not reasonable to ignore them.</p> <p>If behind your wallet there is a human being please do something to protect and help the future of Queenborough</p>		
QR/008	Marine Management Organisation	Comment	<p>Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. The MMO has reviewed the document and whilst we have no specific comments to make we would like to draw your attention to the remit of our organisation as you may wish to be aware of this in relation to the consultation.</p> <p>As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high</p>	<p>1. No specific comment on the proposed revision to the SPD Masterplan, but draw attention to the role of the MMO and the forthcoming South Plan which will cover coastal areas and the tidal extent of rivers. In the interim, they draw attention to the national Marine Policy Statement; and the potential need for licences for construction, dredging, alteration or improvement works in such locations.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>water spring tides mark there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. In our duty to take all reasonable steps to ensure compatibility with existing development plans, which apply down to the low water mark, we are seeking to identify the 'marine relevance' of applicable plan policies.</p> <p>On 2 April 2014 the East Inshore and East Offshore marine plans were published, becoming a material consideration for the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and other public authorities with decision making functions. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans provide guidance for sustainable development in English waters, and cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. More information including the East Inshore and East Offshore marine plans document can be found at https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/marine-planning-in-england</p> <p>The next round of planning began in 2013 in the south plan area. Until such time as a marine plan is in place for the South East plan area we advise local authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. The Marine Policy Statement will also guide the development of Marine Plans across the UK. More information can be found at http://www.defra.gov.uk/news/2011/03/18/marine-policy-statement/.</p> <p>The MMO is responsible for issuing marine licences under the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 in England. Amongst other things, a marine licence may be needed for activities involving the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence.</p> <p>Alongside marine licences, we also issue consents under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in England and parts of Wales. We are also the authority responsible for processing and determining harbour orders in England and for some ports in Wales and for granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours.</p> <p>The applications we receive may be subject to various forms of assessment. This includes environmental impact assessment, Habitats Regulations assessment, marine conservation</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>zone assessment and assessment for compliance with the Water Framework Directive. Early consultation with the MMO is always advised and we would encourage applicants to engage early with the MMO alongside any application for planning consent to ensure that the consenting process is as efficient as possible. We will look to follow the principles set out in the Coastal Concordat in considering any application which is linked to an application for planning consent.</p> <p>We are also an advisor to the Planning Inspectorate, Secretary of State and other consenting bodies for various consents affecting the marine area. This includes Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>We would suggest that reference to the MMO's role in consenting projects be made within planning documents to ensure that necessary regulatory requirements are covered.</p> <p>If you have any questions or need any further information please just let me know. More information on the role of the MMO can be found on our website www.gov.uk/mmo</p>		
QR/009	Minster-on-Sea Parish Council	Object	Please consider this to be Minster-on-Sea Parish Council's formal response to the consultation on the Queenborough and Rushenden - Indicative Revised Land Use Plan. Its comments are as follows:-	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the position of Queenborough Town Council. 2. Felt the Planning for Real exercise undertaken for the original SPD did a better job of 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Much of the adopted Masterplan is still relevant and will be used in planning decisions. The Masterplan Addendum was out for

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>Noting that MPC will support the position of Queenborough Town Council who is better placed to understand the impact the proposals will have on that community, MPC would like to add the following comments:-</p> <p>MPC feels that the 'Planning for Real' consultation work undertaken in the communities of Queenborough and Rushenden ensured that the local communities had their say in the future regeneration of their area. Having engaged a large percentage of the population and gained the support and full confidence of a complex partnership including councillors, master planners, the Regional Development Agency and other organisations, it provided a better understanding of the community situation and helped to identify the issues, wants and needs that might arise as a result of the major developments proposed. It also supported the creation of a sustainable community. In view of its importance, Members would want to see some of the aspects of that work resurrected rather than lost forever particularly related to the environment.</p> <p>MPC also believes that Queenborough offers a better location for a marina than the Sheerness Port Proposal on the North coast. Regarding the reduction of dwelling numbers from 2,000 to 1,180, MPC queries whether the difference of 820 dwellings will go to the ISTIL Mill /Thomsett Way sites.</p>	<p>understanding the wants and needs of all partners and supported the creation of a sustainable community. Lack of proper survey for this consultation not conducive to getting the right feedback.</p> <p>3. Elements of the Planning for Real Work, especially in relation to the environment should be carried forwards and not lost.</p> <p>4. Believes that Queenborough is a better location for a marina than the Sheerness Port proposal on the north coast.</p> <p>5. In regards of reducing the dwelling numbers from 2000 to 1180 – will the 800 now go to the ISTIL Mill/ Thomsett Way site?</p>	<p>consultation for 6 weeks and the Council received a good number of responses on a variety of issues. It would not have been appropriate to use a 'Planning for Real' exercise again as that was used to plan the whole development from scratch whereas this is proposing changes only to the marina, the location of the school and a reduction in dwelling numbers.</p> <p>3. As previously stated, much of the adopted Masterplan will remain in place for Development Management purposes, especially the overall vision, design concepts and environmental policies.</p> <p>4. Noted. This is part of longer term aspirations by Peel Ports and is not part of the emerging Swale Borough Local Plan Part 1: December 2014.</p> <p>5. The 1,180 figure includes the proposed housing at the ISTIL Mill and Thomsett Way site.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			In concluding, MPC feels the lack of a proper survey in the current consultation is not contusive to obtaining important feedback.		
QR/010	Matty Spokes	Comment	Please tell me you are having a laugh?? After all this time saying there was no more houses being built!!!	1. Comment unclear	1. Noted.
QR/011	Highways Agency	No comment	Having reviewed the document, the Agency has no comments on the proposed revised plan. Rather it will be content to consider any and all impacts on the Strategic Road Network as pre-app consultations and subsequent applications for development come forward; and then to agree mitigation as appropriate.	1. No comment at this stage.	1. Noted.
QR/012	Environment Agency	Comment	<p>Overall we have no major concerns with the indicative revised land use plan. We do have the following comments to make which we hope you will find useful.</p> <p>All development at this location will need to be supported with a detailed flood risk assessment, which should be based on modelled tidal flood levels within the site.</p> <p>Surface water drainage will also need to be considered in detail, and we would expect sustainable drainage techniques to be incorporated across the proposed developments.</p> <p>Flood defences around the site boundary may need to be improved and raised in places. This should be fully addressed within a detailed FRA</p>	<p>1. No major concerns over the proposed revisions to the plan.</p> <p>2. All development proposals to be supported by a detailed flood risk assessment based on modelled tidal flood levels within the site.</p> <p>3. Sustainable surface water drainage techniques expected across the proposed developments.</p> <p>4. Flood defences around the site boundary may need to be raised and improved in places and should be fully addressed</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2, 3 +4. These are all issues that would be dealt with at the outline planning application stage.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			and any works would need to be completed prior to development of the site. Works to the flood defences, and any other work within 15m of the existing defences will require flood defences consent from the Environment Agency.	within the FRA. Any works to defences or within 15 m of defences require EA consent.	
QR/013	Eddie Johnson	Object and comment	<p>When the harbour was under threat of closure following Swale Borough Council's decision to terminate their involvement in the mooring facilities Queenborough Harbour Trust was created by a small number of people who not only wanted to save the harbour, but improve it.</p> <p>Just two years later the achievements of Queenborough Harbour Trust cannot be disputed. With increased mooring holders and visitors the harbour is helping the town's economy, and although a lot of work is still needed the harbour is heading in the right direction.</p> <p>The proposal for a marina in the creek shouldn't even need to be discussed. It is a natural progression for the prosperity of the town and island as a whole. With the creation of a marina will come the industries which rely on yachts, and with these industries will come much needed employment.</p> <p>As a resident of Queenborough I am looking at this plan with enthusiasm and sincerely hope this plan goes ahead as soon as possible.</p> <p>Now it's up to the local people, mooring holders and visitors to Queenborough to support this</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell). 2. A marina at Queenborough is essential - will support economic prosperity of the town and island as a whole. Increased moorings showing results after just two years. Increased yacht visits will encourage related industry and jobs. 3. Could work in tandem with the Sheerness Peel Ports proposals for a marina to make island a place of excellence for sailing. 	<p>1 + 2. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>3. The Sheerness Port proposals are part of longer term aspirations by Peel Ports and are not part of the emerging Swale Borough Local Plan Part 1: December 2014.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>incredible plan, and make Queenborough a yachting paradise to match Cowes.</p> <p>With Peel Ports Master Plan for a marina north of Sheerness, it cannot be overstated what these developments will do for the island. I would like to thank Tim and the other people who are responsible for putting this plan together.</p>		
QR/014	Dawn Benson	Support	<p>I am writing to you in support of the proposed Queenborough creek marina, i feel that this would be valuable asset not only to the local area of Queenborough but also the whole of the island, not only would it encourage visitors but it would also give locals a wonderful place to visit & spend the day as a family.</p> <p>As a still working & often used harbour (all be it small) it would be of asset to boatsmen looking for somewhere nice to moor & visit historic Queenborough/Sheppey.</p> <p>Also the economic reasons for dropping the marina earlier this year are no longer relevant, not only has the country as a whole seen an economic upturn, but in particular Kent. I would like to also point out the wonderful job that has been done to Faversham creek, wouldn't it be fantastic not only for the islanders but for the present planners to be a part of something such as a marina at Queenborough.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell). 2. Will encourage visitors and be a local recreational asset. 3. Will be popular with the sailing community and benefit Queenborough and the whole of the island. 4. Economic upturn means that deliverability of a marina now possible and should be reinstated in plans. 	1-4. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/015	David Brown	Comment/	I wish to add my support for a Marina in	1. Supports the Alternative	1-4. See response to respondent

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
		Object	<p>Queenborough Creek. Queenborough is the first and last stopping off point for Yachts sailing around the Coast, across the estuary or to the continent. I keep my yacht in Queenborough and have been offered mooring further up river but much prefer the Queenborough harbour and creek. The work carried out by the Harbour Trust will attract many more craft to the harbour and if Peel Ports can put a Marina in to their plan they must think they will attract sufficient business.</p> <p>To just build flats or houses on to the back of a muddy creek will be a missed opportunity for the town and the borough.</p> <p>I whole heartily support the idea of a Marina in the creek and I would certainly move my yacht to it and in addition it would make an ideal base for disabled persons yachting and dinghy sailing, youth sailing and the Sea Cadet Corps which includes the Sittingbourne Unit who no longer have a boating base.</p>	<p>Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell).</p> <p>2. Support from the boating community as Queenborough is the first and last stopping of point for sailing around the coast, across the estuary or to the continent. Must be a viable proposition for Peel Port to include similar in their plan.</p> <p>3. Valuable sailing and recreational facility for disabled and also Sea Cadet Corps (including Sittingbourne who no longer have a boating base).</p> <p>4. Building houses onto the back of a muddy creek is a missed opportunity for Queenborough and the whole island.</p>	QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/016	David Price	Object	As Commodore of Queenborough Yacht club I would like to support all proposals for Queenborough Creek as submitted by Tim Bell	1. Support from boating community for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell).	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/017	David Marshall	Object	I have recently heard about the possibility of a marina at Queenborough and I would give this my full support.	1. Support from boating community for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin,	1-4. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>As a sailor belonging to one of the sailing clubs up the river Medway I am very conscious that the Swale surrounding the Isle of Sheppey is the first all tide mooring facility travelling up the Thames after leaving Ramsgate and as such is a valuable refuge from adverse weather. The west side of the Swale at Queenborough thus provides the first all tide mooring with immediate access to shops, as close shops is not readily available at the East of the Swale.</p> <p>I have visited Queenborough many times over the past 30 years of sailing and recently I have been ashamed of the lack of facilities for sailors, particularly the fact that for the last 2 years there has not even been a lock on the inside of the men's toilet thus necessitating us using the toilet in an unlockable WC!!!! I have therefore been ashamed of the facilities provided for visiting sailors and I shudder to think what visiting sailors from abroad must think!! They come not only from the near continent but this year I saw those who had sailed here from as far away as Canada.</p> <p>I therefore fully support the plans to build a marina in the creek in Queenborough, not only because of the improved facilities it will mean for sailors but also because of the increased trade it will bring the town; something that I expect all those who live in Queenborough would appreciate.</p>	<p>MacDonald & Bell) plan for a marina at Queenborough. Queenborough is the first all tide mooring facility between Ramsgate and the Thames and a valuable refuge from bad weather.</p> <p>2. Facilities at Queenborough currently very poor and present a bad impression to visitors, including international visitors.</p> <p>3. Improved marina facilities would bring in extra trade and prosperity for the town.</p>	
QR/018	Craig Butler	Object	I am writing this email to add my comments to those of others about the Q&R Regeneration	1. Marina would make the housing in the area more	1. The dwelling numbers have been reduced as Government guidance now

