



Whitstable Harbour Strategic Plan

Consultation responses

1. Introduction

Consultation on Canterbury City Council's (CCC) Whitstable Harbour Strategic Plan took place between Monday 6 November 2023 and Monday 8 January 2024.

This Strategic Plan, which covers a ten-year period, exists to ensure we can manage, maintain and invest in the Harbour for generations to come. It sets out the blueprint by which we can ensure that the Harbour remains a welcoming home to our fishing fleet, visitors, and local business.

This consultation sought views on:

- the Harbour Board's Vision Statement
- the themes of the strategic plan, including;
 - effectiveness
 - environment
 - employment
 - equity
 - education.

Respondents were encouraged to comment on the Strategic Plan. They were asked to do this by outlining if they agree or disagree with the proposals, their reasons for why they agree or disagree and which activities are important to them.

A total of 188 responses were received.

2. Executive summary

The main findings from the consultation are:

- Nearly three quarters of respondents agree with the Harbour Boards vision statement, with many of these citing the importance of a commercially working harbour.
- Almost 80% of respondents agree with Theme 1, with the formation of a user group to help the Harbour Board update stakeholders being deemed important by the majority of respondents. Some 15 comments highlighted that some additional detail was needed for this theme.
- Theme 2, 'Environment', received agreement from 87% of respondents with the management of Harbour operations to increase marine biodiversity see as most important. Ensuring harbour activities are sustainable and the protection of the marine environment were highlighted in the comments.
- An overwhelming number of respondents agree with Theme 3 with most of these emphasising the importance of the fish market returning. Comments highlighted that this would support local fisherman.
- Theme 4 received lots of agreement, with most respondents feeling that all of the activities set out were equally importance. Those that commented on Theme 4 felt that harbour activities should be open to all.
- The final theme, 'Education', received 82% agreement. Almost 90% of respondents agree with enhancing schools and museum links to increase awareness of the Harbour's role.

3. Consultation methodology

Consultation took place between Monday 6 November 2023 and Monday 8 January 2024. The following methods were used to seek views:

- an online questionnaire, which received 162 responses
- a paper version of the questionnaire, 24 of which was returned
- written representations were also welcomed and 2 were received.

The consultation was promoted in the following ways:

- an article on the council's newsroom site
- posts on the council's social media channels
- an in-person consultation launch event where information was shared with attendees about the proposed strategic plan
- two in-person stakeholder sessions with interested Whitstable Harbour stakeholders (*summary included in Section 4.3*).
- an in-person public events where council officers were present to answer questions and take suggestions from the public (*summary included in Section 4.4*).

Additionally, the following stakeholders were emailed directly to encourage them to respond to the consultation:

- Whitstable Rocks *
- Harbour Market *
- Bretts *
- C Attenborough *
- Wheeler Restaurant *
- Chris Hunt Fishing Hut *
- Foad Fishing *
- South Quay Shed *
- Dani Shellfish *
- Glyn *
- Graham West *
- Ocean Marine Fishing Hut *
- Barnes Offshore *
- Crab and Winkle Restaurant *
- Harbour Garage *
- Oyster Coast Water Sports *
- Whistable Marine *
- Phil Edwards Fishing *
- Neil Shilling Fishing *
- Whistable Yacht Club *
- Richard Judge *
- Cooper Fishing *
- Ryan Attenborough Fishing *
- RNLI Whitstable *
- Sailmaker Fishing Hut *
- Parish councils
- CCC councillors
- Residents' associations
- Local 'Friends of' groups
- Canterbury Coastal Clinical Commissioning Group
- East Kent Hospitals University NHS Foundation Trust
- Environment Agency
- Kent and Medway CCG (engagement team)
- Kent County Council (KCC), Head of Paid Service
- KCC, Community Wardens
- Kent Fire and Rescue Service
- Kent Police

