

**GUN WHARF MASTERPLAN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT CONSULTATION  
STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND RESPONSES**

	<b>This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 18(4) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004</b>
<b>STATUTORY CONSULTEE</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Natural England	Generally supportive of the approach taken. Heartened to see that increased opportunities for quiet recreational access to high quality areas of greenspace are at the heart of the proposals for Gun Wharf. Welcome the commitment within the masterplan to enhance the biodiversity value of the area covered by the SPD.
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
Environment Agency	<p><b>Eco Region</b> The masterplan should acknowledge the aspiration to deliver the principles of the Eco Region through the development of Gun Wharf. This concept is central to the Thames Gateway and must be addressed in a comprehensive manner, rather than through the occasional piecemeal reference. We welcome the acknowledgement of Flood Risk and Ecology (Pages 35-36), however the Eco Region concept is much wider reaching than these issues - such as waste, water and energy aspirations. Suggest the following text is inserted: <i>“Help to deliver an EcoRegion Adequate environmental infrastructure will be provided Resources will be used efficiently There will be a high quality environment Climate change will be mitigated and steps will be taken to adapt Flood risk will be managed.”</i> More information on each of these Outcomes is included within the Thames Gateway Environmental Standards</p> <p><b>Flood Risk</b> Recommend making space in this masterplan now for future flood defences, though it is difficult to know how much space will be needed. The masterplan states that future sea levels are predicted to rise to 6.8metres above Ordnance Datum Newlyn (maODN). It is unclear where this information is from, although this figure seems much higher than the best available extreme tide levels predicted in the Lower Medway 2D Modelling Report.</p> <p>It is stated that parts of the site are situated within zone 2, an area which represents a medium probability of flooding, however, it should be noted that the flood zone applicable here is zone 3 which represents a high probability of flooding. Suitable flood defences for the</p>

site are likely to be determined within the Flood Defence Strategy – the Master plan specifies that “flood defence measures will be developed in line with the adopted CCWDB”, however, we are unclear what this means.

The site has already been referenced within the existing Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). It is noted that the Master plan has taken a Sequential approach with respect to the anticipated usage of the site, with less vulnerable development being proposed for those areas at the frontage within flood zone 3. We will of course be in a position to provide further technical advice when individual Flood Risk Assessments are carried out. We are happy with the uses proposed on the Civic site and Ordnance site as all are less vulnerable.

Maintaining access and views to the riverfront are key urban design principles, discussions need to take place as soon as the results of the defence study are published so that whatever options are available they can be factored in at the earliest possible opportunity.

Recommend making space for SuDs to manage surface water within the masterplan area. Surface water features and flood resilience could also be incorporated within open space improvements.

Regarding undercroft car parking the following should be included in the SPD:

*car parking in flood risk areas is only acceptable if the site can receive flood warning (looking at NFCDD it is shown to be in a FW area but don't show what the lead times are) and there is appropriate signage*

*entrance to car park should be designed as such so that it does not fill up with floodwater in times of flood*

*car parks should not be subject to flood depths of more than 300mm*

*the ability to move cars out of the car park within the flood warning time to an area of safety needs to be assessed*

*an FRA would need to detail how the car park was designed to be safe*

#### **Water Framework Directive and Water Quality**

The Water Framework Directive requires all water bodies to reach good ecological quality, and to not deteriorate in ecological quality, with development being an important way in which improvements and deterioration can occur.

It is essential that this large development supports this and take full opportunity to enhance and improve areas via the development proposals. Currently groundwater quality for the Medway Chalk block has been assigned an over chemical category of 'poor status' and the overall status for surface water is 'Moderate' with diffuse pollution being a known pressure. The development will need to work closely with the harbour and port authorities to focus on dredging strategies to reduce risk from diffuse and point source pollution.

When more details of the proposed works in the Medway estuary are available, will be able to fully assess the application against the 'no deterioration' requirements of the WFD. This will include an assessment of the works' potential for impacts on the status of the WFD quality elements, specific pollutants, priority substances and protected areas. At the present time it seems unlikely that the proposal will have a substantial impact on the current status of the water body. If there is to be any dredging associated with the development, the applicants will need to undertake their own assessment of compliance with the requirements of the WFD. The Environment Agency very shortly intends to issue guidance to assist operators in assessing dredging proposals for compliance with the requirements of the WFD

Have not assessed the application against the 'aim to improve' objective of the WFD and would encourage the exploration of measures which could promote to enhance the water body.

Confirm that the proposed site is not located within or near to any SSSI, RAMSAR, SPA and SAC conservation boundaries and there are no EU designated Shellfish or Bathing waters near or within the proposed development location, therefore we would not consider the proposal to impact on them.

Advise that the impacts on water quality are considered, in particular sediment disturbance during the construction phase. One concern is a potential for increased suspended solids, contamination and an increase in bacteriological levels from sediment during the construction process.

**Code for Sustainable Homes**

Under the Lodge Hill, Chatterden, Medway development it had been identified that water

	<p>resource was an 'issue', setting the 'Code for Sustainable Homes' at level 6. Will the same level be applied to the 'Gun Wharf' development?</p> <p>Also under 'Greening the Gateway' does this development have the same aspirations of being 'water neutral' as outlined under the Thames Gateway developments?</p> <p><b>Biodiversity</b> Support increased access to the River and associated open spaces for recreation. In particular there is the opportunity to promote angling in this area especially within the waterfront park.</p> <p>The increased open space and green pedestrian linking will also provide wildlife corridors around the site linking up habitats. Provision of ecological enhancements through use of SuDs would be encouraged as these techniques can also be designed as beneficial wildlife, amenity and landscape features as part of an open space or a landscaping scheme for a development. This is in line with paragraph 24 of supplement to PPS1 <i>Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change</i> and Policy CC8 in of the South East Plan.</p> <p>Keen to work with the Council if they decide to reinstate the Great Barrier Ditch in order to maximise the ecological benefits. With regard to the increase in river transport it would be preferential to use existing structures and piers as opposed to creating new ones to minimise the impact on the river.</p> <p>Overall the Environment Agency is very supportive of the document and wish to encourage the continued move towards greater environmental awareness and sustainability within the LDF agenda.</p>
<b>Response</b>	<p><b>Suggested changes to the text will be incorporated in the final document. The masterplan document will be amended where appropriate to take account of the technical comments made by the Environment Agency.</b></p>
Archaeological Officer Kent County Council	<p>Welcome the opportunity to comment on this exciting opportunity to create a new civic and cultural heart for Medway. The site of Gun wharf is of exceptional historic and archaeological interest. Proposal for Gun Wharf needs to be sympathetic to the historic interest of the site and to be of the highest quality design. The site is also important for the potential future World Heritage Site and needs to provide a positive contribution to the WHS aims.</p>

New Planning Policy Statement on planning and the Historic Environment (PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment) replaces existing guidance PPG 15 and PPG 16. As such the SPD will need to be revised prior to its adoption to take into account this new document.

Development at Gun Wharf has the potential to affect important buried archaeological remains as well as the setting of neighbouring heritage assets and the historic character of this part of Chatham. The Gun Wharf site is bound by the Scheduled Monuments of Chatham Historic Dockyard to the north and Fort Amherst, the Barrier Ditch and Brompton Lines to the east. Within the site is the western end of the Barrier Ditch which is separately designated. The site also includes a number of Listed Buildings, including the prominently positioned, but currently unused, parish church of St. Mary's. The site also has a high potential to contain important but presently undesignated buried remains and other heritage assets.

The section in the SPD outlining the historic development of the Gun Wharf site is generally good, however needs to be more emphasis on the construction and development of the Chatham Lines. The construction of these fortifications in 1756 and their subsequent alteration and redesign has played a vital role in shaping the historic character of this part of Chatham.