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>amendment. I have looked at the amendments and I have the following points to make:</p> <p>1) Removal of Marina: This has been removed and replaced with the waterside hub, as it is deemed as a "risk" to the developers of the scheme. In the grand scheme of things a marina will potentially make the housing around the area more valuable and you will also be able to create a higher density of housing within the area. This means there will be more homes, worth more money. Where is this risk exactly?? I believe the Marina is and always has been a ploy to get the residents on side so you can push through with yet more housing on the island. If these developers really want to build homes then maybe you should state to them that they HAVE to build on this site first before they can go tearing up the green fields of Sheppey. All you are doing is allowing them is to make maximum profit while destroying our quality of life. Being a business if they were told they couldn't build anymore unless they built here, the odds are they will build here first. If the marina is not possible then I suggest that SBC or whomever owns the still natural areas of the creek turn this area over to the not for profit Queenborough harbour trust who are keen to create a successful marina within the current boundaries of the creek. This will create much needed revenue to Queenborough and in turn SBC. It will also start to get other businesses thriving such as cafes, restaurants, etc. with the</p>	<p>viable and enable a higher density to be achieved.</p> <p>2. Brownfield here should be built on before any greenfield is used on the island. Quality of life should come before profit.</p> <p>3. Site should be turned over to the not-for-profit Queenborough Harbour Trust to create a successful marina.</p> <p>4. Marina will boost other related local businesses as a result of increased footfall from visiting boats.</p> <p>5. Supports the more central location of the school and believes it should be built in tandem with the Phase I houses to avoid local overcrowding.</p> <p>6. Queries why the Klondyke estate businesses have been given notice to quit years before anything will be built in this phase – displacing a large number of self-employed people and questions whether/ where new provision being</p>	<p>promotes a lower density of dwellings than was the case when the Masterplan was adopted.</p> <p>2. All of the proposed housing is on brownfield sites. There are very few brownfield sites available in Swale which are not already allocated for development. Many of these contained previous employment uses and the Council's policy is to not lose employment sites for housing if possible.</p> <p>3. It is proposed to strengthen the Masterplan Addendum to highlight that the area to the south of the creek is to be safeguarded for future Creekside leisure, commercial and open space uses. This leaves open the possibility of Queenborough Harbour Trust increasing their facilities at this location. Change Proposed.</p> <p>4. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>5. Noted. Both the HCA and SBC have been working closely with the education provider, KCC, to ensure that the primary school is built at the appropriate time to meet the needs of the increasing population.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>much increased footfall of docking boats.</p> <p>2) School: although I agree the school is situated more centrally now, I do believe that the trigger for building the school should take place as the Phase 1 is commencing as by the time the homes are built all those extra children will be crammed into the existing local schools, namely Queenborough primary for a few more years while the new school is built, if it is ever built. A contribution towards the school should come from the developer before any homes are built.</p> <p>3) Eviction of Klondyke estate businesses: I am unsure why you are evicting the businesses on the estate years before anything is even built in that phase. These are companies although not large, do support a large number of self-employed people and you are kicking them off the land with no plan as to where they can go straight away. Why are you evicting them so soon? What is your plan with these people businesses once you have? Will you be building new workshops for them locally such as Cullet drive?</p> <p>4) Creation of jobs: Apart from Neat's Court where are the plans for the creation of jobs, bearing in mind not even 20 years ago Rushenden Road itself employed 1000s of people. Now you want to just build homes, but you haven't stated exactly how you are going to create jobs for all these lovely new residents, and after evicting people from the Klondyke you are actually</p>	<p>made for them.</p> <p>7. Apart from Neatscourt - where are new jobs to be created on the island?</p> <p>8. This is about Queenborough and Rushenden Regeneration, and to regenerate doesn't just mean build lots of new homes, it means to regenerate all aspects, homes, jobs, quality of life, community and doesn't believe plan fulfils this.</p>	<p>6. Businesses were given notice to allow them time to find alternative premises. The process of preparing that area of the site for development (flood alleviation work, decontamination, etc.) is time consuming and therefore HCA felt that it we the right time to 'give notice.' The Economic Development team at SBC has offered help to tenants to try and assist them with their relocation. As progress has been slower than hoped for, the HCA are currently in talks with the primary leaseholder about extending the lease for 1 year.</p> <p>7. There are other employment allocations on the island at West Minster, Sheerness and at Cowstead Corner, Queenborough.</p> <p>8. Agreed. Much of the adopted Masterplan will remain in place for Development Management purposes, especially the overall vision, design concepts, environmental policies, community facilities, etc.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>eliminating jobs.</p> <p>5) My final point is please remember that this is called the Queenborough and Rushenden Regeneration, and to regenerate doesn't just mean build lots of new homes, it means to regenerate all aspects, homes, jobs, quality of life, community and I am afraid I don't think your plan fulfils this.</p>		
QR/019	Colin and Elaine	Support	What a good revised plan. I would like to see project start as soon as possible, the site looks like a bombed out waste land and anyone visiting the area must think what a rundown place this is.	1. Supports revised proposals.	1. Noted.
QR/020	Clive Hancock at A Glaze Marine Products	Object	<p>As a resident of the Isle of Sheppey I note from your latest plans for the regeneration of Queenborough and Rushenden, the planned marina has been completely dropped.</p> <p>Whilst new homes are obviously very much needed for areas of the South East I would question the sort of development planned for this area.</p> <p>Queenborough and Rushenden are not well off areas and I assume the type of housing will reflect this, which in my view will not improve the area, but attract more social housing and landlords looking to rent out cheaper accommodation to those unable to afford their own homes.</p> <p>Surely this is just providing a "dumping ground" for the type of housing that councillors do not wish to</p>	<p>1. Notes need for new homes in South East, but queries whether this is right for Queenborough and Rushenden. The area is not prosperous and the type of housing likely to be built is likely to reflect this and not contribute to regeneration. Could become a dumping ground for social housing and lead to a downward social spiral.</p> <p>2. Leisure boating on Medway and Swale now huge business and a marina here could take advantage of demand for</p>	<p>1. The Housing Team at SBC will advise at the time of a planning application what type housing is required for this area. It is envisaged that 25% of all of the new dwellings will be 'affordable housing.'</p> <p>2.+3. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>4. Noted. The vision still remains for "a 'multifaceted' regeneration, using the highest standards of design; an urban scheme which is respectful of the history and character of Queenborough, where new houses complementing the old will revitalise the area, bringing money into the local</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>see in more affluent areas of the Borough and Kent as a whole.</p> <p>By building a marina in this area surely it will be easier to attract the type of development and developer that can envisage an area built around the marina to take advantage of the demand for this type of living around our coasts. Leisure boating on the River Medway and the Swale is now huge business and a new marina will only attract visitors and householders to this area, improving the area no end, not adding to its downward social spiral.</p> <p>I do not live in Queenborough or Rushenden, but I am a user of the river and facilities in Queenborough and for anyone like myself it is easy to see the potential of Queenborough to the leisure marine industry in not only in South/ South East/ Eastern England, but also for visitors from France, Benelux, Germany and beyond, being the perfect staging point to visit our capital and other fantastic harbours in Eastern England.</p> <p>I am sure you are trying to achieve what is socially correct at this time, but please look into the future and see how these plans can improve the whole of Sheppey and the Borough for the long term and generations to come by including the Marina plans and areas/trades associated with this.</p>	<p>waterside homes and attract new visitors and households and benefit the whole area.</p> <p>3. As a river user it's easy to see the potential of Queenborough to the leisure marine industry in not only in South/ South East/ Eastern England, but also for visitors from France, Benelux, Germany and beyond, being the perfect staging point to visit our capital and other fantastic harbours in Eastern England.</p> <p>4. Balance needed between what is socially correct and amending plans which will improve the whole of Sheppey and the Borough for the longer term.</p>	<p>economy, improving education and services, and putting a 'value' on the visual, historical and ecological qualities that the Isle of Sheppey enjoys. The new regenerated Queenborough and Rushenden will be a very attractive place to live and work."</p>
QR/021	Chris Foulds	Object	I object to the deletion of the Marina at Queenborough, there is no justification for doing	1. Objects to deletion of marina as this could vastly	1+2. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>so, the people of Queenborough and Sheppey have been promised one after years of consultation. What a wonderful place Queenborough could become with badly needed maritime facilities. Details of a more realistic and deliverable project are to be found in the alternative Creek Marina Plan by Orpin, MacDonald, and Bell.</p> <p>Please reconsider this plan and reinstate the Marina as described in the Queenborough Creek Marina Plan.</p>	<p>improve Queenborough for the longer term.</p> <p>2. Believes the more realistic marina proposals in the Orpin, MacDonald and Bell scheme are deliverable and should be considered.</p>	
QR/022	Ashley Shiel: Chairman, Rushenden Community Association	Comment	I think the idea is amazing if only it would happen.	1. It is unclear whether the respondent is supporting the Masterplan Addendum or the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell).	1. Noted.
QR/023	Adam Hanson	Object	<p>My wife and I have lived in Alsager Avenue in Queenborough for just under a year and we loved our time there. It showed and still does so much potential. We were looking forward to the birth of our first son and we thought long and hard where we wanted to bring him up.</p> <p>It saddened us that we just felt there was nothing ever going to happen to improve the area. Plans for regeneration were always stalling to come to fruition. The neglect of this unique and quite beautiful area continued. Why can't this area get the same attention and investment as parts of Medway has had in the past? Look at the work</p>	<p>1. Believe the Queenborough area has huge potential, given the right investment such as Chatham Maritime (can SEEDA assist?).</p> <p>2. Plan as proposed offers no future or aspiration for Sheppey young people. As ever I feel totally let down by Swale Council.</p>	<p>1. SEEDA was merged into the HCA in 2012 and no longer has the same role as before. They are unable to assist in funding a marina. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>2. The plan offers young people places to work, live and spend their leisure time in an improved natural environment.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			done to regenerate the Chatham Dockyard area focussing on the Marina? Can't this be a template for all other post Industrial sites such as Queenborough? Isn't SEEDA based in the Dockyard area? They should know the important part the Marina has played in that area. Where is the aspiration from the council and what does this show to the Swale community? You don't deserve this better future for your children? Hopefully your children will get out of Sheppey as soon as they can! As ever I feel totally let down by Swale council.		
QR024	Tim Harris Commodore Sheppey Sailing Club	Object	Speaking as Commodore on behalf of the Isle of Sheppey Sailing Club, I wish to register my objection to the amendments to the Queenborough and Rushenden plan, because of lack of marine use of the creek in the amended plan, but I fully support the alternative creek marina idea as attached.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to deletion of the marina use for Queenborough Creek. 2. Support from boating community for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) plan for a marina at Queenborough). 	1+2. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/025	Southern Water	Comment	<p>Southern Water is the statutory water supply and sewerage undertaker for the area covered by Queenborough and Rushenden regeneration.</p> <p>We note that there are four sites (with numbers of dwellings) identified for residential development in the document, described as:</p> <p>New housing site (up to 220 units)</p> <p>Phase one (up to 250 units)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing sewerage capacity in the immediate vicinity of all four sites is insufficient to serve them. This is not a constraint provided each site connects to the system at the nearest point of suitable capacity (precise point to be identified when development 	<p>1+2. Both of these issues can be dealt with at the planning application stage.</p> <p>3. This is too detailed for the Masterplan Addendum and as previously stated it can be dealt with at the planning application stage.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>Higher medium density housing (380 units) Mill and Thomsett sites (up to 240 units)</p> <p>We have carried out capacity and infrastructure checks on these sites. Unfortunately, we are unable to assess the 'Other development sites' to the north of the area because we require both the number of dwellings as well as the precise location to do so.</p> <p>The checks show that there is insufficient sewerage capacity for all four sites listed above and multiple sewerage/water supply pipes running underneath each of these sites.</p> <p>Neither of these issues are showstoppers, however, the following should be taken into account:</p> <p>Insufficient capacity to serve a site</p> <p>Existing sewerage capacity, in the immediate vicinity of each of the sites, is insufficient to serve them. This is not a constraint to development provided each site connects to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity. The precise location of the nearest point of capacity will need to be investigated when the development comes forward.</p> <p>Local infrastructure required to service individual development sites, such as local sewers, should be funded by the development. The mechanism by which the development can provide the infrastructure required to serve it is to connect to</p>	<p>comes forward), but may involve off-site works. Must be coordinated with new development through planning policies and conditions.</p> <p>2. Southern Water sewage infrastructure crosses all four sites. Development layout should avoid building over this and observe appropriate easements around them, or allow for diversion of the infrastructure. Latter would be at developers' expense and subject to a suitable alternative route being available.</p> <p>3. New text suggested to ensure plan takes account of these matters.</p>	