- Police and Crime Commissioner
- South East Coastal Ambulance Service
- South East Local Enterprise Partnership
- Canterbury 4 Business
- Canterbury Connected Business Improvement District
- Visit Kent
- Canterbury Housing Advice Centre
- Citizens Advice Bureau
- Forward Trust
- Kent Savers Credit Union
- Northgate Ward Community Centre
- Plastic Free Canterbury
- Rising Sun Domestic Abuse
- Thanington Neighbourhood Resource Centre
- Canenco
- Canterbury Cathedral
- Canterbury Festival
- Kent Cultural Transformation Board
- Canterbury Society
- Civic organisations - impact for Lord Mayor
- District Councillors
- Kent Association of Local Councils (KALC)
- KCC, Councillors
- KCC, Arts and Regeneration
- KCC, Social Services
- KCC, 18+
- Local Democracy Forum (Canterbury)
- MPs
- Blean Initiative
- Canterbury Climate Action Partnership (CCAP)
- Kent and Medway Biological Record Centre
- Kentish Stour Countryside Partnership
- Natural England
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
- St Dunstan's Horticultural Society
- Woodland Trust
- Age UK Canterbury
- Canterbury Inter-Faith Association (CANDIFA)
- Disability Advisory Panel (DAP)
- Ethnic Minority Independent Council (EMIC)
- HiKent
- Nigerian Community Association
- Polish Educational Club in Kent (PECK)
- Karibu Community Action Kent
- Kwan Ngei Chinese Association
- Canterbury and District Jewish Community
- Canterbury Muslim Cultural Centre
- Porchlight
- Canterbury Christ Church University
- Canterbury College
- Students Unions
- University for the Creative Arts at Canterbury
- Catching Lives
- Community Safety Partnership
- East Kent Spatial Development Company
- Unison
- British Transport Police

* *Whitstable Harbour stakeholders (if you are not included above but would like to be contacted in future, please contact consultations@canterbury.gov.uk).*

4. Findings

4.1. Questionnaire responses

A total of 186 completed questionnaires were submitted, 162 of which were online and 24 were paper copies.

4.1.1. Respondent profile

Over 84% of respondents are residents of the Canterbury district with just over 4% visitors.

Business respondents included businesses based in the harbour such as Bretts and Cardium Shellfish, along with other local businesses with a specific interest.

Respondent type	Percentage
A resident of the Canterbury district	84.4% (157)
A visitor to the Canterbury district	4.3% (8)
A worker in the Canterbury district	2.2% (4)
A business, organisation or community group	6% (11)
A city, county, parish or town councillor	-
An MP	-
Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>King Charles III England Coast Path National Trail (south east section)</i>- <i>Owner of static caravan, very frequent visitor to Whitstable 20 year knowledge of the harbour</i>- <i>Resident of Whitstable</i>- <i>Student</i>	2.2% (4)

NB: 1.1% (2) of respondents did not respond

The majority of people are between 45 and 64. Only 7% of respondents were under 18.

Age	Percentage
Under 18	7% (13)
18 to 25	1.6% (3)
26 to 34	2.7% (5)

35 to 44	16.1% (30)
45 to 54	20.4% (38)
55 to 64	21.5% (40)
65 to 74	18.3% (34)
75 to 84	5.4% (10)
85 and above	1.1% (2)

NB: 5.9% (11) of respondents did not give their age

More females responded than males, however there was only a small percentage of difference between with quite an even split.

Gender	Percentage
Male	42.5% (79)
Female	47.3% (88)
Prefer to self-describe	1.1% (2)

NB: 9.1% (17) of respondents did not give their gender

4.1.2 Harbour Board's Vision Statement

Respondents were asked if they agreed with the Harbour Boards Vision Statement.

The majority of respondents said that they support the vision statement.

Support	Percentage
Yes	73.7% (137)
No	2.2% (4)
Somewhat	22.6% (42)
Not sure	1.6% (3)

Respondents were asked if they had any other views on the Harbour Board's Vision Statement and the following comments were received:

- Commercially working harbour is vital (40 comments)
- Agree with aims (20 comments)
- Do more for local residents (19 comments)
- Important location, needs protecting (15 comments)
- Have some where fishermen can sell their catch (11 comments)
- Not clear (9 comments)
- Remember the history of the harbour (8 comments)
- Put in a cinema (4 comments)
- Consider sustainability (4 comments)
- Harbour needs to be accessible (2 comments)
- South Quay Shed is a great addition to the area (2 comments)
- Clear cycle path needed in the harbour (1 comment)
- They are here to serve, not line own pockets (1 comment)
- Little effort to support yachts visiting (1 comment)
- Mention risks of flooding (1 comment)
- Rebuild area destroyed by fire (1 comment)
- Get rid of Bretts (1 comment)
- Stop negative impact from water companies (1 comment)
- Agree with education centre (1 comment)
- Where is the money gained from the harbour spent? (1 comment)
- Need more big businesses (1 comment)

4.1.3 Theme 1 - Effectiveness (Views on the proposed approach)

Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree with the approach in Theme 1.

