| Site | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Reference | 0828 |
| Address | Former Conoco Site/Thameside Terminal, Salt Lane |
| Description | Relatively flat site mainly formed of hardstanding. There is one two-storey office and open storage facility on site. One access road |
| Size (ha) | 6.77 |
| Relevant policy guidance | - |
| Location Plan | Ford |

| Development Potential | | |
|------------------------------|------------|--------|
| Residential (units) | 163 | |
| Employment (m ²) | Office | 67,710 |
| | Industrial | 27,085 |
| | Storage | 27,085 |
| Main Town Centre Uses | | |
| (m ²) | | |
| Other Uses | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Facilities & Services | Site has poor access to services and | |
| Accessibility | facilities. | |
| Public Transport | Site has poor access to public transport | |
| Accessibility | opportunities. | |
| Highway Network | It is anticipated that the highway network | |
| Capacity | around the site could accommodate the | |
| | traffic generated by the development, | |
| | although some enhancements, funded by | |
| | the developer, may be required. | |
| Site Access | Access to the strategic highway network | |
| | (M2/A2) is via the Four Elms Roundabout | |
| | and A289. Whilst there are currently some | |
| | capacity issues experienced at this junction, | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| | upgrades are planned and are expected to go someway towards resolving these constraints. | |
| | Detailed assessment of the implications of development for the Four Elms Roundabout is likely to be required to inform the local plan and development management process. Assessment of M2 Junction 1 may also be required. | |
| | Access around the Medway urban distributor network is likely to be constrained by a number of identified congestion hotspots including Medway Tunnel in particular. | |
| | Whilst it is possible that strategic infrastructure upgrades may address these congestion issues, improving access to the urban distributor network, there are no upgrades planned or identified at present. | |
| | Further detailed assessment would need to be undertaken (as part of the Local Plan or development management process) to demonstrate how traffic generated be the development could be accommodated on the network. | |
| | Developer contributions may be required to fund infrastructure upgrades necessary to address capacity constraints. | |
| Ecological Potential | An ecological survey of the site has not been investigated as part of this high level assessment and as such the presence or absence of protected species and/or habitats cannot be established at this stage. | |
| | Further assessment would therefore need to be undertaken through the Local Plan or Development Management process, before development could be supported or rejected. | |
| Designated Habitats | Natural England guidance (Impact Risk Zones) indicates that development of this | |

| Suitability - General | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| • | site poses a potential risk to a SSSI. | | |
| | Further assessment of the potential impacts of development upon designated habitats would therefore need to be undertaken through the Local Plan or Development Management process, before development could be supported or rejected. | | |
| | The site is situated immediately adjacent to the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA/Ramsar. Careful regard will also need to be had to the recreational impacts of the development through any further assessment of this site Site-specific mitigation maybe required in addition to strategic mitigation. | | |
| Landscape | Development is unlikely to have a detrimental impact upon the locally valued landscapes. | | |
| Heritage | Development is unlikely to have an impact upon any designated heritage assets. | | |
| Air Quality | Site may be constrained by air pollution but mitigation likely to be deliverable. | | |
| Contamination | Contamination is known or suspected on site but remediation is considered to be deliverable | | |
| Site Developability | Whilst the site is subject to some development abnormals, these are considered resolvable. | | |
| Agricultural Land | Site is within built up area and development would not result in the loss of any agricultural land. | | |
| Open Space | Site is not designated open space. | | |

| Suitability – Housing | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Part of the site is subject to a high level of | | |
| | flood risk but it is expected that this could | | |
| | be resolved and that the site would pass | | |
| | the sequential test for flood risk. | | |
| Noise | Site is unlikely to be constrained by noise | | |
| | pollution. | | |
| Employment Land | Site is not designated employment land. | | |
| Amenity/Overlooking | There are no residential properties | | |
| | adjacent to the site and | | |

| | amenity/overlooking impacts would be unlikely. | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Employment Land | Site is not designated employment land. | |
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
| | development unless identified constraints can be addressed. | |

| Suitability – Economic Development | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Level of flood risk on the site is considered | | |
| | acceptable for commercial uses. | | |
| Noise | Commercial uses on the site are unlikely to be | | |
| | constrained by noise pollution. | | |
| Amenity | Mainly residential or rural area with no other | | |
| | commercial uses. | | |
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | | |
| | development unless identified constraints can | | |
| | be addressed. | | |

| Suitability – Mixed Use | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Overall | Overall The site is considered unsuitable for | | | |
| | development unless identified constraints can | | | |
| | be addressed. | | | |