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>the sewerage systems at the nearest points of adequate capacity. This may require off-site infrastructure if the nearest point is not located within the immediate vicinity of the site.</p> <p>We look to the planning authority to ensure, through planning policies and planning conditions, that development is co-ordinated with provision of infrastructure and not permitted to proceed unless it connects to the sewerage system at the nearest points of adequate capacity, to ensure levels of service are maintained to both new and existing customers.</p> <p>Underground infrastructure crossing a site</p> <p>Southern Water sewerage infrastructure crosses all of these sites. Therefore, we request that development design should avoid building over this existing infrastructure so that it can continue to perform its function effectively and allow access for necessary maintenance and upsizing. These structures also require easements of 6 to 13 metres wide depending on the size and depth of the infrastructure. The layout of the proposed development should take these factors into account and either allow easement or diversion of the infrastructure. Any diversion should be at the developer's expense, and is subject to a feasible alternative route being available.</p> <p>Proposed amendments</p> <p>As described above, the need for additional</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>sewerage capacity and infrastructure crossing the Masterplan area are not 'showstopper' issues, however, it would be helpful if the Addendum recognised these issues.</p> <p>We suggest the following amendment (new text underlined):</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p><u>Each development should connect to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity</u></p> <p><u>Development will avoid building over the underground infrastructure crossing the sites and either allow adequate easement or divert the infrastructure subject to feasibility.</u></p>		
QR/026	Heather Thomas-Pugh; Chair of Sheppey Tourism Alliance	Comment and object	<p>With regard to the refreshed proposals to the Queenborough and Rushenden Masterplan I should like to make the following comment:</p> <p>I fully support the alternative Marina Creek Marina Plan and that it be considered an amendment to the Queenborough & Rushenden Masterplan</p> <p>The British seaside tourist industry is deserving of policy attention – and probably support – in its own right. The industry is an important national asset. These days, most large towns can boast at least one 'tourist attraction' that draws in visitors from elsewhere - this could be Queenborough Harbour/Creek by visiting leisure craft. Some of the visitors support jobs in hotels, and more</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) plan for a marina at Queenborough) and asks that is considered as an amendment to the Masterplan. 2. Could be a significant boost to the tourism offer of Queenborough and Sheppey generally, as an important focal point. Important to diversify Sheppey's traditional 'bucket and spade' holiday offer and cater for a more 	1-4. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>generally visitors add to consumer spending and thereby support jobs in shops, restaurants and so on.</p> <p>The Isle of Sheppey is still steeped in the traditional family holiday, however though there is a place for this the bucket and spade holidays of the 1950s and 60s, often the same week every year to the same place, is limited to the few. The market has become more sophisticated, more fragmented, and more diverse - hence we must think "outside the box" and not lose this opportunity to put "the Island on the Map".</p> <p>Further research and perhaps a feasibility study would be a sound method for ensuring we take a balanced view on the Queenborough Creeks potential.</p>	<p>sophisticated market.</p> <p>3. Marina could also create local jobs in support of facilities to service visiting leisure craft.</p> <p>4. Suggest further feasibility work on the alternatives, to ensure that a balanced decision is made on the potential of Queenborough Creek.</p>	
QR/027	Wendy Bell	Object	I would like to register my support for the attached plan. I think there will be huge social and economic benefits from developing a Marina in Queenborough and would urge you to consider this plan.	1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and economic benefits it would confer.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/028	David Orpin	Object	I object to the deletion of the Marina at Queenborough, there is no justification for doing so, the people of Queenborough and Sheppey have been promised one after years of consultation.	1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough and objects to the deletion of a marina in the Masterplan SPD,	1+2. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>What a wonderful place Queenborough would become.</p> <p>Details of a more realistic and deliverable project are attached.</p> <p>The HCA are instrumental in providing a new Marina in East Cowes with only 180 dwellings being created, so there is no justification for not providing one at Queenborough with 1180 dwellings proposed.</p>	<p>as this would be a key focal point of regeneration for the town.</p> <p>2. Believes this offers a more realistic and deliverable plan and compares this to the HCA project at East Cowes, where a marina is being provided with only 180 enabling dwellings.</p> <p>Alternative plan attached.</p>	
QR/029	Medway City Council	No comment	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 31st October 2014 notifying Medway Council of the consultation on the Queenborough and Rushenden Land Use Plan: Addendum to 2010 Adopted Masterplan.</p> <p>After a review of the addendum, Medway Council has no comments to make on the consultation.</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation letter.</p>	1. No comment.	1. Noted.
QR/030	Alan Friday	Object	I am supporting the Queenborough creek marina (Tim Bell). I think this will be a great project that will help the island bring business- people and financial benefits to Sheppey. We need the council to get behind project like this to build Sheppey for the future	1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and economic benefits it would confer to Sheppey for the longer term future.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/031	KCC	Support	KCC supports the principle of regeneration in Queenborough and Rushenden, especially given	1. Support principle of	1. Noted.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
		and comment	<p>the significant public sector investment by a range of partners that has taken place in order to bring forward development including transport improvements, land acquisition and remediation. The County Council appreciates that the Masterplan forms part of a wider regeneration initiative including the new retail led development at Neatscourt.</p> <p>KCC recognises the substantial investment to date by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) which enabled the delivery of Neatscourt and site acquisition and preparatory works at Queenborough and Rushenden. The ongoing involvement of the HCA will be critical to ensure that all of the original regeneration objectives are met including bringing forward the residential elements in tandem with associated community infrastructure.</p> <p>The County Council welcomes the changes to the original Masterplan which reflect current market conditions and should improve the overall deliverability of the scheme.</p> <p>The Masterplan addendum will play an important role in setting out the vision for the development and its component parts. It should also give the local community and proposed investors clarity in how supporting infrastructure will be brought forward. This will help to de-risk delivery by giving all partners confidence in the overall</p>	<p>regeneration in Queenborough and Rushenden. Note that ongoing involvement of the HCA will be critical. Welcome changes to the original Masterplan which reflect current market conditions and should improve the overall deliverability of the scheme.</p> <p>2. Addendum should be underpinned by an update to 'Volume 2: Project Delivery' of the original Masterplan to give clarity on infrastructure requirements, delivery mechanisms and phasing. This should take into account the latest housing trajectory and proposed mix of dwellings.</p> <p>3. Welcome the provision of a primary school as a key element of the Masterplan. Note the reference to the primary school being required around 2018. As there is a three year lead in time clarity will be needed on funding and site transfer early in 2015. Only a modest amount of housing can be</p>	<p>2. It is proposed that this will take place once the first planning application is imminent.</p> <p>3. Noted. As you will be aware the HCA and SBC have been working with yourselves to plan for the school, including its funding and delivery timescales.</p> <p>4. This will be dealt with through the Queenborough and Rushenden Steering Group and is too detailed to add to the Masterplan Addendum.</p> <p>5. Noted.</p> <p>6. Noted. The suggested inclusion is too detailed to add to the Masterplan Addendum.</p> <p>7. The design of this open space at the planning application stage will take careful account of any BAP habitats or species. This can be dealt with at the planning application stage.</p> <p>8. An HRA has not been produced as the Addendum is updating the Masterplan in terms of the reduction in dwelling numbers, the removal of the marina proposals and the moving of the location of the school. It is likely that recreational activity will be less than previously envisaged due to the</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>implementation strategy.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure requirements</u> The addendum should be underpinned by an update to 'Volume 2: Project Delivery' of the original Masterplan to give clarity on infrastructure requirements, delivery mechanisms and phasing. This should take into account the latest housing trajectory and proposed mix of dwellings. KCC welcomes the provision of a primary school as a key element of the Masterplan. A new school will help to create a sense of place and improve the marketability of the development. The County Council notes the reference to the primary school being required around 2018. There is usually a three year lead in time to deliver a school which suggests that there needs to be clarity on both funding and site transfer proposals early in 2015. The precise timing for the release of the school site will be subject to detailed discussions with KCC Education, taking into account up to date capacity information and the impact of other planned developments on primary school provision.</p> <p>As there are significant capacity issues in respect of primary education within the locality, only a modest amount of new housing is capable of being accommodated ahead of additional capacity being provided. The County Council therefore request the delivery of the new school is linked not only to occupations but also a specific date, whichever is the earlier. The County Council is</p>	<p>accommodated ahead of additional educational capacity being provided. Delivery of the school should be linked to occupations and a specific date, whichever is the earlier.</p> <p>4. Masterplan should refer to the need to establish an Infrastructure Delivery Group to bring forward essential infrastructure including design, planning and implementation.</p> <p>5. A summary of KCC's likely requirements is provided, to inform the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There has been a significant reduction in the cost of KCC requirements since 2009 due to more cost effective models of service delivery.</p> <p>6. The addendum should refer to the undertaking by SBC that KCC would have first call on developer contributions to recover the construction costs of completing the Rushenden Relief Road. KCC will prioritise contributions received towards the delivery the new primary</p>	<p>reduction in dwelling numbers and the removal of the marina. The proposed growth strategy for Sheerness Port is part of longer term aspirations by Peel Ports and is not part of the emerging Swale Borough Local Plan Part 1: December 2014.</p> <p>9. Noted. The importance of cycle routes was highlighted in the adopted Masterplan, stating that "connectivity via footpaths and cycle routes are a key component to the Masterplan." This would be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>keen to work in partnership to assist the delivery of the school and is keen to receive clarification from the HCA about when a site will be available. The Masterplan should refer to the need to establish an Infrastructure Delivery Group in order to bring forward essential infrastructure including design, planning and implementation. The group should help to refine requirements taking into account existing and planned provision and identify appropriate funding (especially developer contributions) and delivery mechanisms. KCC will be keen to play its role in planning for the delivery of key infrastructure but will need confidence in how that infrastructure will be funded in order to include the delivery of any specific projects within its capital programme. A summary of KCC's likely requirements is attached. It should be noted that these are draft figures subject to confirmation and formal agreement by appropriate cabinet members and the S151 Officer but they will hopefully help to inform the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If the quantum of development changes, KCC will need to reassess its requirements. There has been a significant reduction in the cost of KCC requirements since 2009 due to more cost effective models of service delivery.³</p> <p>Rushenden Relief Road</p> <p>The Masterplan addendum should refer to the undertaking by SBC that the County Council would have first call on developer contributions to recover the construction costs of completing the</p>	<p>school.</p> <p>7. Note that Masterplan no longer has a nature conservation area at the north of the site (shown as public open space). The northern section of the site adjacent to the creek is of high ecological value with Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)/ Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 s.41 habitats present. KCC would welcome further discussion on the extent to which these habitats might be retained/ protected.</p> <p>8. Doesn't appear to have been an updated Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). Updated HRA may be necessary to ensure that the potential for increased recreational activity has been adequately addressed, and consider cumulative effects and proposed mitigation strategy of the proposed growth strategy for Sheerness Port.</p>	