The SPD correctly identifies a number of constraints on future development that relate to the historic environment (page 14). These constraints include the need to be sensitive to surrounding heritage assets and views into and out of the site; the constraints on building heights and the scale and massing of buildings resulting from the need to maintain historic firing lines; and the presence of significant buried archaeology which may limit what development would be acceptable for the site. The SPD also recognises the important role that the historic environment plays in contributing to the character of the site and to the successful creation of a strong sense of place. Would welcome the inclusion of a specific aspiration which builds on this historic character and sense of place through better interpretation and presentation of the heritage of the site to improve the public's understanding of the history of this part of Chatham.

These constraints and opportunities outlined have been used to inform a set of urban design principles (presented on page 20). Are supportive of the principles put forward, however do

not feel that the proposals currently presented in the SPD fully adhere to these principles. In particular the illustrated scale of the new building on the car parking adjacent to Chatham Library is of concern. The artistic sketches and sections across the site show a building that is taller than the neighbouring listed buildings (the Command House and the former Ordnance Store) and has the potential to dominate these. The height of the building could also potentially affect the firing lines from Fort Amherst as well as how the fort is viewed and understood from the river. Detailed analysis of historic firing lines and the setting of the fort should be used to inform the appropriate heights of buildings at Gun Wharf. Are not convinced that the building illustrated could be achieved at the site without impacting on these firing lines or on the fort's character.

The buried archaeology of this car park is also rightly referred to in the SPD and in the Archaeological desk-based assessment of the site produced by Oxford Archaeology. It is very likely that important archaeological remains will be present here. Such remains will be found close to the present ground surface as well as being buried at depth. the need to preserve archaeological remains in situ will potentially be a significant constraint on what development could be achieved here. Even where archaeological remains are of a lower significance and it is accepted that they could be preserved by record the cost of such excavations may be a limiting factor on what can reasonably be achieved. At present do not feel that there is sufficient information on the significance of the buried archaeological remains, the depth at which they might be found or the impact that any development might have on them to advise whether a building, such as that illustrated in the SPD, could be successfully accommodated at the site. Preferred approach would be to see the site archaeologically evaluated before any masterplan or illustrative plans are put forward. The results of such evaluation works should be used to inform what development is appropriate and should be used to inform any illustrative proposals.

The proposals suggest the removal of the Riverside One building which is located within the Barrier Ditch. The Barrier Ditch is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and as such English Heritage would usually take the lead on any proposals which will affect the scheduled parts of the site. In broad terms I would support the removal of the building to reveal the ditch walls and to provide a better visual connection between the surviving parts of the ditch on either side of Dock Road.

	<p>Within the masterplan section the former church of St Mary's is illustrated on the plans for the "Ordnance Site" and the "Civic Quarter" but is not really considered in either. This building is currently unused but previously acted as the parish church for Chatham. In its earliest form Chatham would have been a small village focussed on this church which overlooked probable wharfing and a mill on lower ground to the south-west. This settlement was located on a high point overlooking both the Medway and the Brook with the church located in a prominent position. The prominence of the church is clear in early-illustrated views of the town. Even after the church had become surrounded by barracks, warehousing and other buildings associated with the military story of the town it remained a highly visible building (see historic image on the front cover the SPD for example). The prominence of the church as a local focal point and as a reminder of the historic core of Chatham needs to be preserved in any future proposals. The building itself is unused and would welcome the inclusion of a specific objective, which seeks to find a new purpose for the building.</p> <p>In the northern part of the site the SPD suggests that the existing petrol station site be redeveloped to provide a new frontage onto dock Road. The council offices and their car park are to be retained. The current council offices, the council's surface car park and the petrol filling station are located on the site of the former Royal Marines Barracks. The archaeological desk-based assessment by Oxford Archaeology suggests that any buried archaeological remains associated with the former barracks and early town at the petrol station site could be mitigated through preservation by record (archaeological excavation). Agree with this assessment and are broadly supportive of the proposals being put forward for the redevelopment of the petrol filling station. Archaeological evaluation of this northern part of the site would be required to better inform our knowledge of what buried remains might survive here.</p>
<b>Response</b>	<p><b>Illustrations showing a new building behind the library to be amended to show a different roof profile and reduced height. Artist's impression also to be amended. Final masterplan document to include a set of written design principles to address concerns about possible impact on Fort Amherst and other heritage assets. Document amended to address comments about Chatham Lines. Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary's church. Document to be amended to reflect the introduction of PPS5.</b></p>
English Heritage	<p>Welcome the case for change identified for the site so that it can play a central role in the creation of a new civic focus for Chatham. Support the masterplan objectives (page 19) and</p>

how these inform the vision statement and urban design principles (page 20). .Endorse the vision and principles but would question whether the indicative proposals for the site in the SPD comply fully with all of the design principles and those about sensitivity to the historic assets and scale and massing in particular. Chatham parish church is listed grade II, redundant and in need of a new purpose to give it a sustainable future. Recognise the challenge inherent in such a task but think that it should be included as an additional objective on page 19.

The Government has now released PPS 5 about planning and the historic environment to replace PPG's 15 & 16. This necessitates revisions to the SPD before adoption. The new PPS builds on existing practice about the historic environment and its role in place making. As the site is already a conservation area and potentially within a future WHS the SPD has already had to address the need to avoid harm to heritage values and where possible to enhance or reveal these. HE5 of the new PPS appears most relevant to this SPD.

*Local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use.*

HE10 is also very relevant given its advice about development affecting the setting of designated heritage assets and the need to preserve the elements of setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the assets. In this instance the setting of the scheduled fortification of Fort Amherst is a key consideration but also the settings of the listed building.

In the discussion of the historic development of the site (page 10) more emphasis needs to be placed on the construction of the Chatham Lines in 1756 and the way in which what becomes the barrier ditch passes through the site as a major fortification that remains a key feature of it. The ditch west of Dock Road is separately designated as a scheduled monument from the rest of the ditch that forms part of Fort Amherst. Cannot see that this is referenced anywhere in the SPD and it is clearly an important matter. Page 10 refers to listed buildings being shown on fig 3.4 but this appears to show all the surviving ordnance related buildings whether listed or not. This figure should be revised to indicate the listed buildings



and the extent of the barrier ditch scheduled monument. Page 11 refers to the possible WHS but think fig 2.1 is out of date and that the buffer zone has been further revised.

For the southern part of the site as referred to in the document as the “ordnance site”, welcome the suggested removal of the Riverside One building so as to reveal the barrier ditch scheduled monument. In the past this was a wet ditch and so reintroduction of some water as part of a landscape scheme might be appropriate. This is an illustration of how PPS 5 advises that significance might be revealed and enhanced.

The opportunity to locate a significant new building on the car park where once stood buildings is acknowledged but the design of this will be heavily constrained by historic environment issues. The section on page 27 and the artist’s impression on page 33 show one concept for such a new building which we assume are for illustrative purposes. Discussed this aspect of the site with BDP as part of their preparation of the draft SPD. and confirmed then that the height of a new building and the ability to excavate below the existing car park would be informed by the surrounding historic assets. Cannot support the early design in the draft SPD but this does not mean that the principle of a different form of building here is objected to. Do believe that some new development on the car park is possible but it will be complex to design and implement and thus probably expensive.