An overwhelming majority of respondents either strongly agree or tend to agree. Only 8.1% of respondents disagreed with the theme and its activities to some extent.

Level of agreement	Percentage
Strongly agree	33.3% (62)
Tend to agree	44.6% (83)
Neither agree nor disagree	14% (26)
Tend to disagree	5.4% (10)
Strongly disagree	2.7% (5)

4.1.4 Theme 1 - Effectiveness (Activities important to respondents)

Respondents were asked which activities are most important to them in Theme 1.

The most important activity to respondents is to form a user group to help the Board update Harbour stakeholders, over 88% of respondents said this was important to some extent.

The least important activity was to conduct a review of the Harbour Act with just over 7% saying it wasn't important to some extent. However, over 71% still said this was important to some extent.

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all
Form a user group to help the Board update Harbour stakeholders	94	71	15	2	4
	50.5%	38.2%	8.1%	1.1%	2.2%
Devolve responsibilities	59	83	33	2	9

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all
y and regular monitoring to independent members of the Board	31.7%	44.6%	17.7%	1.1%	4.8%
Introduce a balance scorecard to monitor implementation of the Strategic Plan	58	78	37	7	6
	31.2%	41.9%	19.9%	3.8%	3.2%
Conduct a review of Harbour Act	63	70	39	11	3
	33.9%	37.6%	21%	5.9%	1.6%

Respondents were asked for any other comments on Theme 1 and the following comments were received:

- Support approach (17 comments)
- More detail needed (15 comments)
- Support locals, including businesses (7 comments)
- Make sure the board is representative (6 comments)
- Do it correctly (6 comments)
- Do not feel a connection to the harbour (4 comments)
- More communication needed (4 comments)
- How is effectiveness being monitored (3 comments)
- Warnings needed on dangers within the harbour (3 comments)
- Accessibility is important (2 comments)
- Environmental concerns are important (2 comments)
- Important to preserve history (2 comments)
- Annual stakeholder event is important (2 comments)
- Commercial interest is a conflict (1 comment)
- Maintain operations within the harbour (1 comment)
- It doesn't need a reputation for safety (1 comment)
- It should be more commercial (1 comment)

4.1.5. Theme 2 - Environment (Views on the proposed approach)

Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree on the proposed approach in Theme 2. An overwhelming majority of respondents said they agree with the approach.

Level of agreement	Percentage
Strongly agree	53.2% (99)
Tend to agree	33.9% (63)
Neither agree nor disagree	9.1% (17)
Tend to disagree	2.7% (5)
Strongly disagree	1.1% (2)

4.1.6 Theme 2 - Environment (Activities important to respondents)

Respondents were also asked which activities were important to them in Theme 2, the majority said to assess how Harbour operations can be managed to actively increase marine biodiversity is most important.

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all	No reply
Develop an action plan to remove single use plastics from the Harbour with stakeholders	117	57	12	-	-	-
	62.9%	30.6%	6.5%	-	-	-

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all	No reply
Assess how Harbour operations can be managed to actively increase marine biodiversity	125	53	6	1	1	-
	67.2%	28.5%	3.2%	0.5%	0.5%	-
Develop feasible renewable energy projects to seek funding to actively reduce our carbon footprint	109	59	15	2	1	-
	58.6%	31.7%	8.1%	1.1%	0.5%	-
Engage local stakeholders in additional non statutory water quality testing	117	48	18	1	2	-
	62.9%	25.8%	9.7%	0.5%	1.1%	-
Identify and achieve relevant environmental accreditations (eg EcoPort status)	89	58	30	6	2	1
	47.8%	31.2%	16.1%	3.2%	1.1%	0.5%

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all	No reply
Review and update The Harbour Design Guide	60	75	39	7	5	-
	32.3%	40.3%	21%	3.8%	2.7%	-
Improve the public realm and accessibility of buildings	89	65	22	6	4	-
	48.4%	34.9%	11.8%	3.2%	2.2%	-

Respondents were asked for any other comments on Theme 2 and the following comments were received:

- Protect the marine environment (28 comments)
- Make all harbour activities sustainable (21 comments)
- Agree with proposals (13 comments)
- More information needed (8 comments)
- Don't think it'll be done, need strict KPIs (7 comments)
- Accessibility is important (3 comments)
- Get rid of Bretts (3 comments)
- Protect history of the area (3 comments)
- Make clear deadlines for aims (3 comments)
- Look for ideas in other working harbours (1 comment)
- Involve all harbour tenants (1 comment)

4.1.7 Theme 3 - Employment (Views on the proposed approach)

Respondents were asked if they agree to the approach in Theme 3, over 90% of respondents said they agree to some extent.