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>Rushenden Relief Road. This is set out in the letters dated 3 February 2014 from the Leader of SBC to Mark Dance, KCC Cabinet Member for Economic Development, and 26 March 2012 from the SBC Director of Regeneration to Mike Austerberry, former KCC Corporate Director for Growth, Environment and Transport. The County Council would aim to prioritise any contributions received towards the delivery the new primary school.</p> <p>Biodiversity KCC notes the Masterplan no longer has a nature conservation area at the north of the site – this is now shown as public open space. The northern section of the site adjacent to the creek is of high ecological value with Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)/ Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 s.41 habitats present. The County Council would welcome further discussion on the extent to which these habitats might be retained/ protected.</p> <p>There does not appear to have been an updated Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) undertaken in response to this addendum. Given the research that has recently been carried out on behalf of the North Kent Environmental Planning Group in relation to the decline of birds within the north Kent Special Protection Areas, the County Council advises that an updated HRA may be necessary to ensure that the potential for increased recreational activity as a result of the implementation of the plan has been adequately</p>	<p>9. Public Footpaths ZB48 and ZB49 will be directly affected by the proposed development. Inclusion of continuous waterside access is welcomed. An opportunity has been missed to connect the green infrastructure of the “Swale” to the sea wall. Recommend that traffic free, cycling routes are provided.</p>	

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>addressed, particularly given the stated intention to promote public access along the seafront and creek. There may also be a need to consider the cumulative effects and proposed mitigation strategy of the proposed growth strategy for Sheerness Port.</p> <p>Public Rights of Way (PROW) and Access Public Footpaths ZB48 and ZB49 are within the site and would be directly affected by the proposed development. The location of these paths is indicated on the enclosed extract of the Network Map. The Network Map is a working copy of the Definitive Map. The existence of the Right of Way is a material consideration.</p> <p><i>Public Access and Rights of Way</i></p> <p>The inclusion of continuous waterside access around the south side of the creek is an excellent improvement to the existing situation. This will create an attractive and valuable recreational amenity for new residents.</p> <p>As proposed, both Public Footpaths ZB48 and ZB49 would be obstructed by building blocks. As such, proposals for their diversion or part extinguishment must be submitted and agreed by the County Council.</p> <p>Public footpath ZB48 currently follows an alignment along the sea wall, diverting inland along an access track to connect with Rushenden Road. KCC would recommend that this path be diverted to continue around the creek to re-join Rushenden Road, as demonstrated on the enclosed plan. Due to the proximity to water, KCC</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>would request that sensitive lighting is installed along the creek side path.</p> <p>Public Footpath ZB49 is within the proposed "Phase 1" and would be obstructed by housing blocks at its western end and would appear to be lost to highway following the old railway line. KCC would therefore recommend that this path be extinguished for all that length east of "First Avenue". To mitigate for the loss of the Public Footpath, it is recommended a slight change to the green space design within "Phase 1". An opportunity has been missed to connect the green infrastructure of the "Swale" area to that of the sea wall. As this could be achieved with a relatively small design change, KCC would recommend that this be re-connected for the benefit of continuity of Green Infrastructure.</p> <p><i>Cycling access</i></p> <p>On the documents provided it is difficult to comment on the provision of cycle access being proposed. As a general statement KCC would recommend that, at a minimum, traffic free, cycling routes are provided alongside the Rushenden Road from the southern extremity of the site to Railway Terrace. Sufficient public realm space and crossing facilities must be provided at the school frontage for safe access.</p> <p>KCC recognises that this remains a challenging scheme to bring forward and would be keen to work with SBC and the HCA to address any obstacles to delivery. This may include making the</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>case to government for gap or forward funding if viability issues are demonstrated, to ensure the delivery of a high quality development alongside an appropriate package of infrastructure requirements to deliver a sustainable community.</p>		
QR/032	Mark Kennedy	Support and comment	<p>Our home is located at 65 High Street Queenborough, and backs onto South Street with attractive Southerly views across the Creek onto the Klondyke Area. My family has roots in Queenborough back to 1860, and we are passionate about Queenborough retaining its unique historical and maritime atmosphere, which could be developed into an attractive tourist destination with a little sensitivity and investment.</p> <p>We have carefully reviewed the Indicative Revised Land Use Plan: addendum to 2010 Adopted Masterplan, 2014, and are generally pleasantly surprised by the proposal, and support the scheme presented.</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apparent large public open spaces and recreation areas; • Attention given to school, medical and community facilities, well placed within the centre of the development to break-up the expanse of housing; • Retention of green space at the Saltings on the South Bank of the Creek to maintain 	<p>1. Generally support the scheme, subject to confirmation of use of waterside areas, cycle path provision, visual impact of development and confirmation as to whether the marina uses will remain – Queenborough's maritime heritage must be retained.</p>	<p>1. Noted. It is proposed that the area to the south of the creek is to be safeguarded for future Creekside leisure, commercial and open space uses. There are no plans to remove the existing marina uses from the creek. Cycle paths will be provided throughout the development. The visual impact of the development has been considered whilst drawing up the plans and will be assessed at the planning application stage.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>separation between old Queenborough and new;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of unrealistic marina scheme which would have been out of keeping with Queenborough' s traditional marine facilities; • Use of the old Mill site rather than overly dense development towards the Chalk Wharf. <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme says little about what is planned for the water side areas. Are you planning on refurbishing the Chalk Wharf to allow larger vessels (Sailing Barges) to moor? • Will the area be grass/ parkland with cycle paths? • A key issue is how the new development will be viewed from old Queenborough at the North Bank. How will the High/ Medium density housing on the South Bank be landscaped? Will housing back onto the Creek (with unsightly back fencing) or will there be an even more unsightly access road? • Will the marina area (currently leased by Geoff Fray) be retained for marine use? • Will there be waterfront facilities to attract visitors and give locals a pleasant place to walk? Is this area to be actively marketed to waterfront developers? <p>The final point is very critical for many local</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>residents and the many visitors to Queenborough. We must retain Queenborough's maritime heritage. With many hundred overseas sailing visitors coming to Queenborough every year and using the mooring facilities in the Swale, we need to ensure Queenborough has something worthwhile to visit. There is ample space to build upgraded mooring pontoons, workshops, Chandlery shops and visitor facilities with comparatively little work on the existing docks and quay without encroaching onto the development plots. We urge you to take this into account and to provide something to attract people to Queenborough to encourage investment and regenerate not only housing but leisure for the people of Sheppey and surrounds. Regeneration means. "restored to a better, higher or more worthy state", and not just houses. You have a real opportunity here to do this with minimal expense. Please view this regeneration as more than just housing; we only have one chance to do this.</p>		
QR/033	Michael Trimmer	Object	<p>Is Swale willing to look at the option of a Queenborough Creek Marina? Now the Marina has been dropped from the Masterplan. This will bring employment and much needed tourism to our island. I hope it will be considered.</p>	<p>1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and economic benefits it would confer.</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>
QR/034	Crown Commercial	Comment	<p>The guidance which previously advised that we require sight of such documentation is no longer</p>	<p>1. Consultation not required.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
	Service		extant so there is now no need to submit these to us.		
QR/035	Helen Wakeling	Object	<p>Why on earth did you drop the marina? They make a fortune just look at the success of Chatham! We have just as much maritime history here which we should be celebrating! Why do you have ZERO VISION for Sheppey? We need to improve the island and restore it to the central and important strategic hub it once was, loved by royalty for years not least Queen Elizabeth the First; not to be left to rot as a car park for more darned houses!! We get visitors from many different countries coming to Queenborough who have written to express their support for a proper marina.</p> <p>Please don't be near - sighted, Sheppey has been ignored for too long. Even the SEEDA plans which included a marina were wiped out.</p>	1. Objects to the deletion of the marina at Queenborough as it could bring social and economic benefits to Queenborough and Sheppey.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/036	James Bell	Object	<p>Queenborough should be capitalising on its unique strategic location and maritime heritage. Queenborough is the closest location to London offering the best and most direct sheltered access to the Thames Estuary and north sea for yachts. This is why it has such a long and distinguished maritime heritage.</p> <p>Various highly-paid independent strategic consultants as employed by Swale Borough Council to draft local plans, and other government agencies such as SEEDA (also employing</p>	<p>1. Objects to the deletion of the marina at Queenborough as it could bring social and economic benefits to Queenborough.</p> <p>2. Providing houses with no additional infrastructure requires no vision and will only serve to increase the problems that Swale Borough Council will face in the future due to</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>2. Both the adopted Masterplan and the Addendum propose development with the adequate infrastructure. Much of the employment has already been provided at Neatscourt and the link road from Neatscourt to Rushenden is open. The Addendum proposes a new primary school, a health facility and open spaces.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>independent consultants) have clearly recognised this over numerous years. Proposals for a marina in the Queenborough area go back to at least the 1980s. Queenborough exists because of its excellent waterside location and creek – it now needs new infrastructure to be put in place to make the most of this unique and strategic location.</p> <p>Therefore, I CANNOT understand why the proposed marina has been dropped from the regeneration plans and wish to STRONGLY object to the marina being removed from the plans, and request that it is re-instated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It's well known that yachting and sailing activity provides huge economic benefits to an area, including employment (both directly, and indirectly through associated services), tourism (marine and general), as well as being a focal point/draw for activity. The costs associated with building a marina would quickly be re-paid tenfold, bringing considerable income and trade to Swale and the council. Developing a marina is an investment that will pay back year after year. 2. Vision is about looking far into the future to improve the prospects for everyone in an area. SBC will be shooting themselves in the foot (as well as everyone else) by not including a marina as part of this regeneration plan. 	<p>social discord, lack of employment and lack of trade.</p>	

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>3. Providing houses with no additional infrastructure requires NO vision and will only serve to increase the problems that Swale Borough Council will face in the future due to social discord, lack of employment and lack of trade. If however, a marina is reinstated Swale Borough Council will benefit in the future from greater income, greater prosperity, happier residents, a better reputation, and a more cohesive social environment (with less problems for the council to deal with); Queenborough will go on to develop into a strong and vibrant community attracting investment.</p> <p>4. If Swale Borough Council wishes to prosper, the choice is clear: a marina needs to be reinstated in the plans.</p>		
QR/037	John Beasty	Object	I want to add my voice in support of the plans for Queenborough Marina. This is a long overdue development that would benefit the whole of the Island - not only for those who sail but also the work and tourism that such a development would bring.	1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and economic benefits it would bring.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/038	Julia McDougall	Object	I write to object to the deletion of the Marina at Queenborough as part of the Queenborough and Rushenden Regeneration. There is no justification for doing so; in fact the removal of this part of the plan is detrimental to the people of Queenborough	1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>and the Isle of Sheppey becoming a world class player in marine development. If it is allowed to become just residential such an opportunity would be lost.</p> <p>We had been promised a Marina Development one after years of consultation. What a wonderful place Queenborough could become with badly needed maritime facilities.</p> <p>Details of a more realistic and deliverable project are to be found in the alternative Creek Marina Plan by Orpin, MacDonald and Bell.</p> <p>Please reconsider this aspect of planning for the area and reinstate the Marina as described in the Queenborough Creek Marina Plan, utilising the revised plan submitted by the above consortium to develop the Marina at a realistic cost which would be more than recouped within a year of the Marina being functional</p>	economic benefits it would bring.	
QR/039	Anonymous	Object	Please include marina in plans for Queenborough regeneration. It's not just about housing.	1. Support for a marina at Queenborough.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/040	Martin Kuhn	Object	I have been sailing up and down the Medway for many years in my yacht which is based on the river at Gillingham. I am very enthusiastic about the plan to establish a marina at Queenborough. Queenborough is a wonderful location on and off the water however the facilities have been very poor. It would give the area such	1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>a boost and I am sure it would attract many visitors, boat owners and people coming just to enjoy the area. Building more houses only would be just sad. There need to be other attractions making the area vibrant and interesting and in particular jobs!</p> <p>I fully support the proposals to build a marina at Queenborough!</p>		
QR/041	Matt Brown	Object	<p>I would like to show my support for the "Queenborough Creek Marina" proposal which I feel offers far more than the presently considered scheme for the area. This plan provides a far greater useful space and would enhance the existing facilities in Queenborough.</p>	<p>1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and economic benefits it would bring.</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>
QR/042	Mike Greenland	Object	<p>Being involved with the sailing community on Sheppey for the last 33 years and still an active member of IOSSC plus ex commodore I feel the planning and regeneration of Queenborough' will just be wiped off (or is) the map or chart as some yachtie pipe dream however, what you need is a little more thought planners? you may say what thought, Peel Ports management bothered to spend a considerable sum on presenting a need for a Marina off Garrison point to the extent of having their own consultation and presentation, do they think it just a lost leader?</p> <p>So myself; I'm 66 next week and thinking of 'reducing' my dinghy racing and fancy a 32' yacht,</p>	<p>1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and economic benefits it would bring.</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>yes I can afford a 40k to spend but my main criteria is where to keep it? if on the moorings in the Swale at Queenborough' I need a tender and outboard to get on and off, where do I keep that, Join QYC no problem but that involves at least 30-40 minutes each way of getting on and off my yacht and not without dangers! Many a story there. The next alternative is Chatham Maritime half hour + drive and step straight-on your yacht, but there is a waiting list and a price of £3000 a year cost without moving one nautical mile! if I do exit that Marina where do I head off via first 'Queenborough'</p> <p>So, SBC; wipe it off the chart as some pipe dream or look at it as an investment for the Sheppey community and those yachties coming up and down the Thames estuary from the whole of Europe! get in first before Peel Ports do with their 20-25 year project, I may not be around then to see the benefit!</p> <p>Please reconsider this plan and reinstate the Marina as described in the Alternative Queenborough Creek Marina Plan.</p>		
QR/043	Stephen Ford & Sheila Mitchell	Object and comment	<p>We contacted you with regards to our concerns over the Rushenden development and our inclusion in the process, when we called you; we were told only the residents in the immediate area were consulted, so we have no idea of the proposal and the changes that have been made to the master plan!</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raise concerns about extent of public consultation. 2. What changes are being proposed with regard to housing numbers, highway network and the proposed 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All residential and business addresses within the Masterplan area received a letter notifying them of the consultation, along with a large number of statutory consultees and local amenity groups. There was also a press release and all of the