The buried archaeology of the car park is referenced later in the SPD and discussed in the archaeological DBA by Oxford Archaeology. Think the significance of this archaeology needs to be investigated as an early next step including by evaluation. PPS 5 Policy HE6 (para. 6.1) confirms that applications must contain sufficient information to demonstrate the significance of the heritage asset and impacts upon it. In this instance the archaeological DBA is not sufficient of itself to provide information with which to implement the advice of the PSS. Foundations for any new building will have an impact and this would be increased if for example underground parking to reduce the overall height of a building was to be proposed. PPS 5 Policy HE9 (para 9.6) provides advice on archaeological heritage assets that are not designated and confirms that these should not be treated as having lower significance than those that are. Evaluation could confirm that substantial below ground disturbance eg. basements, is not acceptable or even if it is that the costs of archaeological mitigation might be so high as to be prohibitive.

Page 14 of the SPD identifies historic firing lines as a constraint on development that needs to be responded to by building heights. As currently drawn the illustrative scheme for a civic building is higher than any of the other buildings on the “ordnance site” and within some firing lines. Consider this may be too tall in relation to the setting of the grade II listed buildings (carriage store and Command House PH) and are satisfied that it would have an unacceptable impact on the setting of the Fort Amherst scheduled monument. PSS 5 provides policy guidance on setting. The recently issued DCMS guidance on scheduled monuments includes some reference to setting and our own publication Conservation Principles is also relevant.

Analysis of the past firing lines out of Fort Amherst, for both cannon and muskets, will inform the key views that will need to be preserved in any new development. The part of Fort Amherst on the opposite side of Dock Road to the car park is not as first built as a fortification and even once had a now demolished building upon it. Historic mapping suggests an original major earthwork rampart running parallel with Dock Road that was without gun embrasures. There are however lines of fire from the higher parts of the fort (Cornwallis) and from galleries forming part of the main gatehouse. The latter align with a brick lined subsidiary moat that gave a view over the roofs of Gun Wharf to the river. This is at present blocked by a 20<sup>th</sup> century building which though used as workshops by the trust is intrusive. Enhancement of the heritage asset (Fort Amherst) could include recovery of its historic form and its relationship to the land that it was designed to control. Since there are defined lines of fire strongly believe that this is an instance where the height of new buildings will be to be informed by those of their demolished predecessors. The view to the river from Dock Road was over the roofs of the carriage sheds that stood on what is now the car park and the past height of these will set the likely limits on how tall a new building might be. A too tall building on the car park would risk constraining Dock Road as a form of “canyon” and would diminish the significance of the historic brickwork on the fort side of the road, which is intended to be appreciated in long views as a sheer and unscalable barrier. This is an important part of the defensive character of Fort Amherst.

The SPD illustrations suggest a pedestrian access from a new building over Dock Road to connect with the fort. Any such works would require scheduled monument consent and consider this is not likely to be granted and unlikely the owners of the fort would agree to such a proposal. Visitors to the fort would arrive over an bridge at an illogical place in relation

to a fortification and there would be issues as to how then to direct them into the for. Unlikely to ever support such a high level bridge but recognise the challenge to connectivity that crossing Dock Road for pedestrians represents. In the past there were tunnel connections that in part survive but sceptical that these could be satisfactorily re-opened.

The northern part of the site is called the “civic quarter”. Support the aspiration to remove the petrol station. The site of the former Royal marines barracks possibly offers opportunities for more development providing new buildings are able to repeat the success of the civic headquarters (Lloyds) building by keeping the heights low and adding to the views of the garrison area from the river. Acknowledge that car parking might have to be underground in any such scheme. Archaeological remains of the marines barracks and the earlier phases of Chatham as a town are likely to exist on this site but the desk based assessment suggests that mitigation through excavation might be an acceptable approach here. PP5 Policy HE12 discusses the principles guiding recording of information about heritage assets, whether designated or not.

The prominence of the parish church as the marker of the location of the heart of medieval Chatham needs to be preserved and as referenced above it is critical that new uses for the site make it easier to find a sustainable use for the church. The section on page 31 shows a new waterfront building. Notwithstanding the almost certain presence of buried archaeological remains from the ordnance use it might also be possible to consider new buildings on the north side of the steps in what are currently grassed areas.

Page 36 of the SPD includes reference to archaeology. Happy to endorse the revised desktop assessment by Oxford Archaeology as an appropriate statement about the significance and archaeological potential of the site. Archaeological issues will be a significant factor in development at Gun Wharf and recommend that evaluation be taken forward as an early stage of any more detailed proposals. A need for preservation in situ could constrain opportunities and even if it is agreed that excavation of archaeological remains is appropriate the cost of this could be high for such an important place. The practice guide that accompanies PPS 5 provides more information. Page 38 may need to be rewritten to reflect the new document and in such a sensitive historic environment location as the Gun Wharf all applications will need to be supported by detailed heritage information in the Design and Access Statements (PPS 5 Policy HE6).

	<p>In summary welcome the agenda for change set out in the draft masterplan SPD. but think more weight should be attached to finding a sustainable future for the church as a part of this. Cannot support the indicative solution for a new building on the “ordnance site” car park, principally as a result of the height of this in views out of Fort Amherst. Do however think that a lower building on the car park might be possible and if this is to be pursued consideration of buried archaeological remains should be an essential next step. Consider new buildings on the northern part of the site that are perhaps more extensive than what is proposed in the SPD could be possible but if so archaeological evaluation would again be essential. The significance (archaeological potential) of the lower former Ordnance Board part of the site could be higher than for the upper parts that were formerly the marine barracks.</p>
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>Illustrations showing a new building behind the library to be amended to show a different roof profile and reduced height. Artist’s impression also to be amended. Final masterplan document to include a set of written design principles to address concerns about possible impact on Fort Amherst and other heritage assets. Document amended to show no pedestrian bridge over Dock Road. Document amended to address comments about Chatham Lines. Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary’s church. Document to be amended to reflect the introduction of PPS5. Document amended in relation to comments about listed buildings. Document amended in relation to comments about the proposed World Heritage Site buffer zone.</b></p>
<p><b>LOCAL GROUPS</b></p>	<p><b>Comments</b></p>
<p>Fort Amherst Trust</p>	<p>Welcome the plans to reinstate the end of the barrier ditch with the removal of the existing Riverside One building and the possibility of opening up the ditch to become a direct link to Fort Amherst. Preference would be for the course of the ditch to be fully delineated and where possible missing brickwork and ramparts reinstated. Another preference would be to represent the fact that the end of the ditch was tidal through incorporate of a water feature. Request that excavations be made to determine if a counterscarp gallery existed adjacent to the end of the ditch. Also wish that the remains of the former Gun Wharf Guardhouse be preserved when the rest of Riverside One is removed. Would also like serious consideration to be given to the reinstatement of the existing tunnel from this building under Dock Road to Fort Amherst as a pedestrian thoroughfare.</p>

	<p>Fully support the intention to protect the below-ground archaeology known to exist on the Gun Wharf site and believe the opportunity should be taken to investigate this and conserve where appropriate to do so.</p> <p>Welcome the overall vision to create a reinvigorated public domain and a vibrant cultural quarter for Medway; however have serious reservations concerning the proposed scale and height of buildings proposed for the former Carriage Store site and the plans to construct a physical link from this building directly onto Fort Amherst. Believe this to be over-intrusive and will result in a significant loss of the historic view of the river from the lower works of Fort Amherst.</p> <p>Fully endorse the proposal to bring the redundant St Mary's Church back into sustainable use; it is an important historical feature and unused asset within the redevelopment area.</p>
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>Illustrations showing a new building behind the library to be amended to show a different roof profile and reduced height. Artist's impression also to be amended.</b></p> <p><b>Final masterplan document to include a set of written design principles to address concerns about possible impact on Fort Amherst and other heritage assets.</b></p> <p><b>Document amended to show no pedestrian bridge over Dock Road.</b></p> <p><b>Document amended to address comments about Chatham Lines.</b></p> <p><b>Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary's church.</b></p> <p><b>Document to be amended to reflect the introduction of PPS5.</b></p> <p><b>Document amended in relation to comments about listed buildings.</b></p> <p><b>Document amended in relation to comments about the proposed World Heritage Site buffer zone.</b></p>
<p>Chief Executive Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust</p>	<p>Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust is the freeholder of the land to the north of the area of the SPD. It has the stewardship of the 80 acre heritage site, the heart of the future World Heritage Site and the location of 47 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and a built environment that adds up to make it the most complete dockyard of the age of sail in the world. This response is, therefore, limited to issues that relate to the Trust's holding, effects of any proposed development on that environment or on its future economic sustainability. The Trust believes it appropriate to let other organisations such as the WHS Steering Group to comment directly on more site specific issues.</p> <p>The Trust believes that an appropriate development of a kind which creates a vibrant "civic</p>

quarter” with an appropriately scaled entertainment venue is highly appropriate. It should help to join the town centre to the Historic and University areas.

