

**TOWN CLERK'S REPORT TO A MEETING OF FAVERSHAM TOWN COUNCIL
held on 12 November 2018**

1. FAVERSHAM CREEK SWING BRIDGE

Cllr Kay propose and Cllr Cosgrove seconds the motion "The Faversham Town Council wishes to express its appreciation of the ongoing work of the KCC Members, including the leader Mr Paul Carter, and KCC Officers in their attempts to secure an opening bridge for the Faversham Creek that will provide significant regeneration for the Town of Faversham and preserve the Town's maritime heritage. It supports the Leader of Kent County Council in his efforts to press Peel Ports, the statutory navigation authority, to undertake its obligations for the renewal of the swing bridge. The Town Council confirms its support for KCC's efforts by confirming its commitment to cover £175,000 of the cost, which is a very significant commitment in view of the financial resources, available to the Council. It is confirmed that this decision and the appreciation of his and KCC Officers efforts on this project, should formally conveyed to Mr Paul Carter."

2. FRONT BRENTS JETTY

Members are asked consider the attached report from MDL Marine Consultancy and whether to accept the next stage of Design and Specification Works. Stage 2 would develop the design concept in consultation with stakeholders and sufficiently progress a design to reach licence application phase. Members' attention is drawn to MDL's quotation, previously considered in private session on 13 August 2018, which remains confidential due to commercial sensitivity.

3. SECOND QUARTER BUDGET AGAINST EXPENDITURE

Members are asked to note the Budget Report 1st March to 30th September (tabled).

4. DODDINGTON LIBRARY

Members are asked to respond to Mr Richard Oldfield's letter sent on behalf of the Faversham Society.

5. COMMUNITY LAND TRUST

Members are asked to agree to the virement of £2,000 from the "Neighbourhood Plan Earmarked Reserves" to be used for initial setting up costs for a Community Land Trust. Costs to cover legal fees, website and community engagement.

6. REPORT ON NAMING MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Members are asked to consider the attached report.

Louise Bareham PSLCC
5 November 2018



FRONT BRENTS JETTY

Faversham Creek

ABSTRACT

A preliminary report detailing inspection of Front Brents Jetty, including summary of repair/replacement options.

Alex Beere

2018, MDL Marina Consultancy



FRONT BRENTS JETTY – FAVERSHAM CREEK INSPECTION AND DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS

Introduction

Following Faversham Town Council's instruction to proceed with an initial inspection of the existing closed off jetty and prepare a preliminary report on repair / replacement options, a site meeting was held on 29th August 2018 when the structure was inspected.

Prior to the meeting, the previous condition survey prepared by Toby Lester (Marine Surveyor) in January 2018, was reviewed and referenced during the site inspection. The condition of the structure was found to be as stated in the previous survey with the key issue being the section of the jetty (upstream) that is listing towards the creek. This is thought to be most probably due to partial collapse of the main supporting vertical timbers and / or cross bracing in this area, potentially with the more significant damage occurring below the level of the silt.

Other issues include the condition of the decking (both surface condition due to slime and residual strength of some of the boards), some of the vertical timbers are rotten and the electrical services are in poor condition. There is also an accumulation of materials and possessions causing obstructions on the walkway. These issues are all reported in detail in the Toby Lester report.

At the meeting it was agreed that 3 options would be considered with the main objective of bringing the Front Brents moorings back into service. The three options were:

- A repair / refurbishment of the existing structure
- Replace with a new fixed jetty
- Replace with a floating pontoon

These options are discussed in more detail below, referencing licencing requirements, buildability and potential cost. It is understood that the floating pontoon is the preferred option by Faversham Town Council, subject to viability and permissions.

Scope and Limitations of This Report

A detailed proposal was submitted by MDL Marina Consultancy offering a menu of options, breaking the replacement project into a number of stages. The first stage was to inspect the structure and give a preliminary view on potential options based on MDL's experience rather than detailed analysis. Hence cost estimates are only indicative at this stage and show the relative order of magnitude cost of one option compared to another.

This report covers only the first stage, as per Faversham Town Council's instruction given on 14th August. The viability of identified options would be subject to more detailed inspection, design and costing, as well as consultation with statutory stakeholders who could influence a decision on licencing and consents.