Level of agreement	Percentage
Strongly agree	51.6% (96)
Tend to agree	39.2% (73)
Neither agree nor disagree	5.4% (10)
Tend to disagree	2.7% (5)
Strongly disagree	1.1% (2)

4.1.8 Theme 3 - Employment (Activities important to respondents)

Respondents were asked which activities in Theme 3 are most important to them, the vast majority of respondents said that they would like to return the fish market to allow local fisherman to sell their catch.

Respondents feel that extending the pontoon to widen commercial opportunities for leisure craft is the least important activity with under 55% considering it important compared to other goals in this theme.

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all
Extend the pontoon to widen commercial opportunities for leisure craft	48	54	51	15	18
	25.8%	29%	27.4%	8.1%	9.7%
Return a fish market to allow local fisherman	136	37	7	4	2
	73.1%	19.9%	3.8%	2.2%	1.1%

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all
to sell their catch					
Review the role of the council retaining a commercial presence in the South Quay Shed	65	58	45	11	7
	34.9%	31.2%	24.2%	5.9%	3.8%
Explore enabling short-term activities (eg pop-up markets and events) throughout the year	92	65	19	7	3
	49.5%	34.9%	10.2%	3.8%	1.6%
Commercially develop the Cockle Shed site to complement our existing leisure offer	90	53	31	5	7
	48.4%	28.5%	16.7%	2.7%	3.8%
Support the development of a Strategic Planning Document for the Harbour	92	65	21	3	5
	49.5%	34.9%	11.3%	1.6%	2.7%

Respondents were also asked for any other comments relating to Theme 3 and the following comments were received:

- We need a fish market (40 comments)
- Protect local employment (19 comments)
- Agree with proposal (13 comments)
- Keep fishing industry going (10 comments)
- Add additional leisure facilities, i.e. cinema (10 comments)
- Need more detail (6 comments)
- Concern of commercial businesses coming in (5 comments)
- Concern for making pontoon larger (5 comments)
- Burnt shed is sad to see (3 comments)
- Ensure it's accessible (2 comments)
- Need to see less words more action (2 comments)
- Protect Bretts (2 comments)
- Get rid of Bretts (1 comment)
- Review of Zone D needs detail (1 comment)

4.1.9 Theme 4 - Equity (Views on the proposed approach)

Over 83% of respondents agree to some extent the approaches set out in Theme 4. Only 14% disagree.

Level of agreement	Percentage
Strongly agree	54.8% (102)
Tend to agree	28.5% (53)
Neither agree nor disagree	12.4% (23)
Tend to disagree	2.2% (4)
Strongly disagree	1.1% (2)
No reply	1.1% (2)

4.1.10 Theme 4 - Equity (Activities important to respondents)

Respondents have said that 3 of the activities in Theme 4 are important to them with over 82% saying that activities 2, 3 and 4 are important and very few disagree saying that they are not important to them.

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all	No reply
Install a hearing loop system in the South Quay Shed	67	73	26	14	5	1
	36%	39.2%	14%	7.5%	2.7%	0.5%
Carry out an accessibility study of the Harbour	99	57	16	8	5	1
	53.2%	30.6%	8.6%	4.3%	2.7%	0.5%
Identify and find ways in which the Harbour can improve access to the sea for disabled and under	105	50	21	4	5	1
	56.5%	26.9%	11.3%	2.2%	2.7%	0.5%

represented groups						
To promote a wide range of different means of safely accessing the water	91	62	19	8	5	1
	48.9%	33.3%	10.2%	4.3%	2.7%	0.5%

Respondents were asked if they had any other comments on Theme 4 and the following comments were received::

- Harbour activities should be open to all (32 comments)
- Agree with proposals (19 comments)
- Cost v benefit needed (8 comments)
- Ensure it's not detriment to core functions (6 comments)
- Council need to support local businesses with accessibility (5 comments)
- Have assistance when boarding boats (2 comments)
- More support for tourism needed (1 comment)
- Diversity is important (1 comment)
- More seating needed (1 comment)
- Car parking does not support this (1 comment)
- More detail needed (1 comment)
- Dogs should be on lead in the harbour (1 comment)

4.1.11 Theme 5 - Education (Views on the proposed approach)

Respondents were asked for their views on the approaches within Theme 5, over 82% said that they agree to some extent.