Any development should respect views from within the Historic Dockyard site towards the south. With the exception of the intrusive Melville Court flats these views are unfettered by nearby modern development and are, essentially, as Nelson and his contemporaries would have seen them. The current plan seems to indicate that higher buildings are not envisaged and this is an approach supported by the Trust.

In general terms it is hoped that any development of the site will be of the highest quality, reflecting the architectural standards of the Historic Dockyard site and the impressive Medway Council Arrup building. Scale, as well as architectural details will be critical factors in this regard.

The issue of connectivity, pedestrian and vehicular access from Chatham to Chatham Maritime and up onto the Great Lines to Gillingham and Brompton have been much discussed. The Trust recognises these issues but is unable to offer solutions through the Historic dockyard for a variety of reasons including:

- Financial – lost visitor income and increased costs of security and maintenance
- Security of the Historic Environment
- Health and Safety responsibilities
- Long standing relationships with 112 householders and 140 business tenants whose understanding is that the site is “controlled access”.

The plan shows a “one way” route from within the Historic Dockyard to the south. It wishes to make clear that this would only be available to those with rights to be present on the Historic Dockyard site and would not be available as a “general public” route from north to south.

The Trust remains open to discussions about the creation of a “river wall walkway” which has the potential to improve much needed flood defences but has no funding available to create this. The Trust also believes that there is a real opportunity to improve the environment for pedestrian, cyclists and drivers along Dock road, which is actually the “desire line” for the greatest volume of users as it is the shortest route between high volume areas (Chatham

	<p>town Centre, the universities and Chatham Maritime. It strongly recommends that this concept is considered and would be pleased to be an active part of any discussions.</p> <p>As a final point; the Trust is disappointed that the St Mary’s Church is excluded from the study area. Although beyond the Trust’s remit it seems a massively wasted opportunity not to use this process as a way of stimulating appropriate progress in finding an appropriate use for this building which holds such a prominent position in the area. The potential for its on-going state of disrepair to blight the progress that might happen when development eventually occurs is too great to ignore – however difficult the task.</p> <p>Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust thanks Medway Council for the opportunity to comment on these plans and offers its support in progressing them. The Trust is keen to stay engaged in the process and to work actively with the council to find workable solutions.</p>
<b>Response</b>	<b>Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary’s church.</b>
Chatham World Heritage steering group	<p>The Chatham World Heritage steering group adopted a Development Protocol in June 2009 to guide how and when it comments on planning applications or planning policy formulation. The following comments fall within the scope of the adopted protocol:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note the intention to reinstate the Barrier Ditch and specifically to remove the existing Riverside One building (Medway Council’s Contact Point). The Chatham World Heritage steering group, in line with its adopted Management Plan policy 2b, action (ii), fully supports the removal of components of no or low significance that are intrusive to the potential World Heritage Site and/or diminish understanding of it. The group therefore fully supports this proposal.</li> <li>2. Welcome the document’s recognition that the below-ground archaeology at Gun Wharf is of international significance (as evidenced by Chatham’s proposed World Heritage nomination). Note policy 3e of the adopted World Heritage Management Plan, to “encourage the undertaking of appropriate recording programmes for all elements of the historic environment that contribute to the Site’s Outstanding Universal Value, especially prior to approved change”, and policy 3g to “ensure that the archaeological potential of the Site is fully integrated into conservation management and development control processes”. Look forward to the Gun Wharf masterplan enabling greater</li> </ol>

	<p>understanding of the below-ground archaeology at Gun Wharf, and to working closely with development professionals in this complex area.</p> <p>3. Note that St Mary’s Church occupies a central location in the Gun Wharf area and note policy 3d of the adopted World Heritage Management Plan to “encourage and support landowners to identify and secure sustainable and appropriate uses for all elements of the historic environment that contribute to the Site’s Outstanding Universal Value, and encourage the recognition of historic buildings as a mainstay of regeneration”. Consequently, would encourage the masterplan to seek and facilitate an active re-use of St Mary’s Church. Consider that this could sensibly and sensitively be linked to the new cultural facilities proposed and suggest that options for integration could be beneficially explored by the final masterplan.</p> <p>4. The group welcomes the overall vision of the Gun Wharf area as the cultural and civic quarter for Medway and is in principle content with proposals for new buildings to accommodate these uses. Welcome the draft SPD’s recognition that historic firing lines are a paramount consideration for the location and scale of new buildings. Fully support this recognition and consider it imperative that new buildings, particularly in terms of height, do not impede understanding of the historic relationship between Fort Amherst, the river Medway and other strategic defence locations – ie. do not interrupt historic lines of sight and fire. Careful and precise analysis of building heights in this area will be required and this should be made explicit in the final materplan.</p> <p>Understand that parking is a significant concern not just for this masterplan but across Chatham. Would not support proposals, which aim to increase car parking provision within Fort Amherst. Note that the Great Lines Heritage Park Landscape Design Statement 2008 (masterplan) approved by the Chatham World Heritage steering group proposes the medium to long-term removal of all on-site car parking provision within the Fort.</p>
<b>Response</b>	<b>Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary’s church</b>
Area CPDA/CRO - Partnerships & Crime Reduction Kent Police-Medway	The proposed document incorporates many beneficial principles & objectives Following observations relative to this Additional documents that should be factored into the SPD for reading, reference or consideration of planning policy & proposals also include:- Safer Places the Planning system & Crime prevention (ODPM 2004)



Safer Places- A Counter Terrorism Supplement (CLG 2009)  
NACTSO (National Counter Terrorism Security Office) -Crowded Places & guidance.

Consider incorporation of a Community safety contact point (staffed by Community Safety Partnership members) within the proposed new Civic facility building.

Vehicle access routes should be Safe and user friendly. Redesign/widening of the route leading off Dock Road to the present Riverside Car park/waterfront may be beneficial as it is narrow at present and right turn out and onto Dock road can be problematic.

All pedestrian routes should be wide and visually open for user safety.

Creation of a Safe and secure environment particularly with the possible integration of waterfront leisure/office facilities, Council facilities, entertainment venues & increased permeability should be supported by introduction of good Lighting scheme to all public spaces, footpaths, parking aspects, waterfront. With additionally the use of Medway Councils integrated CCTV system to aid surveillance & crime prevention.

Retention and possible expansion of Council staff/offices car park is beneficial as there are, I believe issues with insufficient parking for some staff or visitors to the Council offices, coupled with the possible loss of some parking at Riverside car park, however any additional parking would need to be carefully regulated with suitable access control to ensure it is not used by unauthorised persons or for unauthorised purposes.

Surface parking reprovided as undercroft parking at Riverside -potentially under the new Civic building that may incorporate a range of uses/events, should be carefully considered as there may be increased issues of vulnerability to the buildings above, inclusive of Crime, Hostile vehicle or device placement, congregation or antisocial behaviour issues. If to be provided robust Security/access control would be necessary.