Availability Landowner is actively promoting the site for redevelopment. Planning application MC/14/1896 Retention of Plots 1, Part 2 and 8 for haulage and/or platform hire use with associated parking along with approximately 0.4ha of open storage

| Site | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Reference | 0836 | | |
| Address | Land to the East of Church Street | | |
| Description | Relatively flat open space with football pitches laid out, trees on the perimeter. Shelter belt dividing open space and open agricultural land. Site includes leisure facilities. Housing that surrounds the site tends to be two storey (detached and semi-detached) | | |
| Size (ha) | 15.46 | | |
| Relevant policy guidance | - | | |
| Location Plan | Cliffe Same South Same South | | |

| Development Potential | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|--|
| Residential (units) | 371 | | |
| Employment (m²) | Office | 154,555 m2 | |
| | Industrial | 61,820 m2 | |
| | Storage | 61,820 m2 | |
| Main Town Centre Uses | | | |
| (m ²) | | | |
| Other Uses | | | |

| Suitability - General | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Facilities & Services | Site has poor access to public transport | | |
| Accessibility | opportunities. | | |
| Public Transport | Site has poor access to public transport | | |
| Accessibility | opportunities. | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Highway Network | Access to the strategic highway network | |
| Capacity | (M2/A2) is via the Four Elms Roundabout | |
| , | and A289. Whilst there are currently some | |
| | capacity issues experienced at this junction, | |
| | upgrades are planned and are expected to | |
| | go someway towards resolving these | |
| | constraints. | |
| | Constraints. | |
| | Detailed assessment of the implications of | |
| | development for the Four Elms | |
| | Roundabout is likely to be required to | |
| | inform the local plan and development | |
| | management process. Assessment of M2 | |
| | Junction 1 may also be required. | |
| | Junction 1 may also be required. | |
| | Access around the Medway urban | |
| | distributor network is likely to be | |
| | constrained by a number of identified | |
| | congestion hotspots including Medway | |
| | Tunnel in particular. | |
| | Turner in particular. | |
| | Whilst it is possible that strategic | |
| | infrastructure upgrades may address these | |
| | congestion issues, improving access to the | |
| | urban distributor network, there are no | |
| | upgrades planned or identified at present. | |
| | applicates planned or identified at present. | |
| | Further detailed assessment would need to | |
| | be undertaken (as part of the Local Plan or | |
| | development management process) to | |
| | demonstrate how traffic generated be the | |
| | development could be accommodated on | |
| | the network. | |
| | | |
| | Developer contributions may be required | |
| | to fund infrastructure upgrades necessary | |
| | to address capacity constraints. | |
| Site Access | It is likely a suitable vehicular access could | |
| | be created on to Church Street, which is | |
| | directly adjacent to the site. | |
| | | |
| | Notwithstanding the above, the suitability | |
| | of the prospective access would need to be | |
| | further investigated through the | |
| | Development Management Process. | |
| Ecological Potential | An ecological survey of the site has not | |

| Suitability - General | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| , | been investigated as part of this high level assessment and as such the presence or | | |
| | absence of protected species and/or | | |
| | habitats cannot be established at this stage. | | |
| | Further assessment would therefore need to be undertaken through the Local Plan or | | |
| | Development Management process, before | | |
| | development could be supported or | | |
| | rejected. | | |
| Designated Habitats | Natural England guidance (Impact Risk | | |
| | Zones) indicates that development of this | | |
| | site poses a potential risk to a SSSI. | | |
| | Further assessment of the potential | | |
| | impacts of development upon designated | | |
| | habitats would therefore need to be | | |
| | undertaken through the Local Plan or | | |
| | Development Management process, before | | |
| | development could be supported or | | |
| 1 | rejected. | | |
| Landscape | Whilst the site is situated outside of the | | |
| | built up area, the landscape is considered | | |
| | less sensitive and to have some potential to | | |
| | accommodate change. | | |
| | Further assessment of the potential | | |
| | impacts of development upon the local | | |
| | landscape would need to be undertaken | | |
| | through the Local Plan or Development | | |
| | Management process, before development | | |
| | could be supported or rejected. | | |
| Heritage | Development is unlikely to have an impact | | |
| | upon any designated heritage assets. | | |
| Air Quality | Site may be constrained by air pollution but mitigation likely to be deliverable. | | |
| Contamination | Contamination is not suspected on the site. | | |
| Site Developability | The site is free from known development | | |
| Site Developability | 'abnormals'. | | |
| Agricultural Land | The site is situated on the best and most | | |
| | versatile agricultural land. | | |

| Suitability - General | Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Open Space | Part of the site is designated open space as amenity greenspace and outdoor sports facilities. | | |
| | The site is larger than the area of open space and could potential be accommodated in the development area. | | |

| Suitability – Housing | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |
| Noise | Site is unlikely to be constrained by noise | |
| | pollution. | |
| Amenity/Overlooking | The site has the potential to impact upon | |
| | amenity of nearby residential properties. | |
| | | |
| | Whilst this is likely to be resolvable through | |
| | sensitive design, it is likely this would have | |
| | implication for site capacity. | |
| Employment Land | Site is not designated employment land. | |
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
| | development unless identified constraints | |
| | can be addressed. | |

| Suitability – Economic Development | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Level of flood risk on the site is considered | |
| | acceptable for commercial uses. | |
| Noise | Commercial uses on the site are unlikely to be | |
| | constrained by noise pollution. | |
| Amenity | Mainly residential or rural area with no other | |
| | commercial uses. | |
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
| | development unless identified constraints can | |
| | be addressed. | |

| Suitability – Mixed Use | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for development unless identified constraints can | |
| | be addressed. | |

| Availability | |
|---|--|
| Landowner is actively promoting the site for redevelopment. | |

| Site | |
|-----------------|---|
| Reference | 0837 |
| Address | Land to the West of Church Street |
| Description | Agricultural area on fringe of settlement, relatively flat in |
| | level |
| Size (ha) | 7.93 |
| Relevant policy | - |
| guidance | |
| Location Plan | Cliffe |