Subsequent stages of work would include; design and specification, securing marine licences, inviting tenders and project management of the work. Inputs to these stages of work are not covered by this report.

Description of Structure

The jetty is in a tidal creek which is navigable for around 1-2 hours either side of high water, depending on vessel draft and tidal range.

The creek bed is soft silt which is believed to extend to a depth of up to 1m. A gravel layer can be seen in the centre of the channel where the continuous flow of water has cut a channel through the soft silt down to the gravel layer. No geotechnical information could be found at the precise location, but nearby boreholes indicate that the underlying geology is likely to be clays and sand and the latter is possibly part of the Thanet Beds formation.

The jetty structure comprises a mix of greenheart and softer timbers (piles) driven vertically into the creek bed, supporting a deck arranged on beams fixed to the vertical timbers. The depth of the timbers is unknown.

There is a timber handrail along the back edge of the jetty. The timber piles on the front face of the jetty extend above the deck to provide mooring points for vessels and offer a vertical fender for moored vessels to lay against.



Photo 1: Jetty structure



The greenheart piles are thought to be original fender piles where vessels would have dried out in the mud and laid against the piles before the jetty was constructed. It is likely that the softer and smaller section timbers were added later to create the jetty. The greenheart piles seemed to still be in fair condition and quite stable, whereas some of the softer timbers have rotted, as noted in the Toby Lester survey report.



Photo 2: Failure of jetty structure

There appears to have been a failure at the upstream end of the jetty where there is a noticeable bow outward towards the creek and a significant gradient across the deck. It was not possible to access the timbers below the deck to see in detail why the structure has moved in this way. However, it is likely that either the cross bracing has failed allowing the jetty to lean out of vertical, or the outer vertical timbers have rotted and sunk causing the structure to bow outwards.

The vertical timbers and cross bracing are in variable condition as noted in the Toby Lester report.

The deck comprises transverse deck boards spanning between two outer timber beams which are fixed to the vertical timbers. Additionally, there is a smaller section central timber spine. The side beams and timber spine looked to be intact although could not be accessed to determine whether they remain in sound condition and without significant rot, although they appeared sound from the surface.

The deck boards are in various states, some having been replaced and some overlaid with a non-slip surface which hides the condition of the timber board below. Some are in poor structural condition and all generally very slippery due to a build-up of organic growth on the surface.



Photo 3: Deck board surface and organic growth

The timbers that form the handrailing appeared to be generally in reasonable condition.

There are water and electric services present on the jetty, although the water installation is unlikely to comply with regulations and the electrical services were generally in poor condition with some modules stripped out. It is assumed that power is isolated to the services at present.

Access ladders seemed in good condition and emergency equipment consisted of several life rings and throwing lines secured to the timber handrail.

Repair Option

This option would aim to retain as much of the existing structure as possible and repair or replace the remainder of the structure as necessary. Repair works would require stripping of the damaged and end-of-life components, inspection of the piles, spines, and deck beams, and replacement in situ.

The condition of the deck and spines are obscured in many places by additional non-slip material, but are poor where visible, therefore it is likely that a full replacement of the decking (including spines) will be necessary. Similarly, an allowance should be made to replace the water / electric services, as the existing services hardware is generally in poor condition and is unlikely to meet current regulations. It is also recommended that the existing emergency equipment is replaced (i.e. the life rings) and provision is made for the installation of fire extinguishers on the jetty. The handrailing along the jetty is considered to be in fair condition; it is assumed that this could be removed and reused.

Whilst the greenheart piles are generally in good condition and can be reused, for the purposes of this report and cost estimate, it is assumed that at least 50% of the remaining



pine piles will need to be replaced. This would need to be verified during a more detailed inspection following stripping of the structure. Of those that require replacement, the upstream end is considered a priority where several existing piles are no longer providing structural support. Of those which do not need immediate replacement, bolts and fixings will need to be checked to ensure that the structure is properly secured and these replaced as necessary.

The retained structure will require pressure washing to remove established organic growth. Additionally, the structure would benefit from timber treatment undertaken in dry conditions.

This work is considered sufficient to give at least 5 years residual life to the structure with ongoing maintenance and therefore may be considered uneconomical due to limited residual life.