Level of agreement	Percentage
Strongly agree	43% (80)
Tend to agree	39.2% (73)
Neither agree nor disagree	10.8% (20)
Tend to disagree	4.8% (9)
Strongly disagree	1.1% (2)
No reply	1.1% (2)

4.1.12 Theme 5 - Education (Activities important to respondents)

Over 72% of respondents said that providing a community classroom is important to them.

An overwhelming 88% of respondents said that connecting with local schools is important to them.

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all	No reply
Provide a community classroom/meeting room to support education visits within the Harbour	64	71	29	11	10	1
	34.4%	38.2%	15.6%	5.9%	5.4%	0.5%
Develop a dedicated online presence for the Harbour	69	60	35	12	9	1
	37.1%	32.3%	18.8%	6.5%	4.8%	0.5%
Improve online access and wifi in the Harbour	66	52	41	15	11	1
	35.5%	28%	22%	8.1%	5.9%	0.5%
Support the development of a destination	51	67	46	10	12	-
	27.4%	36%	24.7%	5.4%	6.5%	-

	Very important	Quite important	Neither important nor unimportant	Not very important	Not important at all	No reply
marketing strategy/brand						
Enhance the use of digital media to engage with the local community	59	66	39	15	7	-
	31.7%	35.5%	21%	8.1%	3.8%	-
Enhance links with local schools and museums to increase awareness of the role the Harbour has played in the development of the town	101	62	13	5	3	-
	54.3%	33.3%	8.1%	2.7%	1.6%	-

Respondents were asked if they had any other comments on Theme 5 and the following comments were received::

- Link with local history (25 comments)
- Use the education aspect for children (13 comments)
- Agree with proposals (14 comments)
- Promote the area to tourists (10 comments)
- Cost v benefit needed (5 comments)
- It's not vital (5 comments)
- Ensure everything is accessible (3 comments)
- Important to reach others digitally (2 comments)
- Specific website and comms plan needed for harbour (1 comment)
- Add more plug sockets into South Quay Shed so people can work there (1 comment)

4.2. Written representations

A total of 2 written representations were received.

4.2.1. National Highways

National Highways submitted following comments via email:

[...] We are concerned about the safety, reliability, and operational efficiency of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), in this case the M2 and A2 in the vicinity of the area covered by the Plan.

Given the focus of the Strategic Plan and the distance of Whitstable Harbour from the SRN (approximately 7 miles from M2 junction 7 and over 6 miles from the A2 junction with the A2050) we are satisfied that the implementation of the Plan would not have an unacceptable impact on the safety, reliability and/or operational efficiency of the SRN. Our formal response is No Objection.

In terms of future activity, we would need to be engaged on proposals for intensifying, expanding or diversifying uses at the Harbour where there is a prospect of generating additional long-distance vehicle trips (work-related and/or visitors) that may use and impact on the SRN, in this case the M2 and A2.

Each proposal would need to be supported by a Transport Assessment prepared in accordance with the Department for Transport (DFT) Circular 01/2022: Strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development (December 2022) -

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/strategic-road-network-and-the-delivery-of-sustainable-development/strategic-road-network-and-the-delivery-of-sustainable-development>.

We encourage all parties promoting these proposals to engage with us at the early pre-application stage to discuss each case and the information that needs to be submitted.

We would like to draw your attention to our updated Planning Guide (October 2023), which provides guidance on how NH engages with the planning system and the evidence we expect to see to inform our decisions about the impacts on the SRN: https://nationalhighways.co.uk/media/2depj2hh/final-cre23_0370-nh-planning-guide-2023.pdf.

4.2.2. Whitstable Society

Whitstable Society submitted following comments via email:

[...] Q1 What if it substitutes for existing businesses.