| Development Potential | | |
|------------------------------|------------|--------|
| Residential (units) | 190 | |
| Employment (m ²) | Office | 79,300 |
| | Industrial | 31,720 |
| | Storage | 31,720 |
| Main Town Centre Uses | | |
| (m ²) | | |
| Other Uses | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Facilities & Services | Site has poor access to public transport | |
| Accessibility | opportunities. | |
| Public Transport | Site has poor access to public transport | |

| Suitability - General | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Accessibility | opportunities. | | | |
| Highway Network Capacity | Access to the strategic highway network (M2/A2) is via the Four Elms Roundabout and A289. Whilst there are currently some capacity issues experienced at this junction, upgrades are planned and are expected to go someway towards resolving these constraints. | | | |
| | Detailed assessment of the implications of development for the Four Elms Roundabout is likely to be required to inform the local plan and development management process. Assessment of M2 Junction 1 may also be required. | | | |
| | Access around the Medway urban distributor network is likely to be constrained by a number of identified congestion hotspots including Medway Tunnel in particular. | | | |
| | Whilst it is possible that strategic infrastructure upgrades may address these congestion issues, improving access to the urban distributor network, there are no upgrades planned or identified at present. | | | |
| | Further detailed assessment would need to be undertaken (as part of the Local Plan or development management process) to demonstrate how traffic generated be the development could be accommodated on the network. | | | |
| | Developer contributions may be required to fund infrastructure upgrades necessary to address capacity constraints. | | | |
| Site Access | It is likely a suitable vehicular access could be created on to Church Street, which is directly adjacent to the site. | | | |
| | Notwithstanding the above, the suitability of the prospective access would need to be further investigated through the Development Management Process. | | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Ecological Potential | An ecological survey of the site has not | |
| | been investigated as part of this high level | |
| | assessment and as such the presence or | |
| | absence of protected species and/or | |
| | habitats cannot be established at this stage. | |
| | inabitats cannot be established at this stage. | |
| | Further assessment would therefore need | |
| | to be undertaken through the Local Plan or | |
| | Development Management process, before | |
| | development could be supported or | |
| | rejected. | |
| Designated Habitats | Natural England guidance (Impact Risk | |
| | Zones) indicates that development of this | |
| | site poses a potential risk to a SSSI. | |
| | one poses a potential risk to a soon | |
| | Further assessment of the potential | |
| | impacts of development upon designated | |
| | habitats would therefore need to be | |
| | undertaken through the Local Plan or | |
| | Development Management process, before | |
| | development could be supported or | |
| | rejected. | |
| Landscape | Whilst the site is situated outside of the | |
| | built up area, the landscape is considered | |
| | less sensitive and to have some potential to | |
| | accommodate change. | |
| | , and the second | |
| | Further assessment of the potential | |
| | impacts of development upon the local | |
| | landscape would need to be undertaken | |
| | through the Local Plan or Development | |
| | Management process, before development | |
| | could be supported or rejected. | |
| Heritage | Development is unlikely to have an impact | |
| | upon any designated heritage assets. | |
| Air Quality | Site may be constrained by air pollution but | |
| | mitigation likely to be deliverable. | |
| Contamination | Contamination is not suspected on the site. | |
| Site Developability | The site is free from known development | |
| | 'abnormals'. | |
| Agricultural Land | The site is situated on the best and most | |
| | versatile agricultural land. | |
| Open Space | Site is not designated open space. | |

| Suitability – Housing | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |

| Noise | Site is unlikely to be constrained by noise pollution. | |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Amenity/Overlooking | The site has the potential to impact upon amenity of nearby residential properties. | |
| | Whilst this is likely to be resolvable through sensitive design, it is likely this would have implication for site capacity. | |
| Employment Land | Site is not designated employment land. | |
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for development unless identified constraints can be addressed. | |

| Suitability – Economic Development | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Level of flood risk on the site is considered | | |
| | acceptable for commercial uses. | | |
| Noise | Commercial uses on the site are unlikely to be | | |
| | constrained by noise pollution. | | |
| Amenity | Mainly residential or rural area with no other | | |
| | commercial uses. | | |
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | | |
| | development unless identified constraints can | | |
| be addressed. | | | |

| Suitability – Mixed Use | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Overall | Overall The site is considered unsuitable for development unless identified constraints can | |
| | be addressed. | |

| Availability | |
|---|--|
| Landowner is actively promoting the site for redevelopment. | |

| Site | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Reference | 0848 |
| Address | Land south of View Road, Cliffe Woods |
| Description | Site being used for agricultural purposes. Residential uses bordering on two sides. |
| Size (ha) | 1.08 |
| Relevant policy guidance | |
| Location Plan | Bing |

| Development Potential | | |
|------------------------------|------------|--------|
| Residential (units) | 31 | |
| Employment (m ²) | Office | 10,840 |
| | Industrial | 4,335 |
| | Storage | 4,335 |
| Main Town Centre Uses | | |
| (m ²) | | |
| Other Uses | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Facilities & Services | Site has poor access to services and | |
| Accessibility | facilities. | |
| Public Transport | Site has poor access to public transport | |
| Accessibility | opportunities. | |
| Highway Network | Access to the strategic highway network | |
| Capacity | (M2/A2) is via the Four Elms Roundabout | |
| | and A289. Whilst there are currently some | |
| | capacity issues experienced at this junction, | |
| | upgrades are planned and are expected to | |
| | go someway towards resolving these | |
| | constraints. | |
| | | |
| | Detailed assessment of the implications of | |