The consents and licences needed for repairing the structure should not be contentious and whilst it will be necessary to go through the licencing process to secure a Marine Licence from the Marine Management Organisation and Harbour Works Consent from the Port / Harbour Authority, it is thought that these would be relatively straight forward to obtain and would take around 4-6 months. Other consents are unlikely to be necessary although this would need to be checked during initial consultation.

A very high level cost estimate has been made based on the above assumptions and overall costs are likely to be in the region of £190,000 for this option.

Like-for-Like Replacement Option

This would consist of a complete replacement, like-for-like or with a similar fixed structure. Consideration should be made regarding construction options and expected life of the new structure.

A like-for-like replacement would replace the structure “as is”, although with a new structure and hardwood piles the life expectancy would be significantly increased over a repair. An alternative option would be replacing the wooden structure with steel, consisting of a standard configuration pontoon deck mounted on pairs of cross-braced steel piles. This would create a very robust structure, with an even greater life expectancy with regular maintenance. This option would also include fully replacing the services and emergency equipment.

A design life in excess of 25 years should be possible with this option, although decking and services are likely to need to be replaced during the life of the structure.

A complete replacement of the structure also allows for increasing the overall length of the jetty. The additional cost will be proportional to the length, although this will only be viable if there is demand for additional berths of this type at this location.

The licencing requirement would be similar to the repair option and whilst there might be more objection requiring further work to overcome objections, overall it is thought that the licences would be achievable. Extending the jetty would make the licencing process more challenging as more of the intertidal mud bank (an important habitat) would need to be cut



away to make way for the additional berths. Additional resources should be allocated to allow for the extra work likely to be needed to obtain the licences and consents.

The likely cost for this option has been estimated to be in the region of £230,000.

Floating Pontoon Replacement Option

A floating pontoon could be considered as an alternative solution to the existing structure. This would provide much improved access to floating vessels (around high water) and would future-proof mooring within the creek against changing water levels/flooding. This would enhance the mooring product and could possibly lead to a tariff increase as these moorings would become more desirable. However, a number of considerations require exploring due to the significant change in the nature of the structure.

Firstly, the pontoon would need to be securely moored, either by way of hinged arms or vertical piles. There is potential for the pontoon to incorporate the existing greenheart piles, however, they do not extend high enough to secure the pontoons during flood events and would either need to be extended or over-sleeved but this may lead to a saving in the piling / mooring cost.

A new access gangway would be required, in the form of a hinged bridge. This would need a small bridgehead platform on the bank to allow the bridge to roll on, as the pontoon height varies with the tide. The existing access gate could be repositioned either further up the gangway or on the pontoon.

Second hand pontoons could be considered to help save cost and the use of a local contractor with locally based plant (if available) might also reduce costs.

As with the other options, water and electrical services and safety equipment would need to be replaced. This option also allows for an increase in the overall length but, as above, viability would depend on demand.

It is thought that licencing would be more challenging than for the other two options, more so with an extension (for the same reasons as noted above) and may require additional local authority planning consent and consent from the Environment Agency. These requirements would need to be checked through further consultation with stakeholders. It is thought licencing would be achievable for the like for like length and potentially achievable for the extended option. Some consultation would be required to better understand opinions on the proposal and likely objections, particularly from an environmental standpoint.

The cost for this option would probably be in the region of £210,000 if all new equipment is used, although it may be possible to source some second hand pontoons and other components and use local contractors and plant to help save some cost.

The life expectancy of this option would be up to 25 years depending on the specification of materials used and whether or not second hand equipment is used.



Conclusion

Having evaluated each option, there are four key considerations to note:

- The repair option may be viable but will not improve the product and is unlikely to extend the life of the jetty for more than five years without ongoing repair works.
- The like-for-like replacement option would provide a robust structure with greater longevity than the existing jetty or a floating pontoon. However, being a fixed structure, it would be vulnerable to future changes in water level or flood events.
- Replacing with a floating pontoon will likely be a more cost-effective option than replacing with a fixed jetty, particularly if there is an opportunity to use second hand pontoons.
- There will likely be additional environmental consultation required for the like-for-like replacement and floating pontoon options. Opting to increase the overall length of the jetty will also add additional challenges to securing licences and consents.