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>Although we are the owners of Highfield and Leo Bay the Campsite on Rushenden Hill, it would be nice to be kept in the loop so to speak, as we have a vested interest in the area.</p> <p>We would like to know how the plan has changed towards the number of dwellings proposed, as well as the changes if any to the road network; we also understand the school positioning has changed, so where will that now be? As a tourist business, what has been decided with regards to the creek, we understand the Marina concept has been withdrawn, but is there any chance the Creek can be taken into consideration, as Queenborough and Rushenden needs a focal point! We know this has been discussed locally but what does the Council feel about the subject?</p> <p>Personally developing the creek, with some sort of widening, offering well planned rentable moorings, will bring in people and revenue to the town, add in eating facilities at the quay side, restaurants, coffee bars and shops will lift the tourist trade, creating that special place by the sea, just a few miles from London. Now add in a nice walkway along the shore with seating areas and good parking Queenborough and Rushenden becomes a place to go and not just a dot on the map!</p> <p>After running Leo Bay Campsite for the last few short years, we have listened to the tourist we help bring to the area, just read our reviews to see what</p>	<p>school?</p> <p>3. Marina should be provided at Queenborough due to the social and economic benefits it could bring to Queenborough and Sheppey.</p>	<p>information was placed on SBC's website.</p> <p>2. The number of dwellings has been reduced from 2,000 to 1,180 due to a decrease in the density. There are no major plans for the highway network but the need for some may arise as planning applications are assessed. The location of the school has been moved from land owned by a third party to land owned by the HCA in order to ensure its delivery. It is now in a more central location within the scheme.</p> <p>3. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			sort of job we have accomplished with just an acre of land, see how many people love the place, now let's build on this with the right decisions and our little corner of England could well be the place to go!		
QR/044	Michael Judson	Object	<p>I do not support the proposal to omit the inclusion of the marina from the original 2010 Masterplan.</p> <p>The MacDonald/Bell/Orpin alternative proposal is not only more financially viable, but delivers a development which is in keeping with the spirit of the Masterplan.</p> <p>The marina is vital to the regeneration of Queenborough which as a town is of such historical importance to the island.</p> <p>Queenborough with a marina would generate income, which with time would attract more and more tourists, thereby reflecting the changing economic conditions outlined in your Addendum.</p>	1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and economic benefits it would bring to Sheppey.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/045	Joy Woolley	Object	My family of 4 all support the amended creek marina plan for Queenborough please, please do not let them just build lots of high density houses along the creek-side! Please listen to local people's views as we love our island. Thank you.	1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and economic benefits it would bring to Sheppey.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/046	Royce Watchorn	Object	Queenborough is in a unique position as the gateway to London for both British and foreign cruising boat users (i.e. waterborne tourists!), it is	1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>the natural place to pause before taking a new tide up to London. It is also very well placed for other routes used by cruising boat owners transiting the S.E. Coast and a logical place for local boat owners to cruise to for overnight and longer stays.</p> <p>A marina at Queenborough couldn't fail to be popular and therefore successful, bringing both trade and associated activities to the area. Boats and boat owners need services of all descriptions, from replenishing supplies to major purchases and works being carried out.</p> <p>For some strange reason the UK, unlike other European countries, does not seem to want to encourage boating facilities. Most European coastal countries welcome with open arms maritime activities, realizing they bring prosperity to the areas around them.</p> <p>Please do not let any opportunity to put Queenborough and Swale back on both the National and International map languish due to lack of foresight.</p> <p>A Marina at Queenborough would be good for both Queenborough and Swale.</p>	<p>marina at Queenborough in respect of the huge social and economic benefits it would bring to Sheppey.</p>	
QR/047	Peter Hawkins	Object	<p>As a river user the Marina Plan is just what the Medway/Swale needs, as it would be a long term asset to both Queenborough and the surrounding area. Many yachtsmen travelling from overseas and other east coast ports use this stop off point</p>	<p>1. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the social and</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			for London and for some it is their first experience of England and Kent! Make it a good one! Queenborough would then become a gateway to be proud of. This I feel sure will create jobs and revenue and provide a suitable environment for sailors.	economic benefits it would bring to Sheppey.	
QR/048	Peter MacDonald	Object	<p>Having seen the regeneration of Faversham since the electrification of the Railway in the late 1950's the various Councillors, Officers, & planners deserve to be congratulated. Yes there have been mistakes, but overall the Historic Town is a credit. An increasing number of visitors now enjoy its attractions, and its population has been boosted by a number of families who commute to work by rail to Medway, Gravesham, & London finding more reasonable housing costs & a better quality of life than in the Metropolis, thus yielding a local economy with a greater disposable income.</p> <p>The Historic Town of Queenborough deserves something a lot better than the current regeneration plans to which I OBJECT most strongly.</p> <p>Local people are now coming up with sensible and economic proposals and plans which could quickly get off the ground and truly regenerate the area leaving something to be proud of for future generations. The current Swale Councillors & Officers have started on the mammoth task of regenerating parts of Sheerness by encouraging & facilitating the restoration of the historic Dockyard</p>	<p>1. Object to plans. Queenborough deserves something better.</p> <p>2. Support for the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) for a marina at Queenborough in respect of the social and economic benefits it would bring to Sheppey.</p>	1+2. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>Houses & Church. These are a credit to those involved as is the restoration of the windmill just off the High Street. I call on Swale Borough Council to facilitate and give the same opportunities to Queenborough.</p> <p>I and many others believe a quality well researched maritime plan with water retained in Queenborough Creek, of necessity being of sufficient size to be economically viable, sensibly, it would utilize some of the unattractive wasteland currently being part of the Klondike Estate, this would kick start the whole regeneration of the Queenborough / Rushenden brown field site to the benefit of all. The added bonus is a direct commuter train service to London starting in January should open the area to greater employment opportunities helping the local economy.</p>		
QR/049	Peter Norris; Clarke & Carter Interyacht (Kent) Ltd	Object	<p>I am writing to register my formal disapproval of the proposed amendments to the Queenborough & Rushenden Regeneration Plan both as a local business and a resident of the Isle of Sheppey.</p> <p>It would appear that the main driver for the proposed change is to merely increase the density of the proposed housing to generate additional revenue for the financial stakeholders at the time of selling off the land to proposed developers, in particular the development of additional housing overlooking the Queenborough Creek and the re-</p>	<p>1. Object to amendments to increase housing density, but don't take into account the need to develop and attract small and medium businesses to the area. There, is no point in having additional high density houses with no local employment.</p> <p>2. Note that Peel Ports has been overwhelmed by support for a new marina at Garrison</p>	<p>1. The number of dwellings has been significantly reduced from 2,000 to 1,180 due to a decrease in the density of housing proposed.</p> <p>2. The proposed plans for Sheerness Port are part of longer term aspirations by Peel Ports and are not part of the emerging Swale Borough Local Plan Part 1: December 2014.</p> <p>3. All residential and business addresses within the Masterplan area,</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>location of the primary school.</p> <p>The amendments do not take into account the need to develop and attract small and medium businesses to the area, who can offer urgently needed apprenticeships for the community, and to attract overseas visitors to the area through visiting yachtsman/boat owners to boost the incomes of current small businesses. There, is no point in having all of these additional high density houses with no local employment.</p> <p>I believe from information provided by local residents that Peel Ports have been overwhelmed by the support for the development of a new marina at Garrison Point and the impact that everyone believes it will have on Sheerness and the River Medway in general with additional overseas and UK visitors, the development of local marine related businesses and the local skill base, and the development of further tourism attractions via the release of the old buildings in Blue Town. The River Medway and its surrounding towns have a great opportunity to develop a sailing/boating centre of excellence with its open safe waters, good climate and prevailing winds.</p> <p>Swale Borough Council I understand missed a golden opportunity a number of years ago to invest approximately £60,000 to secure a proper lock gate into the Queenborough Creek which would have made the creek even more attractive and easier to develop as a vibrant and profitable</p>	<p>Point. The River Medway and its surrounding towns have a great opportunity to develop a sailing/boating centre of excellence with its open safe waters, good climate and prevailing winds.</p> <p>3. Trust that what appears to be a clear a current lack of understanding of the asset it has within the creek will not prevent the Council consulting with local interested parties in order to work together to develop the Creek into a vibrant and attractive Marina</p>	<p>along with a large number of statutory consultees and local amenity groups were consulted on this Masterplan Addendum. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>marina. I hope that what appears to be a clear a current lack of understanding of the asset it has within the creek will not prevent the Councils Officers consulting further with local interested parties in order to work together to development the Creek into a vibrant and attractive Marina with small business/restaurants etc. for both the local and oversea boating community.</p>		
QR/050	R. Telford	Object	<p>What drives Swale to ignore local assets and heritage, and waste potential amenity and Industry; Milton Creek wasted, Faversham Creek's only hope resting on an active local resistance to a corrupted 'Neighbourhood Plan', and now Queenborough Creek to be sacrificed on the alter to more crammed housing.... ignoring the success of the Queenborough Harbour Trust.</p> <p>Such lack of vision would not be tolerated in many parts of this country, never mind on the Continent.</p> <p>Are you aware of what the leisure marine industry is worth, and its potential for growth. Estimates vary but the annual total economic contribution for the coastal Marina sector alone, in England is estimated to be around £571million., around £19,000 per marina boat per annum. Given that the majority of the marina berths are in the south, and especially the central south coast, it should be no surprise to you to know that there is a shortage of marina berths in the Thames estuary, and especially on the south Thames.</p>	<p>1. Support the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell)</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>It gets better; the total economic contribution for the leisure and small commercial marine industry [excluding exports and superyachts] in 2012 in the whole UK was £2.31billion; in England £2.15billion, the bulk of which is in the southeast and southwest.</p> <p>Waste this opportunity at your peril; future generations will curse you for throwing away this opportunity to develop industry alongside leisure.</p> <p>The state of the economy at any point is not a valid basis for developing a long term plan; vision is vision, not just the expedient response to current conditions.</p> <p>Please reconsider this plan and reinstate the Marina as described in the Queenborough Creek Marina Plan.</p>		
QR/051	Richard Blake	Object	<p>I object to the deletion of the Marina at Queenborough, there is no justification for doing so, the people of Queenborough and Sheppey have been promised one after years of consultation. What a wonderful place Queenborough could become with badly needed maritime facilities. Details of a more realistic and deliverable project are to be found in the alternative Creek Marina Plan by Orpin, MacDonald, and Bell.</p> <p>Please reconsider this plan and reinstate the Marina as described in the Queenborough Creek Marina Plan.</p>	<p>1. Supports the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) due to the social and economic benefits it would bring.</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
QR/052	Roger Taylor	Object	<p>Having sailed from Queenborough/Sheerness for many years as well as a host of other South Coast ports it has always seemed odd that Queenborough Creek has been what can only be called the worst advert for a community being such a dreadful visual mess when the tide is out, and a wasted asset when the tide covers the mud. Who in their right mind would want to be associated with Sheppey who had an alternative? The Borough Council has neglected its duty of care to the community in regard of enhancing the area to the benefit of the community at large and employment in particular. Housing development alongside an eyesore will only attract those with no other choice.</p> <p>The alternative plan proposed seems the only one with real vision of all those current within the Borough what with Faversham's creek's alternative vision now being all but dismissed in favour of a dormitory future for what is a Cinque Port.</p> <p>SBC's lack of vision is all too obvious but unsurprising in view of the unimaginative efforts which has allowed Sittingbourne to loose what could have been a quite spectacular redevelopment of the Paper Mill in favour of yet another supermarket of little real benefit to either employment or the public at large. And as to the Northern Relief Road – it beggars belief to any outsider the road should go to the motorway i.e.</p>	<p>1. Supports the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) due to the social and economic benefits it would bring.</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>the South, not Sheppey.</p> <p>So while I have little hope that the alternative for Queenborough will be given any real consideration by the Council, I would like it to be noted that I support the alternative plan outlined wholeheartedly.</p>		
QR/053	Tim Bell	Support and object	<p>The first two phases of the amended Masterplan development are good. I like the open space fronting the harbour, like at Maldon, a promenade waterside park, and a primary school, However the third phase around the creek end plans, I object to, by not utilising the creek to its full potential and local marine asset as it should, and in fact potentially impeding the present maritime use, by doing so could well be the start of a decline of the creek where it could wither and die!</p> <p>I would propose that the last phase area around the creek be given more time to be carefully considered, and the addendum for this last phase be postponed as this will not affect or delay the development of the first two phases.</p> <p>STATEMENTS ON CORE OBJECTIVES FOR THE LOCAL PLAN (Bearing Fruits)</p> <p>The Master Plan Amendments around the creek, with the loss of a marina within the development, will lose many of these core objectives:-</p> <p>Use our coastal assets to support a strong economy and a sustainable managed environment</p>	<p>1. Welcome the first two phases of the amended Masterplan - the open space fronting the harbour, a promenade waterside park, and a primary school.</p> <p>2. Object to the creek end plans, which will start the decline of the creek. This element should be more carefully considered. Loss of the marina will have an adverse impact on the core objectives set out in the Local Plan. The amended plan also will lose many of the design concepts and principles of the Masterplan. The plan will damage the potential of marine related businesses alongside the creek and affect the work of the Queenborough Harbour Trust. The land earmarked in the Masterplan for a</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>3. All residential and business addresses within the Masterplan area received a letter notifying them of the consultation, along with a large number of statutory consultees and local amenity groups. There was also a press release and all of the information was placed on SBC's website.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>Support economic success and improve community well-being with a network of maintained, protected and improved natural assets in town and country</p> <p>Conserve and enhance our historic and natural assets as the means to drive regeneration, tourism, and environmental quality and to reverse declines in their condition.</p> <p>Be flexible, provide choice and support sectors that can build on our strengths, diversify our economy, promote investment in skills, and develop our distinct opportunities in pursuit of greener and pioneering technologies.</p> <p>Bring economic growth, regeneration and community development, especially to our most deprived communities.</p> <p>Develop tourism and culture to support regeneration, employment growth, communities and environmental management.</p> <p>Improve prosperity and environmental quality with efficient and sustainable transport networks.</p> <p>The amended plan also will lose many of the design concepts and principles of the Masterplan:-</p> <p>Linking Queenborough & Rushenden, the creek isolates and divides both communities.</p> <p>Views and land marks, the higher medium density housing close to the creek side will spoil</p>	<p>marina is now being planned for residential/housing, therefore land adjacent to the creek should be used for marine use, to replace the land that will be lost for marine use by residential /housing on the dropped marina site within the development. There are enough heritage centres (without the waterside hub) including the Guildhall. The Hub will be of little use, being isolated across the creek, without direct access. A waterside hub for water activities would be impractical when a lot of the time there is no water in the creek. A bridge would limit or stop the movement of boats in the creek and would not be allowed by the creek users. A public house without direct access across the creek will be useless too, many public houses have been closed in the area and it would be in competition to the ones that remain. Loss of a marina would be a very serious setback for Queenborough</p>	