| Suitability - General | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Cartaining Concrat | development for the Four Elms | | | | |
| | Roundabout is likely to be required to | | | | |
| | inform the local plan and development | | | | |
| | management process. Assessment of M2 | | | | |
| | Junction 1 may also be required. | | | | |
| | and the second second | | | | |
| | Access around the Medway urban | | | | |
| | distributor network is likely to be | | | | |
| | constrained by a number of identified | | | | |
| | congestion hotspots including Medway | | | | |
| | Tunnel in particular. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Whilst it is possible that strategic | | | | |
| | infrastructure upgrades may address these | | | | |
| | congestion issues, improving access to the | | | | |
| | urban distributor network, there are no | | | | |
| | upgrades planned or identified at present. | | | | |
| | Further detailed accessment would not dis- | | | | |
| | Further detailed assessment would need to | | | | |
| | be undertaken (as part of the Local Plan or | | | | |
| | development management process) to | | | | |
| | demonstrate how traffic generated be the | | | | |
| | development could be accommodated on the network. | | | | |
| | the network. | | | | |
| | Developer contributions may be required | | | | |
| | to fund infrastructure upgrades necessary | | | | |
| | to address capacity constraints. | | | | |
| Site Access | The site is situated on View Road, providing | | | | |
| | suitable vehicular access. | | | | |
| Ecological Potential | An ecological survey of the site has not | | | | |
| | been investigated as part of this high level | | | | |
| | assessment and as such the presence or | | | | |
| | absence of protected species and/or | | | | |
| | habitats cannot be established at this stage. | | | | |
| | Further assessment would therefore need | | | | |
| | to be undertaken through the Local Plan or | | | | |
| | Development Management process, before | | | | |
| | development could be supported or | | | | |
| | rejected. | | | | |
| Designated Habitats | Natural England guidance (Impact Risk | | | | |
| G.13.55.3.18.8.18.8 | Zones) indicates that development of this | | | | |
| | site poses a potential risk to a SSSI. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Further assessment of the potential | | | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| | impacts of development upon designated | |
| | habitats would therefore need to be | |
| | undertaken through the Local Plan or | |
| | Development Management process, before | |
| | development could be supported or | |
| | rejected. | |
| Landscape | Site is situated within built up area. | |
| | Development is unlikely to have a | |
| | detrimental impact upon the locally valued | |
| | landscapes. | |
| Heritage | Development is unlikely to have an impact | |
| | upon any designated heritage assets. | |
| Air Quality | Site may be constrained by air pollution but | |
| | mitigation is likely to be deliverable. | |
| Contamination | Contamination is not suspected on the site. | |
| Site Developability | Whilst the site is subject to some | |
| | development abnormals, these are | |
| | considered resolvable. | |
| Agricultural Land | Whilst the site is situated on agricultural | |
| | land, it is understood to be Grade 3 or less. | |
| | Notwithstanding the above further | |
| | assessment of the agricultural land quality | |
| | would need to be undertaken through the | |
| | Local Plan or Development Management | |
| | process, before development could be | |
| | supported or rejected. | |
| Open Space | Site is not designated open space. | |
| Орен эрисс | Site is not designated open space. | |

| Suitability – Housing | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |
| Noise | Site is unlikely to be constrained by noise pollution. | |
| Amenity/Overlooking | The site has the potential to impact upon amenity of nearby residential properties. Whilst this is likely to be resolvable through sensitive design, it is likely this would have implications for site capacity. | |
| Employment Land | Site is not designated employment land. | |
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for development unless identified constraints can be addressed. | |

| Suitability – Economic Development | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |
| Noise | Commercial uses on the site are unlikely to be | |
| | constrained by noise pollution. | |
| Amenity | Mainly residential with few commercial uses. | |
| Overall | Site is unsuitable for employment uses. | |

| Suitability – Mixed Use | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
| | development unless identified constraints can | |
| | be addressed. | |

| Availability | |
|---|--|
| Landowner is actively promoting the site for redevelopment through call for sites - residential | |
| Can let sites l'estaential | |

| Site | |
|-----------------|--|
| Reference | 1069 |
| Address | North Mortimers Avenue, west of Town Road, Cliffe Woods |
| Description | Site is overgrown with a grassy footpath running through |
| | the centre. A haven for wildlife, the public footpath is |
| | probably popular with dog walkers. Not really logical to |
| | develop the site on its own, the only use put forward being |
| | residential. |
| Size (ha) | 4.33 |
| Relevant policy | |
| guidance | |
| Location Plan | 11 Dec. 12 Dec |

| Development Potential | | |
|------------------------------|------------|--------|
| Residential (units) | 125 | |
| Employment (m ²) | Office | 43,250 |
| | Industrial | 17,300 |
| | Storage | 17,300 |
| Main Town Centre Uses | | |
| (m ²) | | |
| Other Uses | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Facilities & Services | Site has poor access to services and | |
| Accessibility | facilities. | |
| Public Transport | Site has poor access to public transport | |
| Accessibility | opportunities. | |
| Highway Network | Access to the strategic highway network | |
| Capacity | (M2/A2) is via the Four Elms Roundabout | |
| | and A289. Whilst there are currently some | |
| | capacity issues experienced at this junction, | |
| | upgrades are planned and are expected to | |
| | go someway towards resolving these | |

