


Faversham Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment

Site Details

Detail	Assessment
Site Reference / Name	CNP3 Former Coach Depot
 <p data-bbox="201 1122 288 1155">1:2500</p>	
Site Address / Location	Former Coach Depot
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.10
SHLAA Reference (if applicable)	Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan & SHLAA ref 18/203
Existing land use	Part of the site is used as a car wash. There are two existing single-storey buildings, once used as an office, the other as a motor repair garage and architectural salvage storage.
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Ground floor to include a mix of Class B1 (offices and workshops), Class A1 (retail), and facilities for boat users. The upper floors to be residential use (C3) and holiday lets (C1).



Detail	Assessment
Landowner estimate of development capacity (if known)	Unknown
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHLAA, Call for Sites consultation, FCNP, public)	Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan & SHLAA ref 18/203
Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)	None
Neighbouring uses	The northern boundary is adjacent to the river. The eastern boundary is adjacent to a car park and Standard Quay industrial buildings. The southern boundary is adjacent to Abbey Road. The western boundary is adjacent to a car park.

Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</p> <p>Ancient Woodland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Biosphere Reserve Local Nature Reserve (LNR) National Nature Reserve (NNR) National Park Ramsar Site Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Special Protection Area (SPA)</p> <p>Yes/ No/ Unknown</p> <p>Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</p> <p>Yes/ No/ Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>



Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Corridor Local Wildlife Site (LWS) Public Open Space Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) Nature Improvement Area Regionally Important Geological Site Other</p> <p>Yes/ No/ Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</p> <p>See guidance notes: Flood Zone 1: Low Risk Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk</p>	<p>High Risk - the whole of the site is within Flood Zone 3a(i)</p>
<p>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</p> <p>See guidance notes: Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk</p>	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species?</p> <p>Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats?</p> <p>Is the site part of: A wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity); wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or An area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - Priority Habitat Inventory - Mudflats (England). Priority Species for CS Targeting - Lapwing. Priority Species for CS Targeting - Redshank.</p>
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or within adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>



Physical Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site: Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping</p>	<p>Flat or relatively flat</p>
<p>Is there existing vehicle access, or potential to create vehicle access to the site? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - access could be gained from Abbey Road although the road is quite narrow.</p>
<p>Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access, or potential to create pedestrian/cycle access to the site?</p> <p>Pedestrian? Yes / No / Unknown</p> <p>Cycle? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - access could be gained from Abbey Road although the road is quite narrow and there is only a pedestrian footpath on one side of the road.</p> <p>Yes - access could be gained from Abbey Road although the road is quite narrow.</p>
<p>Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No - no trees on the site</p>
<p>Are there veteran/ancient or other significant trees within or adjacent to the site? Are they owned by third parties?</p> <p>Significant trees? Yes, within / Yes, adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p>Potentially veteran or ancient trees present? Yes, within / Yes, adjacent / No / Unknown</p> <p>Owned by third parties? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>
<p>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No - site is adjacent to a Public Right of Way</p>



Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination? Yes / No / Unknown	Unknown
Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations? Yes / No / Unknown	Unknown
Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value? Yes / No / Unknown	No



Accessibility

Factor		Guidance
Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. Additional facilities can be added to the list. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk. This can be measured using Google Maps :		
What is the distance to the following facilities (measured from the edge of the site)	Distance (metres)	Comments
Town / local centre / shop	<600m 600-1800m >1800m	600-1800m
Bus Stop	<400m 400-800m >800m	400-800m
Train station	<600m 600-1800m >1800m	600-1800m
Primary School	<400m 400-1200m >1200m	<400m
Secondary School	<1600m 1600-3900m >3900m	<1600m (Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School)
Open Space / recreation facilities	<400m 400-800m >800m	<400m



Landscape and Visual Constraints

This section should be answered based on existing evidence (see guidance notes) or by a qualified landscape consultant.

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?</p> <p>Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.</p>	<p>Low sensitivity</p>
<p>Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?</p> <p>Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p>Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.</p> <p>High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.</p>	<p>Medium sensitivity</p> <p>The site forms an important part of the landscape of Faversham Creek, and development would need to respond sensitively to the context, although it is a traditionally industrial/maritime area and could accommodate development which is in keeping with its surroundings.</p>



Heritage Constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</p> <p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</p> <p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible - numerous grade II listed buildings in close proximity to the site.</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible</p> <p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible</p> <p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>	<p>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</p>



Planning policy constraints

Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>CD1 Use classes: the ground floors shall include a mix of Class B1 (offices and workshops), Class A1 (retail), and facilities for boat users. The upper floors to be in residential use (Class C3) and holiday lets (Class C1).</p>
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	<p>The Swale Borough Local Plan: Policy ST 3 The Swale settlement strategy Policy DM21 Water, flooding and drainage Policy CP 8 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment Policy DM33 Development affecting Conservation area Policy DM32 Development involving listed buildings</p>
<p>Is the site: A mix of greenfield and previously developed land Previously developed land? Greenfield</p>	<p>Previously developed land</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area? Within the existing built up area (infill)? Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area? Outside and not connected to the existing built up area?</p>	<p>Within the existing built up area (infill)</p>



Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p>Within the existing settlement boundary?</p> <p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary?</p> <p>Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?</p>	<p>Within the existing settlement boundary</p>
<p>Could development of the site result in any public gain, eg accessibility to green space/connecting foot paths/cycle paths/public access to creek</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes, potential for public Creekside access and could contribute to a continuous Creekside path.</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>



Assessment of Availability

Indicator of Availability	Assessment
Is the site available for development? Yes / No / Unknown.	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? Yes / No / Unknown.	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years.	Unknown

Viability

Indicators of Viability	Assessment
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? Yes / No / Unknown. What evidence is available to support this judgement?	Existing buildings would require demolition.



Conclusions	Assessment
Summary of key development constraints affecting the site	The site forms part of the Creekside the development would need to respond sensitively to the context and development would need to be in keeping with its surroundings. Flood risk.
What is the estimated development capacity of the site?	4-6 dwellings on upper floors with commercial space below.
What is the likely timeframe for development? (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	Unknown
Other key information	
<p>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</p> <p>The site is suitable, available and achievable</p> <p>The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable</p> <p>The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable</p>	<p>The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable</p>



Summary of justification for rating

The site is potentially suitable for allocation.

The site is in Flood Risk Zone 3a(i) and therefore any residential development should be restricted to the upperfloors. It is located on the edge of Faversham Creek, opposite a new development of 3-storey riverside homes and surrounded by light industrial uses and residential development. It would be capable of supporting a 2-3 storey mixed use development with employment/retail on the ground floor with residential above. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required as part of any planning application. Development will only be permitted where it satisfies the Exception Test.

The site is within the Conservation Area and care should be taken to avoid adverse impact on the Grade II listed buildings within the Provender Mill complex to the east. The site also forms an important part of the setting of the Grade II listed Anchor Inn and a characterful unlisted building on the corner of Abbey Road and Abbey Street, and any new development should be designed to enhance the northwards view up Abbey Road from the Anchor. Building heights should be no more than 3-storeys.

There is currently no footway leading to the site, so pedestrians currently share the road with motor vehicles. Provision of suitable pedestrian access is likely to be necessary should the site be redeveloped.

There are existing structures on site, and



Conclusions	Assessment
	<p>the land may require remediation in order to be developed. This, combined with the need for flood mitigation, is likely to increase development costs, potentially affecting site viability.</p>