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>the view from the old town, these houses (like in any urban areas) will not create uniqueness and legibility and destroy the marine use of the creek, and its character, how will boats have security, moored alongside as at the present, it will be lost by this planned development.</p> <p>Activity and movement limited with no direct access between the two communities across the creek, loss of water space.</p> <p>Sustainable Development Houses on their own do not create businesses jobs, tourism. Green energy opportunities lost.</p> <p>Waterspace for the community, the amended plan will lose water-space for the community, facility for disabled persons, youth and Cadets.</p> <p>Creating place and distinctiveness lost, without a focal point of a marina.</p> <p>The amended plan will damage the potential of marine related businesses alongside the creek and affect the work the Queenborough Harbour Trust are doing.</p> <p>Creeks are a precious resource, and this one in Queenborough has been used for maritime use, for hundreds of years and should not be treated as an urban street ripe for housing development; they are a waterway to the sea and beyond, there are many streets and areas suitable for housing development, but very few creek and waterways that are suitable.</p>	<p>and the Island, very few areas like this are suitable for marina related activities, it seems the Council doesn't understand the assets on its doorstep - an international port for leisure and tourism? The viability and reasons given seemed to be flawed. A marina would add to the value of any new housing. Query what research was done on the marina project as a separate project (Interreg). Queenborough is a better location for a marina than Sheerness, because its more sheltered</p> <p>3. Insufficient consultation has been undertaken.</p> <p>The Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) is attached.</p>	

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>The land ear-marked in the Masterplan for a marina is now being planned for residential /housing, therefore land adjacent to the creek should be used for marine use, to replace the land that will be lost for marine use by residential /housing on the dropped marina site within the development.</p> <p>Chalk wharf</p> <p>No mention of regeneration to the top of this wharf, (lost heritage) which could attract Thames Sailing Barges and other marine use alongside facing the outer harbour!</p> <p>The Waterside hub, for a possible use of a heritage centre, there are enough heritage centres including the wonderful Guildhall on the island and the Hub would be of little use when it would be isolated across the creek, without direct access, a waterside hub for water activities would be impractical when a lot of the time there is no water in the creek. It would be a waterless hub. A bridge across would limit or stop the movement of boats in the creek and would be not be allowed by the creek users. A public house without direct access across the creek will be useless too, many public houses have been closed in the area and it would be in competition to the ones that remain.</p> <p>The loss of a marina would be a very serious setback for Queenborough and the Island, very few areas like this are suitable for marina related activities, it seems SBC don't understand the</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>assets on its doorstep, where else does SBC have an international port for leisure and tourism?</p> <p>The viability and reasons given seemed to be flawed, and judged on house values, it appears to be a chicken and egg situation, a marina would add to the value of any new housing stock, what research was done on the marina project as a separate project and supply & demand? What marine experts have been used? Has the EU Inter-regional (Interreg) initiative, investing in the future by working together for a sustainable and competitive region, been considered? (Interreg is financed through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)). Has a partnership been sort like at Brightlingsea which is run by a trust like QHT, Colchester and even Peel Ports with their marina plan are partners for their plan, for the Interreg North Sea Region?</p> <p>What alternatives have been explored? The Island is a holiday haven with the most Caravans/chalets in the South East; this amended plan does nothing to exploit the Tourist and Leisure opportunities.</p> <p>The Minster Parish Council think Queenborough is a better location for a marina than Sheerness, because Queenborough is much more sheltered, The Sea at Garrison Point can get very rough with a difficult tidal back eddy and flow being immediately on the confluence of the Medway and Thames, making it difficult to enter a potential marina. The whirlpools and tidal rip are at its most</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>dangerous here!</p> <p>Nick Ardley editor of the “Thames estuary ditch-crawler, river, creek and coastal sailor” thinks that Queenborough is a better place for a marina too, as well as QYC, IOSSC, and MSBA.</p> <p>Notification to members of the public</p> <p>Many of the island population do not know about these addendum/amendments to the Master plan, because this is so important for Sheppey, all residents should have been notified, as was done by Peel Ports with their plans and exhibitions. The Gateway Centre in Sheerness did not seem to know about this consultation period, they first thought I was talking about Peel Ports that was displayed on their desk for all to see, after much to do and some phone calls they eventually found a scrap of paper in the bottom of a drawing cabinet, even then they didn't know what they were looking for. It wasn't advertising to the public, and yet the scale of such a project as this, with 1,180 houses and a marina is equally as important as Peel Ports marina projected, and should have been publicised better. Even some businesses backing on to the creek did not know about the consultation period.</p> <p>The date for the close of the consultation should be extended and it should co inside with 'Bearing fruits' and because the HCA has not yet finished it consultation to Queenborough Town Council, and for the public's question and answer session,</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>which is due at the Guildhall Monday the 15th 7.30pm after the SBC's 5pm deadline!</p> <p>Loss of Businesses and jobs The Island does not have even one single marina, but the demand is high for marina services, and has a lot of catching up to do, to take advantage of the Multi-billion pound marine industries, the South-East growth is set to boom in this area, but SBC and the island, will miss out, as already Medway and Medway council have enjoyed much revenue, jobs businesses etc from more than 20 established marina's, based 10/15 miles further up the river.</p> <p>A lot of the design concepts and principles that have been lost as above have been retained and included in an alternate cost effective plan and report for the creek area, which is attached, which should be considered and implemented by Swale Borough Council and the Homes & community Agency.</p> <p>Statement by SBC "We intend to further encourage tourism and other businesses that are linked by and harmonised with our landscapes and communities" I hope SBC council will live up to this statement by supporting an alternative creek marina as attached</p>		
QR/054	S.E.A.L	Object	<p>We object to the deletion of the Marina at Queenborough, there is no justification for doing so, the people of Queenborough and Sheppey have been promised one after years of</p>	<p>1. Supports the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) due to the social and economic benefits it would bring.</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			consultation. What a wonderful place Queenborough could become with badly needed maritime facilities. Details of a more realistic and deliverable project are to be found in the alternative Creek Marina Plan by Orpin, MacDonald, and Bell. Please reconsider this plan and reinstate the Marina as described in the Queenborough Creek Marina Plan.		
QR/055	Eric Williams	Object	I support the alternative creek marina plan by Orpin, Macdonald and Bell marine facilities they are badly needed.	1. Supports the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) due to the social and economic benefits it would bring.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/056	Linda Brinklow	Support, comment and object	Whilst I appreciate the importance of sticking to deadlines, there are more important issues than just building houses. There is the sustainability of the community to be considered. There are communities that would benefit from a marina and once the plans have been set there may be no going back on them. I have consulted the National planning Policy Framework and I enclose a copy of the relevant part to see where we feel that the consultation process could have been more inclusive. We have done our best to remedy the situation, but in the time available meeting such a tight deadline has been impossible. Also enclosed is the research into the benefits of	1. I have consulted the National planning Policy Framework and I enclose a copy of the relevant part to see where we feel that the consultation process could have been more inclusive. We have done our best to remedy the situation, but in the time available meeting such a tight deadline has been impossible. Very few people in Queenborough knew about the consultation. Little attempt was made to consult the people for whom a marina	1. All residential and business addresses within the Masterplan area received a letter notifying them of the consultation, along with a large number of statutory consultees and local amenity groups. There was also a press release and all of the information was placed on SBC's website. Officers from both SBC and HCA have also attended two Queenborough Town Council meetings to answer questions and discuss the changes to the Masterplan. The yachting and sailing clubs were all consulted. 2. Noted. We will inform the HCA of