| Suitability - General | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| , | constraints. | | | |
| | Detailed assessment of the implications of development for the Four Elms Roundabout is likely to be required to inform the local plan and development management process. Assessment of M2 Junction 1 may also be required. | | | |
| | Access around the Medway urban distributor network is likely to be constrained by a number of identified congestion hotspots including Medway Tunnel in particular. | | | |
| | Whilst it is possible that strategic infrastructure upgrades may address these congestion issues, improving access to the urban distributor network, there are no upgrades planned or identified at present. | | | |
| | Further detailed assessment would need to be undertaken (as part of the Local Plan or development management process) to demonstrate how traffic generated be the development could be accommodated on the network. | | | |
| | Developer contributions may be required to fund infrastructure upgrades necessary to address capacity constraints. | | | |
| Site Access | It is likely a suitable vehicular access could be created on to Town Road, which is directly adjacent to the site. | | | |
| | Notwithstanding the above, the suitability of the prospective access would need to be further investigated through the Development Management Process. | | | |
| Ecological Potential | An ecological survey of the site has not been investigated as part of this high level assessment and as such the presence or absence of protected species and/or habitats cannot be established at this stage. | | | |
| | Further assessment would therefore need | | | |

| Suitability - General | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| | to be undertaken through the Local Plan or | | |
| | Development Management process, before | | |
| | development could be supported or | | |
| | rejected. | | |
| Designated Habitats | Natural England guidance (Impact Risk | | |
| | Zones) indicates that development of this | | |
| | site poses a potential risk to a SSSI. | | |
| | Further assessment of the potential | | |
| | impacts of development upon designated | | |
| | habitats would therefore need to be | | |
| | undertaken through the Local Plan or | | |
| | Development Management process, before | | |
| | development could be supported or | | |
| | rejected. | | |
| Landscape | The site is situated outside of the built up | | |
| | area, with an area of locally valued | | |
| | landscape – Cliffe Woods Farmland - which | | |
| | is considered sensitive to change. | | |
| | | | |
| | Development is thereby likely to have a | | |
| | detrimental impact upon locally valued | | |
| | local landscapes. | | |
| Heritage | Development is unlikely to have an impact | | |
| | upon any designated heritage assets. | | |
| Air Quality | Site may be constrained by air pollution but | | |
| | mitigation is likely to be deliverable. | | |
| Contamination | Contamination is not suspected on the site. | | |
| Site Developability | A major pipeline runs through or near to | | |
| | the site which main constrain development. | | |
| Agricultural Land | The site is situated on the best and most | | |
| | versatile agricultural land. | | |
| Open Space | Site is not designated open space. | | |

| Suitability – Housing | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | | |
| Noise | Site is unlikely to be constrained by noise | | |
| | pollution. | | |
| Amenity/Overlooking | The site has the potential to impact upon | | |
| | amenity of nearby residential properties. | | |
| | | | |
| | Whilst this is likely to be resolvable through | | |
| | sensitive design, it is likely this would have | | |
| | implications for site capacity. | | |
| Employment Land | Site is not designated employment land. | | |
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | | |
| | development unless identified constraints | | |

| can be addressed. |
|-------------------|
|-------------------|

| Suitability – Economic Development | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |
| Noise | Commercial uses on the site are unlikely to be | |
| | constrained by noise pollution. | |
| Amenity | Mainly residential with few commercial uses. | |
| Overall | Site is unsuitable for employment uses. | |

| Suitability – Mixed Use | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
| | | |
| | be addressed. | |

| Availability | |
|--|--|
| Landowner is actively promoting the site for redevelopment through | |
| call for sites - housing | |
| | |

| Site | |
|-----------------|--|
| Reference | 1070 |
| Address | West of Town Road Cliffe Woods |
| Description | The site feels rural with open space/scrubland rich in |
| | biodiversity in the north eastern corner. The remainder of |
| | the site is in agricultural use. Couple of small semi derelict |
| | brick structures on site. Overhead cables running through |
| | centre and PROW. Gated access from Mortimers Avenue |
| | and Ladyclose Avenue. |
| Size (ha) | 20.87 |
| Relevant policy | |
| guidance | |
| Location Plan | |

