

Appendix A
Site Assessment Criteria

NB There is some overlap between the topics covered by the IA objectives. The issues of most relevance to each IA objective have been placed under that IA objective and not any others, so as to avoid duplication of effects.

Table A.1: Site assessment criteria

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|---|
| <p>IA1: Provide a sustainable supply of housing land including for an appropriate mix of sizes, types, and tenures in locations to meet housing need, and to support economic growth.</p> | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>All of the residential site options are expected to have positive effects on this objective, due to the nature of the proposed development being residential and contributing to meeting the five year housing supply. Larger sites would provide opportunities for the development of a larger number of homes, including more affordable homes and so would have significant positive effects. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites delivering 500 homes or more will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites delivering fewer than 500 homes will have a minor positive (+) effect. |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>The location of employment site options is unlikely to have a direct effect on this IA objective and therefore all site options will have a negligible (0) effect.</p> |
| <p>IA2: Provide a sustainable supply of employment land to ensure sustainable economic growth and job creation.</p> | <p>Mixed use</p> |
| | <p>All of the mixed use site options are expected to have positive effects on this objective, due to the residential aspect of development and contributing to meeting the five year housing supply. Larger sites would provide opportunities for the development of a larger number of homes, including more affordable homes and so would have significant positive effects. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites delivering 500 homes or more will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites delivering fewer than 500 homes will have a minor positive (+) effect. |
| | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>The location of residential site allocations within the Central Lancashire Local Plan (CLLP) area is unrelated to the sustainable supply of employment land and job creation. Therefore, all residential site options are expected to have a negligible (0) effect.</p> |
| | <p>Employment</p> |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|--|
| | <p>All of the employment site options are expected to have positive effects on this objective, due to the nature of the proposed development being employment and contributing towards economic growth. Larger sites will provide opportunities for the development of a larger amount of employment floorspace. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Large sites (>=5ha) will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Small sites (<5ha) will have a minor positive (+) effect. <p>Mixed use</p> <p>All of the mixed use site options are expected to have positive effects on this objective, due to the employment aspect of development and contributing towards economic growth. Larger sites will provide opportunities for the development of a larger amount of employment floorspace. All effects are recorded as uncertain because it is unknown how much of each mixed use site will comprise employment development. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Large sites (>=5ha) will have a significant positive (++) effect, although uncertain. ■ Small sites (<5ha) will have a minor positive (+) effect, although uncertain. |
| <p>IA3: Ensure that there is sufficient coverage and capacity of transport and utilities to support growth and development.</p> | <p>Residential</p> <p>Broadband connectivity can affect peoples' ability to work from home effectively, as well as affecting how businesses can operate. It is a very localised issue and quality of coverage can change very quickly. The Government has several programmes in place with the aim to increase speeds and access to Broadband connectivity and therefore Broadband connectivity is likely to change very rapidly in Central Lancashire over the Plan period. The Central Lancashire Highways Masterplan and the Chorley Highways and Transport Strategy will assess transport capacity rather than the IA. This IA objective has therefore been scoped out.</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>Broadband connectivity can affect peoples' ability to work from home effectively, as well as affecting how businesses can operate. It is a very localised issue and quality of coverage can change very quickly. The Government has several programmes in place with the aim to increase speeds and access to Broadband connectivity and therefore Broadband connectivity is likely to change very rapidly in Central Lancashire over the Plan period. The Central Lancashire Highways Masterplan and the Chorley Highways and Transport Strategy will assess transport capacity rather than the IA. This IA objective has therefore been scoped out.</p> <p>Mixed use</p> |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|---|
| | <p>Broadband connectivity can affect peoples' ability to work from home effectively, as well as affecting how businesses can operate. It is a very localised issue and quality of coverage can change very quickly. The Government has several programmes in place with the aim to increase speeds and access to Broadband connectivity and therefore Broadband connectivity is likely to change very rapidly in Central Lancashire over the Plan period. The Central Lancashire Highways Masterplan and the Chorley Highways and Transport Strategy will assess transport capacity rather than the IA. This IA objective has therefore been scoped out.</p> |