New Commercial/residential building close to Combined Services Careers office, will need careful consideration relative to its use, siting, proximity to such as it will be close to a potentially more sensitive than some location from a Counter Terrorism viewpoint. Offices with limited residential may be a preferable mix over some forms of commercial or

	<p>manufacturing development here, built at an acceptable distance from the careers centre, with suitable secure boundary treatments to ensure safety &amp; security over such.</p>
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>Masterplan document to be amended to refer to the suggested additional documents. Mastplan is a conceptual document, and comments relating to crime and general safety will need to be taken into account as detailed development proposals come forward.</b></p>
<p>The Church of England – Diocese of Rochester</p>	<p>Welcome the general aspirations contained in the Masterplan proposals comment specifically on the proposals as they impact upon the closed church of St Mary the Virgin, Dock Road, Chatham.</p> <p>As the authors of the masterplan rightly note, St Mary’s Church has historic foundations although the present church was considerably rebuilt following a fire in the 1800’s. It remains an important landmark on the high ground overlooking Gun Wharf and contains many memorials demonstrating its links over many centuries to the Dockyard and those who worked there. Any development of the adjacent area should seek to enhance the setting of this historic landmark.</p> <p>The masterplan does not make clear what implications there are, if any, for St Mary’s Church by designating the area in which it is situated as the “Civic Quarter”. This needs to be spelt out.</p> <p>It should be noted that under the Pastoral measure 1983, the Diocesan Board of Finance, in whom the property is currently vested, has a statutory duty to find an alternative use for the building. Concerned that any change to the designation of the sit should not impede the Board in this respect.</p> <p>The building was used for a number of years as a Museum and Heritage Centre and latterly planning permission was secured for the building to be used as offices and meeting rooms.</p> <p>Have considered a number of alternative uses for the building, including its use as a centre for CVS (Medway) and also as a base for the Emmaus project for the homeless in Medway none of which have come to fruition either because of planning hurdles or financial viability. Recognising there is a strong economic case for regenerating historic buildings while conserving the heritage value of the building; we believe that the PPS 5 will encourage a</p>

	<p>more pragmatic, flexible and imaginative approach to any future use for the building.</p> <p>One of the limitations to any future use of St Mary's Church is the lack of car parking facilities and mindful of this there may be merit in investigating how the churchyard and the adjacent Medway Council Headquarters site might be opened up – to improve the setting of St Mary's Church and the "Civic Quarter" generally and provide opportunities for access and possibly shared parking.</p> <p>Note that PPG 15 was replaced by PPS 5 on 23 March 2010 and no doubt such changes as may be required will be reflected in the Gun Wharf masterplan Supplementary Planning Document. It is also noted that St Mary's Church site has been identified as a potential development site in the Draft Medway Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) (March 2010).</p>
<b>Response</b>	<p><b>Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary's church.</b>  <b>Document to be amended to reflect the introduction of PPS5.</b></p>
Brompton Village Association	<p>Welcome the general concept but do have some concerns.</p> <p>There are three other development plans. The Great Lines Heritage Park is well under way and that for Fort Amherst appears in hand. The future of Kitcheners Barracks is still unknown.</p> <p>Concerned about the no-man's land around Dock Road Drawing on page 17 shows a possible link to the centre of the barracks. Consider overhead access from Gun Wharf to the Fort and the Great Lines more appropriate. A location at the top of the New Stair could be considered.</p> <p>Concerned about the future of St Mary's Church. It is a focal point and its use must be appropriate. Anxious that some form of regular public use be required of the building's owners and occupants.</p> <p>At the south end of Kitchener Barracks is a Georgian building (behind Kitchener's statue) whose latest use was for storage by Crispin Borst, opposite the entrance to the Fort. This should be integrated into one of the Plans.</p> <p>Within your boundary in Dock Road is the Army Careers Office which is a late extension to a handsome late Victorian school building. This is of much lower townscape quality.</p>

<b>Response</b>	<b>Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary's church</b>
Port Medway Marina Ltd Station Road Cuxton Rochester Kent ME2 1AB	<p>Include in the proposals provision for access to the river via floating pontoons and landing area. In the overall plan the cost to provide this facility would be minimal but would open up so much opportunity to river uses.</p> <p>Interested in providing river transport between Cuxton and Upnor with stopping off points along the way. Gun Wharf would provide an ideal location for a river bus stop together with Rochester Pier, Strood Pier, Sun Pier, Chatham Maritime, Medway City Estate and Upnor. Would like the opportunity to discuss any proposal relating to the River and maybe even provide the facility at our cost or in conjunction with Medway Council.</p>
<b>Response</b>	<b>The opportunities for river transport are included in the masterplan</b>
<b>LOCAL RESIDENTS AND COUNCILORS</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Cllr David Carr	<p>The overall concept, although rather brief, is great - particularly the integration of Fort Amherst and the building of a new waterfront complex for cafe/restaurant.</p> <p>Two major improvements are missing - perhaps because of the lightweight approach of the consultation leaflet?</p> <p>1 - There are no plans to integrate the church. Of course, it cannot continue to be a church - the cost would be prohibitive without some commercial return over time. However, it would certainly have a commercial value and commercial possibilities that could pay for itself - given the will to do it.</p> <p>2 - This would be a golden opportunity to increase the size of Gun Wharf offices car park and redesign it to be more effective</p>
<b>Response</b>	<b>Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary's church</b>
10 Silver Hill Chatham KENT ME4 5RW	Make it a no-smoking & no-drinking area. No dropping of litter and plenty of bins. Plenty of police in the area to see people behave themselves. Children's play area (6 months – 9 years). Young people must have adults with them.
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
2 Brompton Hill Old Brompton Chatham KENT ME4 4XD	Would like to be kept informed of progress
E Nichol	This is <a href="#">an</a> unimaginative, linear masterplan with no clear public realm benefits, lacking

penetration from Dock Road to the river. The feeling is that it is a desktop draft done without walking the streets! To be more specific:

1. Access to the waterfront via The Stairs to the north of the filling station is poor. It will be a busy little road and service access for

- a) the new building that replaces the filling station,
- b) Council staff parking and taxi drop off,
- c) Gun Wharf service vehicles
- d) Commissioners Hayfield residents and servicing. This will not be a pedestrian friendly route and does nothing to create a sense of place or encourage people to use the area.
- e) What is the point of a 'one way' route into the Dockyard?

The cycle routes along Dock Road are ill thought out and have not been addressed by the masterplan. The route in front of Commissioners Hayfield is wider than the footpath and needs re-thinking. This does not create a good link between Brompton and the town centre. Penetration to the waterfront is not being enhanced with the stairs between the Gun Wharf car park and St Mary's church which are dark, uninviting and in no way public friendly. The green spaces will appear to be 'private' property for Council use only. This does not improve public open space and encourage people to use the area.

The new waterfront building will have insufficient footfall passed its door for it to be a café & restaurant. Use. It has no car parking, so would be a commercial flop that would do nothing to enliven the waterfront, in fact such a failure would be detrimental to that cause.

The church is a fine building. It needs a new use that can only be brought about by it having dedicated parking. This masterplan shows no indication of how that could be brought about to re-use such a heritage asset.

Page 12 is incorrect in stating that The SPD (for Chatham Historic Dockyard and Interface Land) '*will consider the relationship of the Historic Dockyard to adjacent areas and establish a land use mix and design principles for the area*'.

What is correct is that '*The SPD will consider the relationship of the Interface Land to adjacent areas, land use mixes and establish design principles for the area*'.