| Development Potential | | |
|-----------------------|------------|------------------------|
| Residential | 501 | |
| Employment | Office | 208,715 m ² |
| | Industrial | 83,485 m ² |
| | Storage | 83,485 m ² |
| Main Town Centre Uses | | |
| Other Uses | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Facilities & Services | Whilst the site currently has poor access to | |
| Accessibility | services and facilities, given that the site | |
| | has an estimated capacity in excess of 500 | |
| | units, development has the potential to | |
| | deliver an enhancement in the level of | |
| | services and facilities locally, either through | |
| | direct on-site provision or through | |
| | contributions towards local off site | |
| | facilities. | |
| | | |
| | Whilst this high level assessment | |
| | recognises the theoretical potential of the | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Suitability - General | site to aversome its near accessibility, this | |
| | site to overcome its poor accessibility, this | |
| | would need to be further investigated | |
| | through the Local Plan or Development | |
| | Management process before development | |
| | on the site could be supported or rejected. | |
| Public Transport | Whilst the site currently has poor access to | |
| Accessibility | public transport opportunities, given that | |
| | the site has an estimated capacity in excess | |
| | of 500 units, development has the potential | |
| | to deliver an enhancement to public | |
| | transport opportunities locally. | |
| | | |
| | Whilst this high level assessment | |
| | recognises the theoretical potential of the | |
| | site to overcome its poor accessibility, this | |
| | would need to be further investigated | |
| | through the Local Plan or Development | |
| | Management process before development | |
| | on the site could be supported or rejected. | |
| Highway Network | Access to the strategic highway network | |
| Capacity | (M2/A2) is via the Four Elms Roundabout | |
| Capacity | and A289. Whilst there are currently some | |
| | capacity issues experienced at this junction, | |
| | upgrades are planned and are expected to | |
| | go someway towards resolving these | |
| | constraints. | |
| | Constraints. | |
| | Detailed assessment of the implications of | |
| | development for the Four Elms | |
| | • | |
| | Roundabout is likely to be required to | |
| | inform the local plan and development | |
| | management process. Assessment of M2 | |
| | Junction 1 may also be required. | |
| | Access around the Madureur unban | |
| | Access around the Medway urban | |
| | distributor network is likely to be | |
| | constrained by a number of identified | |
| | congestion hotspots including Medway | |
| | Tunnel in particular. | |
| | NA/Initiative in an applicable that at a tracks | |
| | Whilst it is possible that strategic | |
| | infrastructure upgrades may address these | |
| | congestion issues, improving access to the | |
| | urban distributor network, there are no | |
| | upgrades planned or identified at present. | |
| | | |

| Cuitabilita Cananal | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Suitability - General | | |
| | Further detailed assessment would need to | |
| | be undertaken (as part of the Local Plan or | |
| | development management process) to | |
| | demonstrate how traffic generated be the | |
| | development could be accommodated on | |
| | the network. | |
| | Developer contributions may be required | |
| | to fund infrastructure upgrades necessary | |
| | to address capacity constraints. | |
| Site Access | It is likely a suitable vehicular access could | |
| Site Access | be created on to Mortimers Ave and | |
| | | |
| | Ladyclose Ave, which is directly adjacent to | |
| | the site. | |
| | No. 9harada da la da da 1999 | |
| | Notwithstanding the above, the suitability | |
| | of the prospective access would need to be | |
| | further investigated through the | |
| | Development Management Process. | |
| Ecological Potential | An ecological survey of the site has not | |
| | been investigated as part of this high level | |
| | assessment and as such the presence or | |
| | absence of protected species and/or | |
| | habitats cannot be established at this stage. | |
| | 0 | |
| | Further assessment would therefore need | |
| | to be undertaken through the Local Plan or | |
| | Development Management process, before | |
| | development could be supported or | |
| | rejected. | |
| Designated Habitate | † ' | |
| Designated Habitats | Natural England guidance (Impact Risk | |
| | Zones) indicates that development of this | |
| | site poses a potential risk to a SSSI. | |
| | | |
| | Further assessment of the potential | |
| | impacts of development upon designated | |
| | habitats would therefore need to be | |
| | undertaken through the Local Plan or | |
| | Development Management process, before | |
| | development could be supported or | |
| | rejected. | |
| Landscape | The site is situated outside of the built up | |
| | area, with an area of locally valued | |
| | landscape - Cliffe Woods Farmland - which | |
| | is considered sensitive to change. | |
| | | |
| | Development is thereby likely to have a | |
| | - suprise the early many to have a | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | detrimental impact upon locally valued | |
| | local landscapes. | |
| Heritage | Development is unlikely to have an impact | |
| | upon any designated heritage assets. | |
| Air Quality | Site may be constrained by air pollution but | |
| | mitigation is likely to be deliverable. | |
| Contamination | Contamination is not suspected on the site. | |
| Site Developability | A major pipeline runs through or near to | |
| | the site which main constrain development. | |
| Agricultural Land | The site is situated on the best and most | |
| | versatile agricultural land. | |
| Open Space | Site is not designated open space. | |

| Suitability – Housing | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |
| Noise | Site is unlikely to be constrained by noise pollution. | |
| Amenity/Overlooking | The site has the potential to impact upon amenity of nearby residential properties. Whilst this is likely to be resolvable through sensitive design, it is likely this would have | |
| | implications for site capacity. | |
| Employment Land | Site is not designated employment land. | |
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for development unless identified constraints can be addressed. | |

| Suitability – Economic Development | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |
| Noise | Commercial uses on the site are unlikely to be constrained by noise pollution. | |
| Amenity | Mainly residential with few commercial uses. | |
| Overall | Site is unsuitable for employment uses. | |

| Suitability – Mixed Use | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
| | development unless identified constraints can | |
| | be addressed. | |

| Availability | |
|--|--|
| Landowner is actively promoting the site for redevelopment through | |
| call for sites – housing/retail | |