Following this report, and the condition survey by Toby Lester, the next step would be to review the options and decide on the preferred approach. Once the preferred approach has been confirmed further consultation can begin to determine the likelihood of obtaining consent and to better understand any objections from statutory stakeholders which can then be addressed in the design and licence application process.

Cost estimates can also be firmed up at the next stage with input from contractors and pontoon suppliers who might be able to suggest ideas to save cost and then a detailed design and specification can be assembled in sufficient detail to be able to procure the works.

Alex Beere
Head of Consultancy and Technical Services
On behalf of MDL Marina Consultancy
November 2018

Dear Louise Bareham

Doddington Library

I have been asked to write on behalf of the Faversham Society to make clear our position on the relocation of the Doddington Library to the Reading Room at 12 Market Place.

As you will see from the attached agreement with the Doddington PCC they wished the collection to remain in the town and that the Library should be kept together as a collection. Our Secretary Jan West has consulted with the Doddington Steering Group and they have confirmed that they want to see the collection housed in Faversham and support the move to a better reading room in 12 Market Place. The Rev Richard Birch, vicar of Doddington, commented :

“The new facility in 12 Market Place seems ideal for the Doddington Library. The Cathedral Library was only ever seen as a last resort if safe and appropriate storage in Faversham was not possible. The collection can be held together and used more widely in these new premises, just as the original intention. We can still ask the cathedral to hold the catalogue for scholars wishing to investigate the library.”

And one of the Church Wardens:

“It is my view in my capacity as Church Warden that the collection should remain in Faversham. In view of the new facility in 12 Market Place and the opportunity for a much larger percentage of people in the area to be able to see it there it seems a good solution.

As long as the rarer books are kept safely and secure and the conditions in which the collection as a whole is stored and monitored I feel we should encourage the move.

As someone who was present at meetings when Mr Nightingale fought tooth and nail to keep the collection in Faversham (with the agreement of the incumbent at the time and the PCC) I feel we should continue to honour our side of the decision.

Faversham is acknowledged for its historical importance and the library can only enhance this further.”

There is only one other extant Parish Library in Kent and a significant part of its history and heritage value lies in keeping the collection together. The collection has been catalogued by the Society's Librarian Paul Moor bath and that work should continue.

Paul reports that the collection comprises 360 or so books pre 1800 and that they should be kept together. There are 65 items in the Doddington library which are not in the British Library. Particularly rare items include

- Geneva Bible of 1588 with Robert Cecil, Lord Burghley's coat of arms
- 4 early editions of John Calvin including a first edition of a commentary on books of Moses
- Sermons by John Donne 1640
- Erasmus first edition 1535

- Influential churchmen such as William Laud

Michael Nightingale financed the arrangements for 15 years with a charitable donation, and when the 15 years was up renewed the arrangement (possibly with another donation). He was very concerned that the collection should not be dispersed, as he thought it would be in Canterbury. He is now dead; his son John, an Oxford don, has also been consulted:

“This sounds like an excellent solution. If I were you I would want to be clear about arrangements for curating and security - even non valuable leather bound books have a tendency to disappear into pockets and cases if there is no close supervision). And it is very important that any plan includes provision for the original wooden travelling boxes which originally housed the books and which (from memory) were incorporated into the shelving in the Fleur de Lis centre. These are of considerable interest and an integral part of the library so it is important that they are retained and incorporated into any new set up. The Cromarty Trust could give a small grant to help with the costs of this if that would be helpful.”

John also wrote of his father’s view

“He was concerned that as with other parish libraries this separate identity would be lost if the collection was subsumed into the Canterbury Cathedral Library. Academic experts would of course still be able to study it as a collection in Canterbury thanks to handlists and shelfmarks but for most the singularity and local nature of the collection would no longer be visible and he felt this would be a sad loss - he didn't think the world should be organised for the sole convenience of academics (like me) and librarians.

Doddington is particularly noteworthy in so far as some of the original portable boxed shelves survived. These are a rare survival and an integral part of the collection - any relocation must ensure that the books and the cases remain together.”