| <p>IA4: Reduce levels of deprivation and disparity and levels of crime.</p> | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>The CLLP area contains 19 Lower-Layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) that fall within the 10% most deprived areas in England and 25 LSOAs that fall within the 10-20% most deprived areas in England. New residential development within the most deprived areas of the CLLP area can help regenerate those areas, including through the delivery of supporting infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites partially or entirely located within one of the 0-20% most deprived areas within the CLLP area will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites not located within one of the 0-20% most deprived areas within the CLLP area will have a negligible (0) effect. <p>With regard to crime, the effects of new development on levels of crime will depend on factors such as design and the use of appropriate lighting, particularly at night. However, such issues will not be influenced by the location of residential development; rather they will be determined through the detailed proposals for each site.</p> |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>The CLLP area contains 19 Lower-Layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) that fall within the 10% most deprived areas in England and 25 LSOAs that fall within the 10-20% most deprived areas in England. New employment development within the most deprived areas of the CLLP area can help regenerate those areas, including through the delivery of supporting infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites partially or entirely located within one of the 0-20% most deprived areas within the CLLP area will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites not located within one of the 0-20% most deprived areas within the CLLP area will have a negligible (0) effect. <p>With regard to crime, the effects of new development on levels of crime will depend on factors such as design and the use of appropriate lighting, particularly at night. However, such issues will not be influenced by the location of residential development; rather they will be determined through the detailed proposals for each site.</p> |
| | <p>Mixed use</p> |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|---|
| | <p>The CLLP area contains 19 Lower-Layer Super Output Areas (LSOAs) that fall within the 10% most deprived areas in England and 25 LSOAs that fall within the 10-20% most deprived areas in England. New residential development within the most deprived areas of the CLLP area can help regenerate those areas, including through the delivery of supporting infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites partially or entirely located within one of the 0-20% most deprived areas within the CLLP area will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites not located within one of the 0-20% most deprived areas within the CLLP area will have a negligible (0) effect. <p>With regard to crime, the effects of new development on levels of crime will depend on factors such as design and the use of appropriate lighting, particularly at night. However, such issues will not be influenced by the location of residential development; rather they will be determined through the detailed proposals for each site.</p> |
| IA5: Promote equality of opportunity and the elimination of discrimination. | Residential |
| | <p>The location of residential site options will not affect the achievement of this objective. Therefore, the likely effects of all site options on this IA objective will be negligible (0).</p> <p>Deprivation is considered separately under IA objective 4.</p> |
| | Employment |
| | <p>The location of mixed use site options will not affect the achievement of this objective. Therefore, the likely effects of all site options on this IA objective will be negligible (0).</p> <p>Deprivation is considered separately under IA objective 4.</p> |
| | Mixed use |
| | <p>The location of mixed use site options will not affect the achievement of this objective. Therefore, the likely effects of all site options on this IA objective will be negligible (0).</p> <p>Deprivation is considered separately under IA objective 4.</p> |
| | Residential |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|--|--|
| <p>IA6: Support improved health and well-being of the population and reduce health inequalities.</p> | <p>Public health and well-being will be influenced by the proximity of residential site options to open spaces and walking and cycling paths, which can encourage participation in active outdoor recreation. For sites within close proximity of open spaces, effects will be recorded as uncertain because the quality of open space varies across the CLLP area. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites within 800m of an area of open space and within 400m of a walking or cycling path will have a significant positive (++?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are within 800m of an area of open space or within 400m of a walking or cycling path (but not both) will have a minor positive (+?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are more than 800m from an area of open space and more than 400m from a walking or cycling path will have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that contain an existing area of open space or a walking or cycling path which could therefore be lost as a result of new development could have a significant negative (--?) effect, although this is uncertain. The actual effect is also dependent on whether the development of the site would in fact result in the loss of that facility. <p>Residential site options that are within close proximity of existing healthcare facilities will ensure that residents have good access to healthcare services, although it is noted that if a number of sites are allocated within close proximity of one another, this could lead to existing healthcare facilities becoming overloaded. It is also recognised that new development could stimulate the provision of new healthcare facilities, but this cannot be assumed at this stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are within 800m⁵ of a GP surgery and a hospital will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites that are within 800m of either a GP surgery or a hospital (but not both) will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites that are not within 800m of a GP surgery or a hospital will have a significant negative (--) effect. <p>Employment</p> <p>The delivery of employment sites is likely to increase the number of job opportunities available, which can have beneficial effects on people's health and wellbeing. Therefore, all employment site options are expected to have a minor positive (+) effect on this objective.</p> <p>The proximity of sites to walking and cycle routes that may be used for active modes of commuting is considered under IA9 below.</p> |