<b>Response</b>	<b>Disagree with comments about the masterplan being unimaginative. Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary's church. Text amended to clarify relationship with the Interface land SPD</b>
66 Charles St Chatham KENT ME4 5RZ	This project is a waste of time and money. Our money, misused by the Council who will please themselves, as they have always done in the past. Is there really the spare spending money now? We are in a recession, trade & industry sold off. Market share in decline against China and India. Isn't this all a pipe dream none of us can afford? The bus-station has moved to the Paddock area, a large empty road instead of a perfectly good flyover and will the traffic flow even improve? I think not.
<b>Response</b>	<b>Masterplan funded from HCA approved Medway Renaissance budget.</b>
	Gun Wharf masterplan is very impressive – the glass atrium link to the library is a brilliant idea and cafes at Waterfront will be most welcome – however these objectives will sadly be spoilt by the awful mistake of the siting of the new bus depot apart from the loss of trees and flowers from the area. This appalling “blot on the landscape” will completely ruin the improvements you are trying to make and spoil the air quality and ambience of the area
<b>Response</b>	<b>Bus station has already got planning permission and is outside the area of this masterplan.</b>
	Is the building over the car park at the front of the library having an underground car park? If so why is it not mentioned on the pictorial plan ? Why have so many trees been felled in front of the “white building”? Will the one way exit from the Historic Dockyard to the Gun Wharf be really safe from vandalism? Is the new building really going to be orange? Orange dotted lines go over building.
<b>Response</b>	<b>No underground car park is proposed and drawings showing the building are artist's impressions not detailed proposals.</b>
16c Meadowbank Rd Chatham KENT ME4 4PD	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do not need more council offices.</li> <li>2. Use of St Mary's Church is essential.</li> <li>3. Management of trees – is there any?</li> <li>4. Council to maintain all ready existing infrastructure eg. Roads, paths, fences, walls, drains &amp; buildings.</li> <li>5. Whose idea was it to put a bus stop on traffic lights – Dock Rd to Kitchener Barracks?</li> <li>6. Dredging off silt from alongside the River Medway or Mudway?</li> <li>7. Medway Towns or City of Medway?</li> </ol>
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted. Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary's</b>

	<b>church.</b>
384b High St Chatham KENT ME4 4NP	It's bad enough that we are losing the Paddock to a bus station but building over Chatham riverside? Utter travesty!
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
14 Alexandra Road Chatham KENT ME4 5DG	All for an attractive area cultural, regeneration. Don't object to anything. The one thing to put in your Gun Wharf masterplan is some needing of public toilets. As a cleaning company we clean public toilets around Medway. People are always moaning about toilets. There's no hot water, etc.
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
davidpat.scott@gmail.com	<p>This seems to be another example of piecemeal planning for the future of an important zone between the Historic Dockyard site and the town centre. Don't see how any such plan can be crystallized when so many aspects are contingent upon decisions made in other areas, for example town car parking, which in the report's own admission will not be taken in the lifetime of this study. Other examples are in-river amenities and the future of Chatham's theatres. The design brief should provide overarching, definitive, assumptions and constraints to work to.</p> <p>No doubt cost is an important consideration but the plan seems to lack ambition. Historic buildings aside, the architecture in the whole of Chatham and satellite towns is deeply depressing. It would not be unreasonable to insist in the objectives of the plan on a level of commitment and design expertise to provide a very good probability of a national design award at some time after completion.</p> <p>The plan is full of jargon and arcane planner's language, and occasionally very poor English, which is a big turn-off for the members of the general public. A sentence such as "Creation of new site (sic) lines and vistas to improve legibility (??) and encourage people to use the site" hardly inspires confidence.</p> <p>Specific - artists' impressions showing yachts sailing up the river in this area. As a keen yachtsman there is absolutely no reason to do so: there is nowhere to moor the boat for short spells, and no landing points for a yacht tender. The plan refers in passing to improved river transport, but this should include provision of pontoons and landing points for visiting yachts. Those in the Falmouth, Dartmouth and Salcombe estuaries on the south-west coast show</p>

how it can be done, and bring significant trade to the area.

One such short stay/ landing point should be the Command House. This pub has a beautiful facade and an enviable position, but in all other respects (internal ambience, food & beer quality, etc) is truly appalling. Under any competent management this could be a focal point of the area and a magnet for beer and food lovers.

On the cafes and restaurants promised for this area, these should raise the overall standard of dining in the town. Currently over-provided with cheap eateries, even given the generally depressed financial state of the local populace. There are no establishments in the immediate vicinity listed in the Good Food Guide, let alone the Michelin Guide, nor any prospect of such unless the council resolves to create an atmosphere in which investors will provide more upmarket dining.

Similar remarks apply to entertainment. Keen theatre-goer who tries to support Chatham Theatre but wants to see something more appealing than the endless diet of tribute bands, all-in wrestling and dodgy comedians. It's a sad fact that the current theatre is most unlikely to receive the investment necessary to restore it to any sort of glory. Instead why not invest in a new theatre, as part of the proposed "civic facilities centre" in this plan? The current draft is very vague on what this might include, but I think it should incorporate an iconic modern theatre, such as that at Hampstead or the Rose at Kingston, or a restored and transplanted interior such has been done at the Hammersmith Lyric. Again, the right atmosphere would help to attract big-name touring companies and theatre of real substance.

Notwithstanding the statements about new "quality" car parking elsewhere in the town, doubts many people will want to visit the library if this means a 10 minute trek across town. The same goes for the rest of the cultural centre, and I doubt more people will use public transport, even with the benefit of the new bus station, if the vast majority of bus routes stop running by 8pm, as now.

Instead of allowing the threat of future flooding to limit the type and scale of developments, why not commit to providing the necessary defences at the outset, particularly since the paper admits this is going to be needed anyway, in the short to medium term.



	<p>What will the closure of the petrol station in Dock Road will achieve, other than money from the sale of the site or rent from commercial offices. The proposed "public courtyard" in front is bizarre - what are visitors to do in this tiny disconnected oasis other than watch traffic passing in Dock Road, or stare at Kitchener Barracks?</p>
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p>
<p>jbarker193@btinternet.com</p>	<p>Include in the Gun Wharf Masterplan provision of a `River Medway Marine Sport and Leisure Club` which would be the `high profile` home for various river based sport and leisure activities including, Rowing, Kayaking, Sail boat/boarding, Sub-Aqua Diving, Barge driving, Sculling, Boat Fishing, etc.</p> <p>Could be either sited on the shore or afloat aboard a large `Pontoon` accessed by a companion `Gangway` linked to the shore, or a combination of both.</p> <p>The River pontoon could also be utilised for scenic `river trips`, and possibly peak time commuter ferry to Medway City Estate (sustainable ? ) if a commuter service to MC Estate was viable would also introduce `Free` cycle hire within the MC Estate using `unique highly distinctive work/city bicycles for use within the MC Estate. The bikes would hopefully be sponsored, and if successful could be trialled in other Medway urban areas including the Gun Wharf area, Train stations, town centres, etc. The principle being to use a cycle to commute to your destination, park ( in designated cycle park ) and leave cycle for next person wishing to use. Different coloured cycles would define which `Free Cycle Zone` the cycles belong to.</p> <p>Regarding possible ferry to Medway City Estate from Gun Wharf if the provision of a park and ride facility could be incorporated, confident the Ferry service would be sustainable, especially as the Ferry would double up as a `Pleasure trip Service` for `day trippers` in dormant commuter hours.</p> <p>Propose that in addition to the facilities required for this scheme at the Gun Wharf site, it would be necessary to establish an `Off Shore Marine Sport Base Station` ( large permanently anchored support barge/pontoon with all necessary ancillary storage, craft moorings, marine sport equipment, First Aid area, self catering canteen / Mess area, toilet facilities, changing rooms, watch tower and radio room, etc.</p> <p>Propose that the support barge / pontoon would be permanently moored in one of the deep</p>