Karen Brayshaw, the University of Kent Special Collections & Archives Manager, wrote recently:

“I am familiar with the Doddington Library from my time as Cathedral librarian. I visited the collection a few times and Justin Croft came to visit me whilst he was Honorary Librarian to talk about storing and cataloguing the collection. I’m delighted that it is going to be moved from the attic of the Fleur de Lys – I had grave concerns about the books being kept there and the difficulty in gaining access to them.

Subject to security being adequate I would support the collections moving to the new reading room and staying in Faversham. There is much duplication with the collections at Canterbury Cathedral so it will be better used where it is.”

Use

Attached is a letter from Ben Marsh, Director of Public Engagement for the Faculty of Humanities, expressing the interest of his Faculty in research in Faversham, the No 12 Reading Room is important to realising that opportunity. There is similar interest from academics at Christ Church and Greenwich and our Chair Emeritus Professor Harold Goodwin is currently in discussion with all three universities.

The No 12 Reading Room provides excellent facilities for Masters and PhD students wishing to work on Faversham archives from whichever of our collections.

Security

We would suggest the library collection is valued, perhaps by Justin Croft, and insured. The room should be kept locked and bona fide researchers can be shown in to the room leaving their bags in the office. There are perhaps 12 volumes of particular value which should be more properly kept in the adjacent "strong room".

Yours sincerely

Richard Oldfield

President, Faversham Society

March 1982

To the Secretary of the Faversham Society

Dear Sir,

We are writing to confirm the arrangements made between the Parochial Church Council of Doddington ("the Council") and the Faversham Society ("the Society") for the future housing of the Doddington Parochial Library left to the Parish by the Reverend Daniel Somerscales, Vicar of Doddington who died 1737, and augmented by his successors ("the Library") at the Heritage Centre in Faversham:-

1. The Heritage Centre has been selected by us^{as} a fitting home for the Library
 - (a) because Faversham and Doddington are both situated within the Deanery of Ospringe
 - (b) because Faversham is close to Doddington and is the town in which the people of Doddington do their business
 - (c) because the Heritage Centre is a repository for the history of Faversham and surrounding villages.
2. We understand that application has been made to the Pilgrim Trust, the Cromarty Trust and to the Kent Archaeological Society for financial assistance towards the conversion of attic space in the Heritage Centre into a suitable book room to house the Library and in view of the considerable expenditure involved the arrangement will be for an initial period of 10 years and thereafter continue subject to termination by one year's written notice given by either the Council or the Society.
3. The Library will be kept insured in the joint names of the Council and the Society at the expense of the Council throughout the period of this arrangement against fire, damage by water and theft, initially in the sum of £4,000 and subsequently in such other sum to be agreed from time to time between the Council and the Society. In the event of a loss the Society will not be responsible for any sum beyond that covered by insurance.
4. The books in the Library will be available to be read in the Heritage Centre by appointment by members of the Society, by members of the Council and other residents of the Parish of Doddington and by such other bona fide scholars as may be thought suitable for admission by the Chairman of the Society.
5. No book in the Library may be removed from the Heritage Centre except for the purpose of repair or with the written approval of the Council.
6. The Library will be kept together as a collection and not interspersed with other books belonging to the Society.

We would be grateful if you would signify your approval on behalf of the Society by signing and returning a copy of this letter to which a certified copy of the Schedule of books in the Library should be attached.

contd.....

Yours faithfully
for and on behalf of the Parochial
Church Council of Doddington

Chairman

Secretary

We agree to the above arrangements on behalf of the Faversham Society

Date 30/3/82

C. A. C. C. M.

Chairman

R. Andrews

Secretary

25 May 2018

Expression of Support for Faversham Heritage Proposals

School of History, University of Kent
Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NX

Email: b.j.marsh@kent.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0)1227 824175
Office: Rutherford.E3.W1

Dear Louise:

I write in my behalf as Director of Public Engagement for the Faculty of Humanities, and a Senior Lecturer in History at the University of Kent.

I have been pleased to have been involved in several of the preliminary discussions, alongside colleagues in the education and heritage sectors, considering the council's exciting plans in Faversham to develop and support a heritage hub for the town at the central location of 12 Market Place. At a time when heritage assets and the sector is under considerable pressure, my sense is that this would be a welcome and timely intervention. Opportunities to design and develop integrated spaces and initiatives, especially those that are closely fitted to the needs of the surrounding communities, only come around rarely. It has been excellent that the plans under consideration have such a strong collaborative and integrative intent, and I can see them making a real difference to how residents and visitors conceptualise and make use of many local museums and sites, and strengthen a sense of identity and place.

