



THE FAVERSHAM SOCIETY

FOUNDED 1962

FLEUR DE LIS HERITAGE CENTRE

ESTABLISHED 1977

Company No. 7112241, Registered Charity No.1135262
Address 10-13 Preston Street, Faversham, Kent ME13 8NS

Trustees: Harold Goodwin (Chair), Jonathan Carey, Andrew Holden, Sophie Kemsley, Brian Kelsey, Pat Reid, Anne Salmon, Laurie McMahon, Tim Stonor, Graham Warner, Janice West, Heather Wootton, Christopher Wright, Sir David Melville (Vice-Chair) and Katie Begg.

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees held on Tuesday, 28th July 2020

Present: HG, KB, DM, TS, CW, AS, AH, HW, LM, JC

Part I

Agenda Item	Minutes	Actions
Apologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">SK, BK, PR,	
Declarations of interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none">None	
Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">JC proposed, CW seconded. The minutes were approved.	
Matters arising	<ol style="list-style-type: none">JW has resigned her position as Trustee of the Society. The Board asked HG to write to JW expressing our gratitude for her service as trustee.Neighbours Complaint JC & HG: JC explained that there has been a complaint from some of our neighbours in Gatefield Lane, and JC and HG met with the main complainant. The meeting was positive, and JC	<ul style="list-style-type: none">HG to write to JW.

	<p>and HG believe the relationship will be improved. If there are difficulties in future neighbours understand to approach HG directly.</p> <p>c. JC read a note from a volunteer suggesting there are challenges with the VIC. The Board agreed that one possible solution was to have more trustee visibility at the VIC, with trustees spending more time there. HG suggested a small group of trustees look into the management of the VIC – HG, AH and JC will be on that group. JC asked if an assessment can be made of how many volunteers will return after COVID – HG explained this will be possible in the next few weeks.</p> <p>d. Keyholder service – The Board unanimously supported the appointment of the keyholder service.</p> <p>e. Algar letter: The Board unanimously supported the reply to Simon Algar.</p> <p>f. Roof works: JC reported that the original roof works as initially specified are almost complete. A quote for additional works necessary has been submitted to repair additional issues. The work will cost approximately £16,000 and the Society has the funds. The Board recorded its thanks to JC for all his work on the roof, and to Paul Moorbath for his work in securing the Doddington Library.</p>	
<p>Committee Reports</p>	<p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All issues are to be dealt with later in the agenda <p>Museum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has not met <p>Planning Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 38 Stone St: The Board approved the position • 12 Stone St: The Board approved the position 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HG to change planning submission on Preston St to opposition.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gatehouse, Lees Court: The Board approved this position• 88 Preston Street: The Board requested the Planning Committee object to this application as it will represent sub-standard housing in Faversham.• HG advised that the Fleur Hall is closed until further notice so a face-to-face meeting will not be possible at that location.• Ordnance Wharf: AS raised that the policy in the Neighbourhood Plan is part of the Swale Local Plan, and as such if that development fulfils the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan, then it should be approved. DM and CW suggested they do not feel it is in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan. KB suggested we disregard compliance with the Neighbourhood Plan as a major factor and assess the proposal on the Society's objectives.• JC asked whether the application is valid, and AS and HG suggested it is not. HG updated the Board that KCC will not look at the application in its current form for this reason.• DM has been in contact with the Creek Trust and the Heritage Harbour group, both of which are strongly opposed. DM also highlighted that public opinion appears to be strongly against the proposal.• AS asked that we raise that the correct certificates have not been submitted as part of the application.• TS asked whether the Society has an answer for what should be done with the land if not this proposal. CW said a previous proposal has been rejected.• SK submitted comment via email that the proposal for a dinghy club would not be viable. DM also raised this point.• The Board agreed via vote that DM and HG will form the Society's | |
|--|---|--|

	<p>response.</p> <p>PEEP</p> <p>Has not met</p> <p>GPC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has not met • The membership report was approved 	
<p>Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary Procedure • Business Continuity • Business Continuity V2 • Emergency Plan • Fleur Evacuation • Lone Working • Manual Handling • Safeguarding Violence & Aggression • Storage and communication of policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AH suggested that comments will be welcome via email over the next six weeks. SK and AH will then finalise in late September, and present to the Board. There will be a process of amalgamation and indexing. • AH suggested that the museum policies be kept separate. • HW asked for the VIC business continuity plan to be sent to her, and that the bookshop may need them. • AH explained that there are some mandatory policies that we need, and they are the ones that can be combined. • 15th August is the deadline for final comments to be sent to AH. 	<p>Board to submit comments by 15th August.</p>
<p>AGM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Arrangements b. Succession planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice of the AGM has been sent to all members. • All of those who register will be checked against the membership list before they are invited to the meeting. • DM asked that we send the Zoom log in meeting details a week before and then again the day before the AGM to ensure people have them and can prepare. • HG suggested that succession planning is now an issue and we need 	