	<p>anchorages within the River Thames Estuary, accessed by fast support boats / River taxis running from Gun Wharf, Isle of Grain, Sheerness, Whitstable, Canvey Island, Southend, etc.</p> <p>All marine sports which require deep water, unrestricted speed limits, open seas, etc ( water skiing, personal watercraft ( jet bikes ), wind surfing, paragliding, high diving, sub aqua diving, sail boat training, deep water angling, etc, would be operated from the ` Off Shore Marine Sport Base Station` with all other marine sports ( barge driving, rowing, sculling, kayaking, solo sailing, etc ) operated from the Gun Wharf site.</p> <p>All marine sport tuition and information would be available at the Gun Wharf site.</p> <p>Funding for the `Off Shore Marine Sport Base Station` could be sought by delegating with other surrounding Councils ( Swale, Canterbury, Thanet, Castle Point, Southend, etc who could share a vested interest in the project.</p>
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>The opportunities for river transport are included in the masterplan.</b></p>
<p>59 Port Rise, Chatham. ME4 6QA c/o Mark Hodgetts mchodgetts@ukonline.co.uk</p>	<p>The SPD describes the existing riverside space as being of merely “average quality,” “lacking a central focus,” and the Paddock as “isolated.” What it fails to note is that both are well-used and well-loved public open spaces. You had the opportunity to link them together, which would have part-compensated us for the removal of the flyover and the resulting congestion of traffic around Chatham (with no measures to reduce its volume). Instead, you opted to separate them with a set of expensive concrete mushrooms masquerading as a bus station. These will hardly improve on the function of the existing bus station in the Pentagon. They will not improve links with the railway station or shelter passengers from the wind-tunnel effect of Military Road, and have required the felling of numerous mature trees which contributed to the character of the area.</p> <p>First concern about the SPD is that the area under consideration seems to end abruptly in the middle of this green space. Any plan which aims to give this area a “central focus” needs to consider it as a whole, preferably along with the Paddock and all the “poorly defined open space” between the Library and Staples. The “contextual area” also needs to include the opposite riverbank, to which many people commute daily by car, contributing to traffic congestion through Chatham, Rochester, the Medway Tunnel and the Medway City Estate itself. Traffic on and off the Medway City Estate is gridlocked almost daily, a situation which</p>

	<p>will be exacerbated by the planned new Superstore but could be improved by direct links with Chatham town centre. My comments on the Gun Wharf Masterplan SPD are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please don't fell any more trees! It has been heartbreaking to observe the concern of local people during recent tree-felling for the Bus Station development. People relate to mature trees as a link with the past. They don't want replacement decorative "lollipop" trees. They want the existing trees, which have taken hundreds of years to reach their current stature and provide aesthetic balance to large buildings, shade, shelter and a haven for interesting wildlife.</li> <li>2. Please don't add too much new housing in this area, especially now through routes for traffic are so restricted: It's bad enough having the noise, pedestrian hazard and pollution of a bus station in the middle of the "green space" without adding to residential traffic demand.</li> <li>3. Like the idea of an arts centre behind the library (assuming it will have adjacent parking) and especially the possibility of linking this to Fort Amherst via the Barrier Ditch, which is currently sadly hidden.</li> <li>4. Like the idea of riverside pedestrian and cycle links toward Rochester (and Chatham Maritime, via the Historic Dockyard. The main barrier is the unsightly and surely unnecessary bulk of the Rats Bay Pumping Station. Couldn't it be replaced with a smaller building incorporating continuation of the cycle/walkway toward Rochester?</li> <li>5. Most importantly, what both central Chatham and the Medway City Estate desperately need is not a river taxi service but a pedestrian/cycle bridge, maybe a high-level suspension bridge at the narrowest point, near the Command House. Such a possibility was indicated on earlier plans for consultation but seems to have been shelved. It would radically cut traffic congestion around Chatham and through the Medway Tunnel and journey times for the people who work there, who could then arrive by bus or train, walk to work and stroll across to the library, new Arts Centre or Pentagon during their lunch break.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>Comments relating to the bus station outside the scope of this masterplan. Limited provision for housing proposed by the masterplan. Comments about a new bridge crossing noted but any crossing must not prejudice the existing heritage assets of the area.</b></p>
<p>12 Edwin Road Rainham</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. new structures should not just follow current fads in design, but be sympathetic to and complement existing features of historical and architectural interest;</li> </ol>

<p>ron norwood norwood.ron@googlemail.com</p>	<p>2. environmentally valuable sight lines must be considered - Mountbatten House is an example of bad planning;</p> <p>3. the waterfront and green areas are invaluable assets to be managed sensitively and kept open to public access; mature trees to be kept wherever possible - they take a lifetime to grow to maturity, while most modern manmade structures come and go every 10 years or so...</p> <p>The proposed building adjacent to the library appears rather like a temporary hangar in the illustration, and could be improved - perhaps by use of different building materials or style. The plan appears to respect points 2 and 3.</p>
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>Comments noted.</b></p>
<p>247 City Way Rochester ME1 2TL</p>	<p>Would not like to see any more built development. There are already enough buildings on the site. Would like to see more soft landscaping and grassed areas where people can just sit about on sunny days, more seats would be ok. A public toilet would be good and grass areas where people can play ball games.</p> <p>Access to the gardens through the proposed bus station would be good but I expect people will have to walk around it.</p> <p>There is no connection here which the river at one time, big ships like the Grand Turk and Medway Queen, would moor at Sun Pier which created tremendous interest and great views from the gardens.</p> <p>Just a slipway, as at the Strand, where boats can be launched would create interest and connect people with the river.</p> <p>Since we went unitary the council has had other priorities and our river facilities have been allowed to deteriorate.</p>
<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p><b>The opportunities for river transport are included in the masterplan</b></p>
<p>85 Hartington Street Chatham ME4 5PJ</p>	<p>Please find use for the church – an unused building quickly falls into disrepair and decay. Suggested use: - art displays, local history displays and information, displays connected to the library, general public information.</p> <p>Will stairs cut off access to some areas for wheelchair users? There are stairs at the other</p>

	end, don't forget.
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted. As developments come forward access for all will be a paramount consideration. Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary's church.</b>
20 Prospect Row Brompton Gillingham ME7 5AL <a href="mailto:clive-perry@tiscali.co.uk">clive-perry@tiscali.co.uk</a>	<p>Welcome the proposals to make this central area of Chatham more welcoming and accessible, there are two points; Dock Road Crossing The draft plan calls for a wider and more accessible pedestrian route between Dock Road and the Waterfront, which I welcome. However, why stop there? The access needs to cross over Dock Road. Dock Road is correctly described as noisy and polluting in one of the drawings submitted. You could also add dangerous and dirty from a pedestrian point of view as the photographs show.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the future redevelopment of Kitchener Barracks, into residential use, a wide pedestrian overhead crossing connecting this development and Brompton to the Waterfront would be of great merit.</p> <p>The route would also allow for the continuation of the Saxon Way from the River through to Brompton without having to cross a 40 mph dual carriageway or using a dark and uninviting underpass, originally build for the Dockyard workers.</p> <p>To make a real impact the crossing needs to be wide, not just a footbridge. Bearing in mind that the Kitchener Barracks side of Dock Road is already served by a high elevation footpath, the overhead crossing would only need to rise by another 2m or so, to gain sufficient height. On the council offices side, a slow and graceful descent down to the waterfront would ensure a quite unique vista to the pedestrian.</p> <p><b>Army Careers Office</b> The extension built onto the front of this office, a once handsome late Victorian house, is an abomination as the photos show. It must be a monument to the power that the military once wielded in Chatham. Because of its central position thousands of motorists and pedestrians are confronted with it every day.</p> <p>If the Council wants its residents and businesses to take pride of ownership in our historic</p>