- *Q2 Why only at the harbour?*
- *Q3. What if it substitutes for a marine business which would expand use of the harbour and raise marine related skills; regardless whether the business is local.*
- *Q 4. What is local? Locally owned (resident)? Employs local people? Does local mean; the District or just the town?*

- *[The vision (a) and (b)] is not a vision statement in several respects.*
 - *1)The first part (a) is unconnected to the rest or is part of (b). Could put 'other local businesses'.*
 - *2) It needs 'driving marine related business' included as it is a working harbour and all that goes with it hangs off that.*

- *Edge of S Quay. Must be given priority use to marine related industry.*
- *No mention of residential development, despite this being a part of the Local Plan ;ie an adjunct.*
- *No mention of the local fishermen who use the public quay or the needs of our fishing industry.*
- *No mention of management of jet skis on our beaches and at the entrance to the harbour.*
- *No mention of seasonality as a policy matter. Ship-building is all year round. Open air retail is not.*
- *No mention of training.*
- *The Harbour Estate beyond the harbour environs is not addressed as a separate matter as it should be when setting out strategy.*
- *History is ignored. For example will remaining vestiges be protected.*
- *We don't see policy for the use and rules for the western face of the West Quay.*

4.3. Stakeholder sessions

Two stakeholder sessions were held on Wednesday 15th November 2023 and Friday 17 November 2024, facilitated by council officers.

These sessions were promoted via email to Whitstable Harbour stakeholders and approximately 11 attended, some of which represented other stakeholders.

During the sessions, stakeholders were asked for their comments on the Harbour Board's Vision Statement and the Strategic Plan themes and the following comments were received:

- Retain working Harbour, protect uniqueness (6 comments)
- Supportive of new vision (5 comments)
- Positive feedback on strategic commitments and goals (5 comments)
- Return Fishmarket (5 comments)
- Redevelop Cockle Shed site (5 comments)
- Themes struck the correct balance (4 comments)
- Support the fishing industry (4 comments)
- Dedicated Harbour website, free public WiFi (4 comments)
- Important to promote the Harbour's heritage (3 comments)
- Educational space for school trips, community groups (3 comments)
- Staff presence at weekends (2 comments)
- Improve destination marketing (2 comments)
- Look at ways to extend trading season (2 comments)
- Explore renewable options (1 comment)

4.4. Public event

A public meeting was held at South Quay Shed, Whitstable on Wednesday 13 December 2023 from 5pm to 7pm.

The event was promoted via email to a wide array of stakeholders on the council's newsroom website as well as social media channels.

The event was attended by 18 people.

The following comments were made by residents:

- Will you retain from the previous strategic plans the no residency not even for one overnight stay?
- Will the lack of ring fencing affect your plans and the way in which you can get them done quickly?
- Will everything remain harbour dependent and beneficial?
- Do you consider residents as stakeholders?
- It was said the annual meeting was poorly attended, i've been to every meeting and they've always been well attending, amazingly good events, covid slowed things down but you're right to bring it back again, it must be continued
- Safety - will anything be monitored and enforced on wheels including scooters, motorcycles etc.. they are dangerous within the harbour
- Clarity on time scales for formulated plans for zone D, will this not happen till 2026? Nothing near term coming up with ideas for strategies and consultation
- Looking ahead, the rebuilt cockle shed, I hope this will be rebuilt to the same size and style as it was originally, pushing the car park back. We don't need more cars on the harbour
- We do need a proper fish market, not frozen. We need a local fish market as we don't have a fishmonger in the town
- Small cinema inside the cockle shed will be beneficial
- What is the time scale for the cockle shed to be rebuilt
- When will the fish market be back
- Didn't see in the plan reference to persevering fishing, local residents and visitors and expanding the opportunity for the harbour to be a hub for Whitstables tourism. Could we use the harbour to attract more people to visit Whitstable by sea rather than by land e.g. ferry from London, South End or Medway.
- There was a big influx in visitors from the Waverly for a few hours, this is the sort of thing we need to promote more often
- There are proposals submitted for the East Quay, what sort of detail do you require in the proposals for this
- Will we have another draft plan after this consultation?
- Is this survey accessible online and can this presentation be put online?

5. Conclusions

Overall, the survey results show that there is overwhelming support for the Whitstable Harbour Strategic Plan with the majority of respondents saying they agree with all of the themes set out.

This report provides a range of information about the activities which are most important to them and how much they agree with each theme.

While respondents said that some activities were more important to them than others, there were no outstanding figures where the majority disagreed with approaches.

It is clear that there is widespread support for the plan and that the things most important are to set up a fish market within the harbour and support the local residents, including fishermen.

Given the response rate and overall engagement during the consultation period, residents seem engaged with the harbour board and supporting the plan.

It is hoped that the findings from this consultation provide useful insight as to how the council will proceed during its review of the Whitstable Harbour Strategic Plan.