	<p>to think about where new volunteers and Board members might come from.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC suggested we need a working group to address succession planning and start to think about how to engage younger generations. LM agreed and suggested the Society represents different things to different people in the town. 	
<p>Covid-19 the new normal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second-hand Bookshop & fire escape • Curators • VIC • Museum • Fleur Hall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fire escape has been created in the second-hand bookshop. • Curators: HW has sent documents – the Board agreed the plan for curators as set out in the document, and HW will take responsibility for the curators, as chair of the Museum Committee. HW raised that the curators will need access to the areas of the museum, but HG said this will have to progress slowly, and that at present it would be appropriate to just use the curators' office. • VIC: HG asked that we support Christine in her efforts to re-open the VIC. • Re-opening the museum is not on the agenda currently. • We do not have anyone who can manage the gallery or Fleur Hall currently. JC suggested that need a more formal review of the uses of the hall and gallery. HW suggested this is necessary for all of our assets. HW also asked if volunteers could use the hall if they commit to deep cleaning it. HG said that could be possible. 	
<p>Migration Stories</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Swale Migration Project lead came to meet with Anthony Millett, and came away with a really positive impression and enthusiasm to work with us. HG suggested that this is a good area in which to engage young people, and once we come out of COVID restrictions we should take the opportunity. • The Board approved that we proceed with this as best we can. • HG is going to float an idea with Simon Rowlands to get names on the churchyard trees. • TS has been talking with HG and tech providers about opportunities to use digital opportunities to engage young people in Faversham's heritage. 	

<p>Cleve Hill</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM updated the Board. There has been consideration of whether there could be a judicial review of the decision, but legal advice suggested there is no case. • There are now a series of approvals required by Swale, KFRS and other bodies. DM proposed the Society work with those bodies on mitigation of the worst aspects of the development. The Board approved DM and HG continuing this work. 	
<p>Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Society's work on the SHLAA sites has continued. The process is now for HG to go through them and make sure all the comments are included. KB will then read and sense-check them before they are put in the public domain. • HG also proposes putting the full SHLAA site map on the website. • HG also suggested that at the August Board Meeting we decide which sites we would prefer to be developed. • The Board approved this plan. 	
<p>Housing Police Station Listing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HG raised that we have one opportunity to get our position out. • AS raised that she would prefer the Society to support Option C based on lack of infrastructure proposals. • TS raised that he believes the Swale paper itself should be challenged as it lacks evidence. TS would also challenge that Faversham lacks viability, and that Swale's assessment is wrong. TS also supports AS's view that infrastructure is inadequately dealt with, and that there are no plans supporting this document. TS also challenged Swale's links between jobs and housing in the paper as no evidence is provided. The Swale paper also contains contradictions. • CW suggested that generating infrastructure for the sake of it is not advisable and that we should challenge the assumption, for example, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HG to amend paper to include TS' comments

	<p>that more roads are needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LM agreed with TS' views but believes the vote will happen in any case. • HG suggested a delay while Swale improves the documents, but Swale advised that may be untenable. • KB and DM suggested the statement should include TS' outlined views of the Swale paper to ensure we make consistent arguments throughout. DM also suggested making a point that the assumptions needed to distinguish between the options are base don incredibly flimsy evidence and assessment. • LM, KB and TS raised that the decision at Swale may be political – and KB raised that we should take a position with that in mind. • HG confirmed that he feels it is appropriate Option A at present for reasons outlined above and bearing in mind it is a very political decision. • HG will email TS more wording for approval. • The Board voted 8 to 1 in favour of the paper as it stands, with the addition of TS' comments on evidence and assessment. 	
War memorial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HG asked the Board to decide whether the Society would like to support the re-painting • AS proposed that we should not support the re-painting. DM countered that the Board has already decided to support this and there is no reason not to. HW suggested that we have already offer so this would just constitute a re-issue of this offer. • The Board voted 8-1 in favour of re-issuing our support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JC to send letter offering support.
TS Hazard and Engine Sheds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HG proposed that we proceed to campaign for bringing Hazard back to the ownership of Faversham. The Board supported this proposal. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DM asked for clarification on where we would like ownership of Hazard to reside. HG suggested a conversation is needed to outline options on this. 	
Stone Chapel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HG has written to English Heritage and we now have a volunteer that will visit once a week. 	
AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	
Officers Report	Chair's Report	

NOTES:

Part II

Agenda Item	Minutes	Actions
Confidential matters		

Next Meetings

Date	Agenda
25 th August	Board of Trustees

Future Business