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>having additional services attached to a marina.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework –2 Guidance</p> <p>What local planning authority consultation takes place before a planning application is decided, and with who?</p> <p>Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 15-001-20140306</p> <p>After a local planning authority has received a planning application, it will undertake a period of consultation where views on the proposed development can be expressed. The formal consultation period will normally last for 21 days, and the local planning authority will identify and consult a number of different groups.</p> <p>The main types of local planning authority consultation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public consultation – including consultation with neighbouring residents and community groups. • Swale Borough Council did consult with the people in Rushenden. It did consult with the parish councils i.e. Queenborough and Minster. It did consult with the Queenborough Harbour Trust. • It did not consult with the people of Queenborough or the businesses bordering the creek on the northern side. The area is called Queenborough and Rushenden. Very few people in Queenborough knew about the consultation. 	<p>would have been an asset. i.e. the yacht clubs.</p> <p>2. At present HCA do not own the land around the creek. Our group would like is to be given a chance to influence the plans for that area once HCA take ownership of that land – next September. For that reason, we would like to become consultees/help with the planning in the next stage of the process.</p> <p>3. Support the Alternative Marina Creek Plan.</p> <p>4. Will the houses include energy savings and energy creation and regeneration systems in their design; making them sustainable as well as comfortable?</p> <p>5. There is much good sense in the following suggestions: “There is now much greater certainty regarding the delivery of the school, which represents a key element of new social/ community infrastructure, given its new location on land owned by the</p>	<p>your offer.</p> <p>3. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>4. Yes. The Government intends to increase energy standards and reduce carbon emissions through Building Regulations and other national standards, with the aim of achieving net zero carbon emissions for new housing by 2016, new public buildings by 2018 and for new commercial development by 2019. Reductions in carbon emissions are to be implemented through energy efficient design and delivery of on-site low carbon or renewable energy.</p> <p>5. Noted.</p> <p>6. Noted.</p> <p>7. This is an issue that would be dealt with at the planning application stage.</p> <p>8. Noted.</p> <p>9. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>10. Noted.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory consultees – where there is a requirement set out in law to consult a specific body, who are then under a duty to respond providing advice on the proposal in question. • Any consultation required by a direction – where there are further, locally specific, statutory consultation requirements as set out in a consultation direction. • Non statutory consultees where there are planning policy reasons to engage other consultees who – whilst not designated in law – are likely to have an interest in a proposed development. • The initial plans for the area, as drawn up by SEEDA, and as originally agreed by SBC, included jobs associated with a marina. The marina was scrapped in the new draft plans. • Very little attempt was made to consult the people for whom a marina would have been an asset. ie the yacht clubs. • It is appreciated that the Queenborough Harbour Trust is working hard to make provisions for this section of society. However, research shows that where additional services are provided, there is additional benefit to the larger community in the way of jobs and revenue. • It is this additional benefit that the scrapping of plans for a marina with associated jobs, has failed to address. 	<p>Homes and Communities Agency. The school also now sits in the heart of the new residential community, and on a key new pedestrian axis, linking Queenborough and Rushenden.”</p> <p>6. Agree with the delivery of a “Waterside Hub”.</p> <p>7. Will public access along the seafront and the south side of the Creek include both footpath and cycle way?</p> <p>8. Agree with a visitor centre as how well the harbour functions will depend upon what is on offer for the visitors. I have some thoughts about making the whole area south of the creek, an information/arts area, with information dispersed throughout the various facilities.</p> <p>9. For water-related uses to happen it would be better to have deep water for longer periods. The idea of a lock gate system would enable this to happen.</p>	

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>Following the initial period of consultation, it may be that further additional consultation on changes submitted by an applicant, prior to any decision being made, is considered necessary. Finally, once consultation has concluded, the local planning authority will consider the representations made by consultees, and proceed to decide the application. See here for more information on the role that consultees' views play in making a decision. Local planning authority consultation does not remove or affect the requirement for the applicant to complete and submit an ownership certificate and agricultural land declaration with an application for planning permission.</p> <p>At present HCA do not own the land around the creek. What our group would like is to be given a chance to influence the plans for that area once HCA take ownership of that land – next September. For that reason, we would like to become consultees/help with the planning in the next stage of the process.</p> <p>The alternative Marina Creek plan</p> <p>Dear Members of the Planning Board,</p> <p>I enclose a copy of the Alternative Creek Marina leaflet which is in part our answer to the consultation over the plans for the Rushenden Queenborough area. We are but a relatively small group of people and getting a reply out in time to test the opinion of the general public, has been</p>	<p>10. The inclusion of residential development on the Istil Mill and Thompsett site has significant urban design benefits. Similarly, the introduction of residential uses along the new Rushenden Link Road will improve the character of this key gateway into Queenborough and Rushenden, and improve pedestrian linkages to the new retail and employment uses at Neatscourt.</p>	

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>quite a tall order.</p> <p>I have not been able to get around to speak to or to leaflet many of the people who may be interested in the project. With such a short consultation period, I have suggested that people reply anyway, by the 30th January - the deadline for the Bearing Fruits feedback. I do hope that you will honour this delayed deadline and give it your proper consideration. It has concerned me somewhat, that the people in Queenborough did not receive the consultation documents, which seem to have only gone out to those living in Rushenden. I do know that the matter has been discussed at the Town Council Meetings.</p> <p>I include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An initial presentation that I produced after taking part in the Wish You Were Here consultation; which was organised by KCC. • My feedback presentation on the recent transcoastal conference and in particular its relevance to the port of Queenborough. (slide 13 is the most important) <p>Please note, these are not professionally produced presentations. They do however, show you that I am more than interested in what happens to the area, and will do anything possible to get the results that people need in order that the area may prosper and be a sustainable and attractive place in which to live.</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>The Vision for the Queenborough/Rushenden Regeneration</p> <p>Comments on this publication by Linda Brinklow</p> <p>STATEMENT -A 'multifaceted' regeneration, using the highest standards of design;</p> <p>Question</p> <p>Will the houses include energy savings and energy creation and regeneration systems in their design; making them sustainable as well as comfortable?</p> <p>STATEMENT an urban scheme which is respectful of the history and character of Queenborough,</p> <p>Question;</p> <p>Can you show how the urban scheme is respectful to the history and character of the area?</p> <p>Opinion;</p> <p>From my point of view,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is too little attention paid to the port facilities and maritime character of the area • And too much emphasis on the need to provide houses. • More emphasis on the maritime heritage would bring much needed jobs to the area. • In scrapping the marina, the jobs that it 		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>would have created have also been lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, were the marina/port jobs to be transferred to the Creek area, then the situation could be reversed. <p>STATEMENT the new regenerated Queenborough and Rushenden will be a very attractive place to live and work.</p> <p>Opinion;</p> <p>Not only should it be an attractive place to live in, it should also continue to function as a port which provides jobs and businesses. The architects might like to dream; People need to work and the port could again be a thriving and bustling place not unlike Whitstable.</p> <p>Key benefits of the changes to the Land Use Plan</p> <p>Opinion – There is much good sense in the following suggestions</p> <p>STATEMENT • There is now much greater certainty regarding the delivery of the school, which represents a key element of new social/ community infrastructure, given its new location on land owned by the Homes and Communities Agency. The school also now sits in the heart of the new residential community, and on a key new pedestrian axis, linking Queenborough and Rushenden;</p> <p>Comment</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>(Delighted at this)</p> <p>STATEMENT • the revisions eliminate the potentially high risk/high cost marina;</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>(I sort of agree- The location in the centre of the development did not seem right. It needed to connect the two areas of Queenborough and Rushenden)</p> <p>STATEMENT • Given the loss of the employment/leisure elements potentially associated with the marina, any development should seek to deliver a “Waterside Hub”, which would benefit from an attractive location adjacent to the Creek.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>(I absolutely agree with this but it needs careful planning and consultation)</p> <p>STATEMENT while viability/marketing testing is required,</p> <p>Comment;</p> <p>(If at all possible, I should like to be personally involved in any market testing and public consultation regarding the creek area. I am very keen to ensure that the decisions made over the future of this area reflect the needs of the local community and visitors to the area and at the same time retain the history and character of the port.)This should not be just about building</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>houses.</p> <p>STATEMENT potential uses might include a mixture of some or all of the following: - Public access must be provided both along the seafront and the south side of the Creek.</p> <p>Question</p> <p>Will access include both footpath and cycle way? The plan is not clear on this issue</p> <p>- STATEMENT Visitor Centre (potentially covering environment, local history etc.) - A waterside pub, restaurant or café –</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>(I sort of agree with these statements. How well the harbour functions will depend upon what is on offer for the visitors as well as how well it functions as a commercial port)</p> <p>I do not like the design for the visitors centre given as an example and can see problems in staffing.</p> <p>I have some thoughts about making the whole area south of the creek, an information/arts area, with information dispersed through-out the various facilities. I can elaborate further if required.</p> <p>STATEMENT Limited water-related uses (possibly as part of the visitor centre) e.g. canoeing.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>For this to happen it would be better to have deep</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>water for longer periods. The idea of a lock gate system would enable this to happen.</p> <p>- STATEMENT other active uses possibly in the form of youth provision e.g. BMX, skate park etc.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>NO to a BMX or a skate park – this is a maritime area.</p> <p>Queenborough and Rushenden already have more amenities than places such as Halfway.</p> <p>- STATEMENT employment uses e.g. managed workspace, workshops, and chandlery</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>The boat yards need to be retained.</p> <p>This place needs to become a Mecca for boat people.</p> <p>It needs to bring work to local people</p> <p>The chandlery is most important.</p> <p>(There is not another such one between Ramsgate and the Medway Ports area.</p> <p>Queenborough is an excellent location.</p> <p>STATEMENT - Attractive public realm • the inclusion of residential development on the Istil Mill and Thompsett site has significant urban design benefits. The removal of industrial uses from part of Rushenden Road helps to create a more integrated development and improve the quality of</p>		

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>the environment. Similarly, the introduction of residential uses along the new Rushenden Link Road will improve the character of this key gateway into Queenborough and Rushenden, and improve pedestrian linkages to the new retail and employment uses at Neatscourt.</p> <p>Comment</p> <p>Largely agree with all of the above.</p> <p>See also enclosed 2 presentations that I produced earlier.</p> <p>I am hoping to come to the Sheppey Gateway viewing, where I can discuss these ideas. However, I would be more than willing to chat to any one that would listen. It is so very important that planning at this stage achieves the results that are right for the area.</p>		
QR/057	Malcolm Bennett	Object	<p>The HCA consultants, Knight Frank and Allies Morrison appear to have almost zero competency in marine studies, marine awareness, Marina ethos and considerations and are NOT suitable to advise on the marine issues within the Master Plan.</p> <p>The HCA has seemingly discarded the marina and marine issues without competent advice.</p> <p>My own personal Due Diligence has revealed this.</p> <p>Please ensure that Swale Council obtains proper and competent input from Consultants who know</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The HCA has seemingly discarded the marina and marine issues without competent advice. 2. The historic significance of the Creek and South Creekside at Queenborough and the retention of the existing green space and the trees, has been poorly considered bearing in mind that it is within an undeveloped 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed. 2. The impact on the Conservation Area was considered during the Masterplanning stage and would again be looked at during the planning application stage. 3. All residential and business addresses within the Masterplan area received a letter notifying them of the consultation, along with a large number of statutory consultees and local amenity groups. There was also