| Site | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Reference | 1071 |
| Address | South of Ladyclose Avenue, West of Town Road |
| Description | Currently in use for farming. Access and track to south and |
| | west. Small brick structure on site. |
| Size (ha) | 2.94 |
| Relevant policy guidance | |
| Location Plan | MADECIONAL PLANTS AND STATE OF THE PLANTS AND STATE OF |

| Development Potential | | |
|------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|
| Residential | 85 | |
| Employment | Office | 29,425 m ² |
| | Industrial | 11,770 m ² |
| | Storage | 11,770 m ² |
| Main Town Centre Uses | | |
| Other Uses | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Facilities & Services | Site has poor access to services and | |
| Accessibility | facilities. | |
| Public Transport | Site has poor access to public transport | |
| Accessibility | opportunities. | |
| Highway Network | Access to the strategic highway network | |
| Capacity | (M2/A2) is via the Four Elms Roundabout | |
| | and A289. Whilst there are currently some | |
| | capacity issues experienced at this junction, | |
| | upgrades are planned and are expected to | |
| | go someway towards resolving these | |
| | constraints. | |
| | | |
| | Detailed assessment of the implications of | |
| | development for the Four Elms | |
| | Roundabout is likely to be required to | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| , | inform the local plan and development | |
| | management process. Assessment of M2 | |
| | Junction 1 may also be required. | |
| | | |
| | Access around the Medway urban | |
| | distributor network is likely to be | |
| | constrained by a number of identified | |
| | congestion hotspots including Medway | |
| | Tunnel in particular. | |
| | Whilst it is possible that strategic | |
| | infrastructure upgrades may address these | |
| | congestion issues, improving access to the | |
| | urban distributor network, there are no | |
| | upgrades planned or identified at present. | |
| | | |
| | Further detailed assessment would need to | |
| | be undertaken (as part of the Local Plan or | |
| | development management process) to | |
| | demonstrate how traffic generated be the | |
| | development could be accommodated on | |
| | the network. | |
| | Davidanar contributions may be required | |
| | Developer contributions may be required to fund infrastructure upgrades necessary | |
| | to address capacity constraints. | |
| Site Access | It is likely a suitable vehicular access could | |
| Site riccess | be created on to Town Road, which is | |
| | directly adjacent to the site. | |
| | , | |
| | Notwithstanding the above, the suitability | |
| | of the prospective access would need to be | |
| | further investigated through the | |
| | Development Management Process. | |
| Ecological Potential | An ecological survey of the site has not | |
| | been investigated as part of this high level | |
| | assessment and as such the presence or | |
| | absence of protected species and/or | |
| | habitats cannot be established at this stage. | |
| | Further assessment would therefore need | |
| | to be undertaken through the Local Plan or | |
| | Development Management process, before | |
| | development could be supported or | |
| | rejected. | |
| Designated Habitats | Natural England guidance (Impact Risk | |
| | Zones) indicates that development of this | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| _ | site poses a potential risk to a SSSI. | |
| | | |
| | Further assessment of the potential | |
| | impacts of development upon designated | |
| | habitats would therefore need to be | |
| | undertaken through the Local Plan or | |
| | Development Management process, before | |
| | development could be supported or | |
| | rejected. | |
| Landscape | The site is situated outside of the built up | |
| | area, with an area of locally valued | |
| | landscape of the Cliffe Woods Farmland, | |
| | which is considered sensitive to change. | |
| | Davidanment is thereby likely to have a | |
| | Development is thereby likely to have a detrimental impact upon locally valued | |
| | local landscapes. | |
| Heritage | Development is unlikely to have an impact | |
| Heritage | upon any designated heritage assets. | |
| Air Quality | Site may be constrained by air pollution but | |
| | mitigation is likely to be deliverable. | |
| Contamination | Contamination is not suspected on the site. | |
| Site Developability | The site is free from known development | |
| | 'abnormals'. | |
| Agricultural Land | Whilst the site is situated on agricultural | |
| | land, it is understood to be Grade 3 or less. | |
| | | |
| | Notwithstanding the above further | |
| | assessment of the agricultural land quality | |
| | would need to be undertaken through the | |
| | Local Plan or Development Management | |
| | process, before development could be | |
| | supported or rejected. | |
| Open Space | Site is not designated open space. | |

| Suitability – Housing | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |
| Noise | Site is unlikely to be constrained by noise pollution. | |
| Amenity/Overlooking | The site has the potential to impact upon amenity of nearby residential properties. Whilst this is likely to be resolvable through sensitive design, it is likely this would have implications for site capacity. | |
| Employment Land | Site is not designated employment land. | |

| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
|---------|---|--|
| | development unless identified constraints | |
| | can be addressed. | |

| Suitability – Economic Development | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Level of flood risk on the site is considered acceptable for commercial uses. | |
| | Note: Flood Zone 1, 2 and 3a. | |
| Noise | Commercial uses on the site are unlikely to be constrained by noise pollution. | |
| Amenity | Mainly residential or rural area with no other commercial uses. | |
| Overall | Site is unsuitable for employment uses. | |

| Suitability – Mixed Use | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
| | development unless identified constraints can | |
| | be addressed. | |

| Availability | |
|--|--|
| Landowner is actively promoting the site for redevelopment through | |
| call for sites - housing | |

