


Faversham Neighbourhood Planning Site Assessment

Site Details

Detail	Assessment
Site Reference / Name	FNP10 The Railway Yard, Station Road, Faversham, ME13 8GE
 <p>1:2500</p>	
Site Address / Location	The Railway Yard, Station Road, Faversham, ME13 8GE
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.73
SHLAA Reference (if applicable)	n/a
Existing land use	Residential
Land use being considered, if known (e.g. housing, community use, commercial, mixed use)	Residential (1-2 bed properties)
Landowner estimate of development capacity (if known)	Unknown
Site identification method / source (e.g. SHLAA, Call for Sites consultation, FCNP, public)	Call for sites

Detail	Assessment
<p>Planning history (Live or previous planning applications/decisions)</p>	<p>The land to the east, which was the old Hunter Saphir Plc Eurocentre, has been redeveloped into the Jubilee Way housing development and a business park in the early 2000s. The Railway Yard site is partially masked by an existing tree line around the edge</p>
<p>Neighbouring uses</p>	<p>The northern boundary is adjacent to housing and Faversham Recreation Ground. The eastern boundary is adjacent to the Jubilee Way housing development and business park. The southern boundary is adjacent to the railway line. The western boundary is adjacent to St Marys Road and Station Road.</p>



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>Unknown</p> <p>Unknown</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>Low Risk (small section of the middle of the site which is in Flood Zone 3)</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>Medium 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>Adjacent to a Woodland Improvement (High Spatial Priority) area. Adjacent to Priority Habitat</p> <p>Inventory Deciduous Woodland and National Forest Inventory area. 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
Is the site: Flat or relatively flat Gently sloping or uneven Steeply sloping	Flat or relatively flat
Is there existing vehicle access, or potential to create vehicle access to the site? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes - access could be gained from Station Road.
Is there existing pedestrian/cycle access, or potential to create pedestrian/cycle access to the site? Pedestrian? Yes / No / Unknown Cycle? Yes / No / Unknown	Yes - access could be gained from Station Road. There is currently no pedestrian footpath on the road within the site. Site submission states the site could be opened up in the north easterly corner, allowing pedestrians direct access from the recreation ground to the station through the proposed development site. Yes - access could be gained from Station Road.
Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site? Yes / No / Unknown	No



Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<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>Unknown</p>
<p>Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - public right of way runs across a footbridge over the site.</p>
<p>Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value? Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>No</p>

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	<p style="text-align: center;"> <600m 600-1800m >1800m </p>	<p style="color: green;"><400m (Preston Street - town centre)</p>
Bus Stop	<p style="text-align: center;"> <400m 400-800m >800m </p>	<p style="color: green;"><400m</p>
Train station	<p style="text-align: center;"> <600m 600-1800m >1800m </p>	<p style="color: green;"><400m</p>
Primary School	<p style="text-align: center;"> <400m 400-1200m >1200m </p>	<p style="color: orange;">400-1200m (St Mary Charity Cof E Primary School)</p>
Secondary School	<p style="text-align: center;"> <1600m 1600-3900m >3900m </p>	<p style="color: green;"><1600m (Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School)</p>
Open Space / recreation facilities	<p style="text-align: center;"> <400m 400-800m >800m </p>	<p style="color: green;">400m (Faversham Recreation Ground)</p>



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>Low sensitivity</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>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</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>No</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 DM33 Development affecting Conservation area. Policy CP7 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</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>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)? Within the existing settlement boundary? Adjacent to and connected to the existing settlement boundary? Outside and not connected to the existing settlement boundary?</p>	<p>Within the existing settlement boundary</p>



Indicator of Suitability	Assessment
<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 a footpath through the site linking railway station to Recreation Ground, linking to railway bridge</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.	0-5 years

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?	The site has been cleared, but there may be a need for land remediation and relocation of infrastructure, which may affect site viability.



Conclusions	Assessment
Summary of key development constraints affecting the site	No significant constraints identified
What is the estimated development capacity of the site?	Minimum 17-18 homes, more depending on housing type.
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>Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable</p>

Summary of justification for rating

The site is potentially suitable for allocation.

The site is a former railway yard located within close proximity of the railway station and close to the town centre, which is being promoted for residential development for 45 apartments. The existing access from Station Road could service the development subject to provision of a footway, and the landowner has indicated that additional pedestrian access could be established to the adjacent recreation ground to the north.

It is somewhat isolated from nearby residential development, but it would represent an opportunity for re-use of previously developed land.

The site is adjacent to the railway and is liable to be affected by rail noise which would need to be addressed in any development proposal. The developer has indicated that an acoustic fence could be provided to mitigate the noise. A small part of the site is in Flood Risk Zone 3 - this crosses the access road, and a drainage solution is likely to be required to allow safe access to the site. There is also a risk of surface water flooding which should be addressed in the drainage strategy.

Although the site covers approx. 0.73ha, the developable area is reduced to approx. 0.5ha once the long access road and the land beneath and to the east of the footbridge is removed from consideration, and the proposed 45 dwellings is likely to represent overdevelopment of the site.



Conclusions	Assessment
	<p>The site has been cleared, but there may be a need for land remediation, as well as the relocation of infrastructure, which has the potential to affect site viability.</p>