	buildings seriously, it needs to show the lead. This ugly eyesore needs to be removed which would help enhance one of the focal points of this waterfront regeneration scheme.
<b>Response</b>	<b>Improved access across Dock Road is an important issue.</b>
	<p>Some of the ideas in this plan seem very good – to increase public use of the riverside area and to improve pedestrian access.</p> <p>However if the intention is to “improve the environment” building a bus-station on very rare green space does not seem to do this – why not on the site of the former police station or elsewhere on the Brook?</p> <p>Unfortunately, Medway Council have recently been proceeding to damage or destroy much heritage and wildlife habitat:</p> <p>The Aveling &amp; Porter building knocked down for no reason;</p> <p>The wall to the rear of Restoration House (Medway Council gave permission to the contractors);</p> <p>The plan to damage the grassland area and the rare plants here with large tarmac paths and planting buddleia;</p> <p>The bus-station.</p> <p>Damaging heritage and green space areas does <u>not</u> improve the environment.</p>
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted</b>
Heritage Road Chatham ME4 7ST	I would hope there were many trees and flowers involved.
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted</b>
17 Restharrow Way St Mary’s Island ME4 3HS	<p><b>Page 15, fig 2.3 weaknesses and constraints</b></p> <p>a) <b>The plan notes that Dock Road is “noisy and polluted”</b>. I regularly walk from St Mary’s Island to Chatham town centre and find that the section of Dock Road from the University (Observatory) roundabout to the Brompton roundabout is most unpleasant. The high walls on both sides produce a canyon filled with traffic, fumes and noise. It would be beneficial if a pedestrian route were available from Chatham Maritime to link with the Gun Wharf riverfront that avoided Dock Road. I appreciate that having public access through the Historic Dockyard visitor attraction could produce challenges. A precedent has been set by the site already having public access from commercial enterprises and residents. Public footpaths cross other visitor attractions such as Leeds</p>

Castle Estate and Howletts Wildlife Park and they seem to cope. Pedestrian access to the Historic Dockyard along the riverfront from the new bus station would also re-enforce the linkage between Gun Wharf and the adjacent Heritage site.

- b) **The plan notes that Fort Amherst has “poor visitor arrival”.** This is true but the plan does not seem to suggest how this is to be improved. Would this be dependent on the possible re-development of Kitchener Barracks?
- c) **The plan highlights the limited public access to the riverfront.** This links to the point (1a) above.

***Page 16, Opportunities.***

- a) **St Mary’s Church – “bring back into use”.** The plan makes no proposals as to what use this would be.
- b) **“Create new routes through site to link with adjacent development opportunities and the town centre” and “Opportunities to improve the Riverside Walk to contribute to a high quality public realm”.** Again, this links with the point (1a) above.

***Page 28, The Civic quarter***

**“Petrol station redeveloped for commercial use”.** The owners of this petrol station have recently re-built and upgraded it. It is one of only two petrol stations left in Chatham town centre and is therefore well used. For traffic leaving Chatham, the next petrol stations would either be the Co-Op – through the Medway Tunnel on the City Estate, Rochester or the Shell station next to the old council offices in Gillingham. Is the Council planning to relocate the petrol station to another site, for example the site of the old Esso station on the other side of Dock Road?

***Page 32, Civic Quarter***

**“Opportunity for Council surface car park to be removed but re-provided as underground car parking space”.** This complements the Urban Design Principles listed on page 20. Principle 6 states **“Integrate the Waterfront Park with the bus station to encourage movement between Gun Wharf and the town centre and encourage greater use of public transport”.** Taking these two items together it must be asked why replace the

	<p>car park? The majority of employees that work in Chatham’s shops and offices do not benefit from car parking spaces and this would be an excellent opportunity for Medway Council to set an example in reducing the number of cars entering the town centre.</p> <p><b>Page 39, Car parking</b>  <b>“There are a number of short stay surface car parks in the study area. These car parks are not the most efficient use of space and impact on the character of the area”</b>. The Waterfront Park is quite small so the addition of the land currently occupied by the Globe Lane and Medway Street car parks would greatly enhance the significance of the amenity.</p>
<b>Response</b>	<p><b>The masterplan seeks to improve access and connections where feasible. A pedestrian route through Chatham Historic Dockyard is not currently supported by Chatham Historic Dockyard Trust.</b></p> <p><b>Document to be amended to include written guidance on St Mary’s church.</b></p> <p><b>Masterplan identifies the petrol station as a potential redevelopment opportunity should circumstances change.</b></p>
<b>COUNCIL OFFICERS</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Medway urban Parks & Green Spaces	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To my mind this has a predominately Naval history, so would like to see mainly Naval, as well as military artefacts and static display boards etc outside as well as in the historic buildings.</li> <li>2. As I understand the original Dockyard was based around the inlet immediately in front of The Command House, so maybe a ground plan of the extent of this area could be displayed.</li> <li>3. Will the opportunity to excavate and otherwise explore for archaeological remains of our heritage in this area ?</li> <li>4. I’m concerned that sufficient car parking is supplied - bearing in the mind the lack of this at the present Council Offices – as the increased Civic needs and extra public use will obviously need extra provision.</li> <li>5. There is obviously scope to include access to and from in the Green Grid and Medway Transport Plan.</li> <li>6. I hope the “House” part of The Command House will be replaced on the front of the pub.</li> <li>7. Incidentally, Great Lines Park is in fact “Great Lines Heritage Park”</li> <li>8. This is a useful addition to the Chatham World Heritage Bid, both of which</li> </ol>



	<p>demonstrate how Medway is opening up its attractions and needs to ensure easy access to, from and between them.</p> <p>9. I agree with all the bullet point objectives.</p> <p>10. Best of luck with the project.</p>
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
Senior Transport Manager Medway Council	<p>Emphasize the importance of a sustainable and dependable bus link along Dock Road from Wood Street.</p> <p>This will demonstrate an emphasis on the importance of public transport and provide an improved "offer", thus assisting retail trade and supporting our objectives to promote access and sustainability</p> <p>This approach would also support the operations of the dynamic bus facility, which requires approach routes to be dependable and reliable to support the allocation of stands efficiently.</p>
<b>Reponse</b>	<b>Comments noted</b>
Implementation Manager Quality Public Transport Corridors Medway Council	<p>Firstly, overall, this appears to be a very positive approach to Gun Wharf but following comments in relation to the sustainability of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dock Road/Wood Street (between Globe Lane and Gillingham Town centre) is planned to be a new sustainable transport corridor with bus priority measures and improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists and as a means of strengthening the link between this site, the new Bus Station and town centre</li> <li>• final car park layout needs to take account of a stronger Travel Plan with the emphasis on sustainable measures rather than maintaining the existing levels of car parking with increased provision for car sharing and pool cars (Car Club?)</li> <li>• car park layout should also make provision for improved pedestrian and cycle permeability between Dock Road and the main entrance of GW</li> <li>• well located, covered and secure cycle parking</li> <li>• provide improved lighting for the site, car park and riverside walk which should be low energy (LED)</li> <li>• emphasis on sustainable energy provision (eg, solar panels, photovoltaics) for the building and site as a whole</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Command House PH is in a high quality location but has been very badly managed and offers a very poor customer experience</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<b>Comments noted.</b>
Senior Business Technician Quality Assurance & Release Mgt	Much of the plan looks interesting but concerned about potential loss of the petrol station.
<b>Response</b>	<b>No immediate intention to redevelop the petrol station. Masterplan identifies the station as a possible redevelopment opportunity</b>