From the university's point of view, we have several programmes and student groups (including those in history, medieval and early modern studies, archaeology, European heritage, architecture, and the performing and visual arts) who would be excited at the prospect of the heritage hub, and the various possibilities it would offer for advanced research, local history study, curating exhibitions, and digital projection and development. Outreach and engagement are a growing part of the HEI sector generally, and several colleagues have already worked in partnership with Faversham organisations and communities, so the Heritage Hub and its prospective reading rooms, exhibition spaces, and constituencies would offer an exciting vehicle for partnerships (whether in terms of research, educational initiatives, or public engagement) looking forward. Please do let me know if you require any further elaboration from me on the matter.

Yours faithfully,



Dr. Ben Marsh
Senior Lecturer in American History
Director of Public Engagement (Humanities)
University of Kent

Report to the Town Council Meeting

12 November 2018

Naming Members of the Public during Open Session

1. Background

- 1.1 Should the name and address of members of the public, who ask a question during the open session of Town Council meetings, be recorded in the minutes?

2. Definitions

- 2.1 A **data subject** is any person whose personal **data** is being collected, held or processed.
- 2.2 **Personal data** is information that relates to an identified or identifiable individual. What identifies an individual could be as simple as a name or a number or could include other identifiers such as an IP address or a cookie identifier, or other factors.

3. Considerations

- 3.1 Faversham Town Council currently operates under the more traditional rules in only allowing the public to speak outside of the meeting. Their questions are shown as an annex attached to the minutes.
- 3.2 If Members were to adopt the modern way of allowing public speakers within the meeting, it could be argued that they should be named in the interests of transparency. As part of the formal minutes it would give the opportunity to the questions and responses to be accepted, or not, by the Members as a true record, but not the public. If a named person feels they have been misrepresented in the minutes there would be no way to redress the issue.
- 3.3 The Data Protection Act 2018 states that processing of personal data shall be lawful only if and to the extent that the data subject has given consent to the processing of his or her personal data for one or specific purposes.
- 3.4 Consent requires a positive opt-in. Explicit consent requires a very clear and specific statement of consent.
- 3.5 Under the Freedom of Information Act we are required to publish minutes and agendas of all meetings. However, we would not be expected to include any information which would be exempt under the FOIA or any personal

information which it would be unfair to disclose or would otherwise breach the Data Protection Act 2018.

4. Recommendations

4.1 Members are asked to consider the following recommendations:

- a. Members of the public who provide positive consent be named in the minutes. The following statement be included on the agenda and as part of the Mayor's welcome "When providing your name and address prior to addressing the meeting, please confirm, or otherwise, that you consent to your personal details being recorded in the Minutes. Your personal data will be processed as directed by GDPR Article 5"¹
- b. Consideration is given to whether the Open Session should become part of the meeting. This will be addressed fully when drafting the new Model Standing Orders

Louise Bareham
Town Clerk

¹ The GDPR Article 5 states Personal data shall be:

1. processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to the data subject ('lawfulness, fairness and transparency');
2. collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and not further processed in a manner that is incompatible with those purposes; further processing for archiving purposes in the public interest, scientific or historical research purposes or statistical purposes shall, in accordance with Article 89(1), not be considered to be incompatible with the initial purposes ('purpose limitation');
3. adequate, relevant and limited to what is necessary in relation to the purposes for which they are processed ('data minimisation');
4. accurate and, where necessary, kept up to date; every reasonable step must be taken to ensure that personal data that are inaccurate, having regard to the purposes for which they are processed, are erased or rectified without delay ('accuracy');
5. kept in a form which permits identification of data subjects for no longer than is necessary for the purposes for which the personal data are processed; personal data may be stored for longer periods insofar as the personal data will be processed solely for archiving purposes in the public interest, scientific or historical research purposes or statistical purposes in accordance with Article 89(1) subject to implementation of the appropriate technical and organisational measures required by this Regulation in order to safeguard the rights and freedoms of the data subject ('storage limitation');