| Site | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Reference | 1082 |
| Address | Land to the west of Cliffe Woods |
| Description | Large area of farmland in use. Track access from main road to east. Pedestrian access points from Mortimers Ave and Ladyclose Ave. 2 small brickbuilt structures within the area could be shelters/air raid shelters. |
| Size (ha) | 11.12 |
| Relevant policy guidance | |
| Location Plan | Cathe Woods |

| Development Potential | | |
|-----------------------|------------|------------------------|
| Residential | 267 | |
| Employment | Office | 111,150 m ² |
| | Industrial | 44,460 m ² |
| | Storage | 44,460 m ² |
| Main Town Centre Uses | | |
| Other Uses | | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Facilities & Services | Site has poor access to services and | |
| Accessibility | facilities. | |
| Public Transport | Site has poor access to public transport | |
| Accessibility | opportunities. | |
| Highway Network Capacity | Access to the strategic highway network (M2/A2) is via the Four Elms Roundabout | |
| | and A289. Whilst there are currently some | |
| | capacity issues experienced at this junction, upgrades are planned and are expected to | |
| | go someway towards resolving these | |
| | constraints. | |
| | Detailed assessment of the implications of | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| - Interest Control | development for the Four Elms | |
| | Roundabout is likely to be required to | |
| | inform the local plan and development | |
| | management process. Assessment of M2 | |
| | Junction 1 may also be required. | |
| | Janetion 1 may also be required. | |
| | Access around the Medway urban | |
| | distributor network is likely to be | |
| | constrained by a number of identified | |
| | congestion hotspots including Medway | |
| | Tunnel in particular. | |
| | rumerm particular. | |
| | Whilst it is possible that strategic | |
| | infrastructure upgrades may address these | |
| | congestion issues, improving access to the | |
| | urban distributor network, there are no | |
| | upgrades planned or identified at present. | |
| | upgrades planned of identified at present. | |
| | Further detailed assessment would need to | |
| | be undertaken (as part of the Local Plan or | |
| | development management process) to | |
| | demonstrate how traffic generated be the | |
| | development could be accommodated on | |
| | the network. | |
| | the network. | |
| | Developer contributions may be required | |
| | to fund infrastructure upgrades necessary | |
| | to address capacity constraints. | |
| Site Access | It is likely a suitable vehicular access could | |
| | be created on to town Road/Ladyclose | |
| | Avenue/ Mortimers Avenue, which is | |
| | directly adjacent to the site. | |
| | | |
| | Notwithstanding the above, the suitability | |
| | of the prospective access would need to be | |
| | further investigated through the | |
| | Development Management Process. | |
| Ecological Potential | An ecological survey of the site has not | |
| | been investigated as part of this high level | |
| | assessment and as such the presence or | |
| | absence of protected species and/or | |
| | habitats cannot be established at this stage. | |
| | | |
| | Further assessment would therefore need | |
| | to be undertaken through the Local Plan or | |
| | Development Management process, before | |

| Suitability - General | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | development could be supported or | |
| | rejected. | |
| Designated Habitats | Natural England guidance (Impact Risk | |
| | Zones) indicates that development of this | |
| | site poses a potential risk to a SSSI. | |
| | Further assessment of the potential | |
| | impacts of development upon designated | |
| | habitats would therefore need to be | |
| | undertaken through the Local Plan or | |
| | Development Management process, before | |
| | development could be supported or | |
| | rejected. | |
| Landscape | The site is situated outside of the built up | |
| | area, with an area of locally valued | |
| | landscape – Cliffe Farmland - which is | |
| | considered sensitive to change. | |
| | Development is thereby likely to have a | |
| | detrimental impact upon locally valued | |
| | local landscapes. | |
| Heritage | Development is unlikely to have an impact | |
| | upon any designated heritage assets. | |
| Air Quality | Site may be constrained by air pollution but | |
| | mitigation is likely to be deliverable. | |
| Contamination | Contamination is not suspected on the site. | |
| Site Developability | The site is free from known development | |
| | 'abnormals'. | |
| Agricultural Land | The site is situated on the best and most | |
| | versatile agricultural land. | |
| Open Space | Site is not designated open space. | |

| Suitability – Housing | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |
| Noise | Site is unlikely to be constrained by noise | |
| | pollution. | |
| Amenity/Overlooking | The site has the potential to impact upon | |
| | amenity of nearby residential properties. | |
| | | |
| | Whilst this is likely to be resolvable through | |
| | sensitive design, it is likely this would have | |
| | implications for site capacity. | |
| Employment Land | Site is situated within built up area. | |
| | Development is unlikely to have a | |
| | detrimental impact upon the locally valued | |

| | landscapes. | |
|---------|---|--|
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
| | development unless identified constraints | |
| | can be addressed. | |

| Suitability – Economic Development | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Flood Risk | Site is at low risk of flooding. | |
| Noise | Commercial uses on the site are unlikely to be | |
| | constrained by noise pollution. | |
| Amenity | Mainly residential with few commercial uses. | |
| Overall | Site is unsuitable for employment uses. | |

| Suitability – Mixed Use | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Overall | The site is considered unsuitable for | |
| | development unless identified constraints can | |
| | be addressed. | |

| Availability | |
|--|--|
| Landowner is actively promoting the site for redevelopment through | |
| call for sites - housing | |