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>what they are talking about in this regard.</p> <p>Queenborough deserves better than the cursory disregard that the HCA has given in all matters marine.</p> <p>No regard has been given to the existing leisure and tourism Visitor Centre that exists at The Guild Hall Queenborough.</p> <p>Is there a need to spend / waste money on providing another such facility rather than making better use of, and better funding, the existing facility?</p> <p>2. The historic significance of the Creek and South Creekside at Queenborough has been poorly considered bearing in mind that it is within an undeveloped Conservation Area. No regard has seemingly been made to consider retention of the existing rare green space and the trees within the specific Conservation Area.</p> <p>It would appear that the profit driven ethos by the HCA, as evidenced by the amended master plan, will ensure that the rare green space and trees are ripped out and annihilated rather than enhanced in totality.</p> <p>I understand there are rules that planners are required to follow that oblige any sight view from an existing Conservation Area, (that is in fact all the properties on the north side of the Creek) , to be fully and actively considered in active</p>	<p>Conservation Area.</p> <p>3. Consultation has been inadequate.</p>	<p>a press release and all of the information was placed on SBC's website. Officers from both SBC and HCA have also attended two Queenborough Town Council meetings to answer questions and discuss the changes to the Masterplan.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>consultation with those individual landowners / interested parties specifically.</p> <p>3. It is a fact that those landowners, the individual residents and others, have NOT been individually and specifically consulted.</p> <p>Swale Council, by this consultation process, has not given due regard to a full and satisfactory process to ensure that ALL necessary consultees are actually consulted.</p> <p>In order that a fuller and more robust consultation with appropriate experts can be determined, especially in the case regarding a marina and greater marine ethos, marine job creation and Leisure Tourism with a marine ethos..... would it be possible to defer the Conservation Area considerations alone?</p> <p>This could enable the bulk of the HCA suggestions within the non-contentious Conservation Area, specifically the remainder of the Housing, and School, Community and Health service provision, to continue unfettered and in a timely fashion.</p>		
QR/058	Natural England	Comment	<p>We have commented on previous versions of this document and many of the issues raised are still relevant, albeit that the Masterplan provides a framework in which these matters can be resolved and that we will be consulted where appropriate on the individual phases and development proposals.</p>	<p>1. Recognise the reduction in potential environmental risk arising from the removal of the marina from the Masterplan, and the use of that part of the site for residential.</p> <p>2. Assume that reduction in</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Yes, the new dwelling numbers include the old ISTIL Mill and Thomsett Way sites, along with the land previously allocated for the marina. It is a reduction in density that has</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>Natural England recognises the reduction in potential environmental risk arising from the removal of the marina from the Masterplan, and the use of that part of the site for residential.</p> <p>Your letter indicates that the changes result in a reduction in dwelling numbers. I assume that this includes the new residential proposals north of Thomsett Way and on the site previously allocated for the marina; and that the reduction in numbers is achieved through reductions in density.</p> <p>I trust that consideration has been given to the potential of the development (now envisaged) to generate sufficient funds to generate the measures necessary to address potential impact on the Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar and the Swale SPA/Ramsar inter alia.</p> <p>The Campbell Reith HRA, October 2009 is now dated. Although the spatial implications of some of their 24 recommendations may have been reflected in the Rummey Design Masterplan (Circa 2016), that document barely mentions the natural environment and the designated habitats. The associated issues may be covered elsewhere, however, in order to ensure delivery of mitigation through a series of phases, greater clarity about the nature and scale of spatial and management measures is important; and the way in which development will deliver some components and fund others should be set out. In addition, since</p>	<p>dwelling numbers includes the new residential proposals north of Thomsett Way and on the site previously allocated for the marina; and that the reduction in numbers is achieved through reduction in density.</p> <p>3. Development will need to generate sufficient funds to address potential impact on the Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar and the Swale SPA/Ramsar.</p> <p>4. The October 2009 HRA is now dated. Although the spatial implications of some of their 24 recommendations may have been reflected in the Rummey Design Masterplan (Circa 2016), that document barely mentions the natural environment and the designated habitats. In order to ensure delivery of mitigation through a series of phases, greater clarity about the nature and scale of spatial and management measures is important; and the way in which development will deliver</p>	<p>allowed this.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Noted. The Queenborough and Rushenden Steering Group are aware of the need for delivery of mitigation and that funding will be required. This would be looked at during the planning application process. The work of the North Kent Environmental Planning Group has been highlighted to the HCA who are aware that developers will need to be made aware of it also.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>2009, a great deal of valuable work has been undertaken by the North Kent Environmental Planning Group which should inform the proposals and mitigation to be delivered through the phases at Queenborough & Rushenden.</p> <p>Due to the current pressure of consultations on land-use plans, I have not been able to spend the time I would have wished to fully review and comment on your Masterplan and associated documents. Nevertheless, I hope you find these comments helpful.</p> <p>If there are issues I have not covered, please let me know and I will respond as quickly as possible. If discussion would be helpful, please give me a call.</p>	<p>some components and fund others should be set out. In addition, since 2009, a great deal of valuable work has been undertaken by the North Kent Environmental Planning Group which should inform the proposals and mitigation to be delivered through the phases at Queenborough & Rushenden.</p>	
QR/059	English Heritage	No comment	No comments to make.	1. No comments to make.	1. Noted.
QR/060	Estelle Stanton	Object	<p>I would like to object to the removal of the Marina at Queenborough from recent planning for the area, there does not appear to be any justification for doing removing this most valuable asset. I believe that a marina at Queenborough would be a huge benefit not only to the people of the area and tourism, but also for the boating community that visit the Isle of Sheppey both Summer and Winter.</p> <p>A Marina would bring a big increase in tourism to the area, the added shops and restaurants would bring much needed employment to this</p>	<p>1. Object to the removal of the Marina at Queenborough. A marina would be a huge benefit to the people of the area and tourism, and also for the boating community. It would bring a big increase in tourism to the area and bring much needed employment; it would put Queenborough 'on the map' and give a welcoming facility to the</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p> <p>2. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>beleaguered island, it would put Queenborough 'on the map' and give a welcoming facility to the boating community. In short, it would be a huge boost to this area. The people of Queenborough and Sheppey have been promised a marina at Queenborough after years of consultation, so why the removal ?? I have visited the Marina at Eastbourne which has revitalised the previously shabby and rundown area, it has brought 'gentrification', jobs and prosperity to Eastbourne once again and Queenborough is in dire need of such a transformation. I ask you to reconsider. There are details of a more realistic and deliverable project are to be found in the alternative Creek Marina Plan by Orpin, MacDonald, and Bell.</p> <p>Please reconsider this plan and reinstate the Marina as described in the Queenborough Creek Marina Plan.</p>	<p>boating community.</p> <p>2. A realistic and deliverable project is to be found in the Alternative Creek Marina Plan by Orpin, MacDonald and Bell.</p>	
QR/061	R.J Collins	Comment and object	Hand written letter with poems which indicate that the respondent is disappointed with the revised plan and that there is a need for council houses in the area.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disappointed in revised plan. 2. Need for council houses. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. 25% of the proposed dwellings will be provided as 'affordable housing.'
QR/062	William Haylock & Margaret Keay	Support and comment	As a long term Queenborough resident (born in Queenborough) I am 100 percent behind this project we have a delightful area by the creek and the harbour and hopefully improving this area to its full potential would benefit all, though hopefully it will not be spoiling the character of the area. One	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the initiative at Queenborough and Rushenden. 2. There are existing parking problems in Queenborough High Street – would like 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. This would be dealt with at the planning application stage.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>concern I have is that as a resident of Queenborough high street, the parking in the last year has become a nightmare and it is a miracle if you can get parked outside your property, which as we are part of the elderly community can be difficult when heavy shopping etc is involved. This combined with the popularity of the Dutchman are an on-going problem as although there is a car park opposite most people choose to use the high street. It hasn't been said that if the area is improved and hopefully bringing more people into this area that adequate parking would be assured?</p>	<p>assurance that adequate parking will be provided for the new development.</p>	
QR/063	Andrew Crawford	Object	<p>I support the proposals in the attached document except I believe the scheme has to be more comprehensive. The conceptual design as shown would not give a practical modern marina and the costs are insufficient for the level of facilities expected by boat owners. However I also believe the income is understated.</p> <p>I would not expect Swale BC to fund all or any of this development and am at the moment approaching possible inward investors. Therefore if an award investor is found that investor will be making a multi-million contribution to Swale and the Isle of Sheppey. What is required from Swale BC is the enthusiasm and vision to back this scheme and be prepared to fast track planning consents and assist with any land ownership issues.</p> <p>This project would significantly increase local</p>	<p>1. Supports, and attaches, the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) due to the social and economic benefits it would bring.</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>wealth, facilities and opportunities and would encourage further inward investment. It is a one-time opportunity which really should not be missed. I was a previous Leader of a District Council where we were presented with a scheme for a marina/property development similar to this. Sadly there was a small number of very vociferous opponents and prevarication within the Council at the crucial point with the potential investors they pulled out. The District was poorer for not grasping the chance when it was available. I would not wish to see that scenario happen here especially as the majority of residents and businesses appear to be in favour of the scheme.</p> <p>I have previously written to Mr P. Raine on this matter and I have added the photo montage views of how the finished project could be, which I previously submitted.</p>		
QR/064	Barry Day	Object	<p>I fully support the proposal for Queenborough Creek Marina, because the area is ripe for regeneration. It would provide much needed employment which would certainly help to eliminate the benefit culture that is widespread on the island at present. Also, it would encourage tourists, especially those interested in marine pastimes, who would hesitate to come here now due to the many sites of dilapidation.</p> <p>I look forward to seeing this improvement completed and many others of the same ilk in the</p>	<p>1. Supports the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) due to the social and economic benefits it would bring.</p>	<p>1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.</p>

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			future.		
QR/65	Mrs Shaw	Object	I'd like to see new people come to the island to show what a pleasant place it can be. A marina would give the place a lift; bring new life, with busy sporty people. We don't want endless housing built for people from run down areas who won't find work or facilities, where the infrastructure is inadequate.	1. Supports the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) due to the social and economic benefits it would bring.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/66	R. Young	Object	Excellent, viable scheme. Will tidy up the area considerably and attract smaller day boats to spend in Queenborough. The Sheerness harbour scheme, if it ever gets built, will be too expensive for most sailors to use. A good opportunity for small businesses i.e. chandlery, repair, etc.	1. Supports the Alternative Creek Marina Plan (Orpin, MacDonald & Bell) due to the social and economic benefits it would bring.	1. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.
QR/67	Queenborough Harbour Trust	Comment and Object	Queenborough Harbour Trust would like to take this opportunity to respond to the proposed changes to the Indicative Revised Use Plan – Addendum to the 2010 Adopted Masterplan with reference to Queenborough and Queenborough Creek in particular. Our primary concern is that the opportunities and advantages that Queenborough Creek offers Queenborough and the Isle of Sheppey as a whole would not be fully exploited by the revised plans. There appears to be no evidence that a viability study has been carried out that would maximise the perpetual use of this unique asset. Evidence should be shown that the following issues have been thoroughly investigated: 1. The arrangements for public access to the water on the south side of Queenborough Creek.	1. Concerned that the opportunities that Queenborough Creek offers Queenborough and the Isle of Sheppey would not be fully exploited by the revised plans. No viability study has been carried out that would maximise the perpetual use of this unique asset. 2. Evidence should show that the following issues have been investigated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The arrangements for public access to the water on the south side of Queenborough Creek. 	1, 2 and 3. See response to respondent QR/001. Change Proposed.

Ref No.	Name/organisation	Support/ Object/ Comment	Full representation	Summary of representation	Borough Council's response
			<p>2. The provision of viable maritime facilities and employment opportunities.</p> <p>3. That the plans contribute significantly to the town's and the broader Island's leisure and tourism offer.</p> <p>Until these fundamental issues are fully addressed the proposed plans can only be considered as incomplete. We would, therefore, look for a fully resourced viability plan for Queenborough Creek to be commissioned which would include within its terms of reference the issues highlighted above and the results from this plan made public.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of viable maritime facilities and employment opportunities. • That the plans contribute significantly to the town's and the broader Island's leisure and tourism offer. <p>3. Until these are addressed the proposed plans can only be considered as incomplete. Would like a fully resourced viability plan for Queenborough Creek which would include the issues highlighted above and the results from this plan made public.</p>	