⁵ Planning for Walking. Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, 2015. This document states "Most people will only walk if their destination is less than a mile away. Land use patterns most conducive to walking are thus mixed in use and resemble patchworks of "walkable neighbourhoods," with a typical catchment of around 800 m, or 10 minutes walk".

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---------------|--|
| | <p data-bbox="573 371 2134 416">Mixed use</p> <p data-bbox="573 427 2134 485">The delivery of the employment aspect of each site is also likely to increase job opportunities available, which can have beneficial effects on people's health and wellbeing. Therefore, all mixed use site options are expected to have a minor positive (+) effect on this objective.</p> <p data-bbox="573 496 2134 582">Public health and well-being will also be influenced by the proximity of mixed use site options to open spaces and walking and cycling paths, which can encourage participation in active outdoor recreation. For sites within close proximity of open spaces, effects will be recorded as uncertain because the quality of open space varies across the CLLP area. Therefore:</p> <ul data-bbox="573 593 2134 938" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="573 593 2134 667">■ Sites within 800m of an area of open space and within 400m of a walking or cycling path will have a significant positive (++?) effect, although this is uncertain. <li data-bbox="573 678 2134 751">■ Sites that are within 800m of an area of open space or within 400m of a walking or cycling path (but not both) will have a minor positive (+) effect, although this is uncertain. <li data-bbox="573 762 2134 836">■ Sites that are more than 800m from an area of open space and more than 400m from a walking or cycling path will have a minor negative (-) effect, although this is uncertain. <li data-bbox="573 847 2134 938">■ Sites that contain an existing area of open space or a walking or cycling path which could therefore be lost as a result of new development could have a significant negative (--?) effect, although this is uncertain. The actual effect is also dependent on whether the development of the site would in fact result in the loss of that facility. <p data-bbox="573 949 2134 1061">Mixed use site options that are within close proximity of existing healthcare facilities will ensure that residents have good access to healthcare services, although it is noted that if a number of sites are allocated within close proximity of one another, this could lead to existing healthcare facilities becoming overloaded. It is also recognised that new development could stimulate the provision of new healthcare facilities, but this cannot be assumed at this stage.</p> <ul data-bbox="573 1072 2134 1209" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="573 1072 2134 1114">■ Sites that are within 800m⁶ of a GP surgery and a hospital will have a significant positive (++) effect. <li data-bbox="573 1125 2134 1166">■ Sites that are within 800m of either a GP surgery or a hospital (but not both) will have a minor positive (+) effect. <li data-bbox="573 1177 2134 1209">■ Sites that are not within 800m of a GP surgery or a hospital will have a significant negative (--) effect. |
| | <p data-bbox="573 1230 2134 1272">Residential</p> |

⁶ Planning for Walking. Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, 2015. This document states "Most people will only walk if their destination is less than a mile away. Land use patterns most conducive to walking are thus mixed in use and resemble patchworks of "walkable neighbourhoods," with a typical catchment of around 800 m, or 10 minutes walk".

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|--|---|
| <p>IA7: Ensure access to and provision of appropriate social infrastructure.</p> | <p>Residential site options that are within close proximity of the main urban areas in the CLLP area will ensure that residents have good access to the services and facilities in those areas. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within Preston Main Urban Area⁷, South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas⁸ or the District Centres⁹ will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within the Local and Rural Centres¹⁰, or the Smaller Rural Villages and Hamlets¹¹ will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites that are not adjacent to or within any of these areas will have a minor negative (-) effect. <p>Proximity to GP surgeries is considered separately under IA objective 6, whilst proximity to primary and secondary schools is considered separately under IA objective 8.</p> |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>Employment site options that are within close proximity of the main urban areas in the CLLP area will ensure that workers have good access to the services and facilities in those areas. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within Preston Main Urban Area¹², South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas¹³ or the District Centres¹⁴ will have a significant positive (++) effect. |

⁷ This is the City Centre, Inner Urban Neighbourhoods and Northern Preston. The City Centre is defined as Stoneygate, Station Quarter, Harris Quarter and the University of Central Lancashire (main campus). Northern Preston is defined as Cottam, North West Preston and West Preston.

⁸ South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas is defined as Leyland, Chorley, Farington, Farington Moss, Midge Hall, Moss Side, Penwortham, Lostock Hall, Bamber Bridge and Walton-le-Dale.

⁹ Adlington, Euxton, Longridge, Longton, Clayton Brook/Green, Whittle-le-Woods, Buckshaw Village, Clayton-le-Woods and Coppull.

¹⁰ Higher Walton, New Longton, Walmer Bridge, Croston, Eccleston, Hutton, Broughton and Grimsargh.

¹¹ Coupe Green, Much Hoole, Mellor Brook, Barton, Goosnargh, Lea Town, Woodplumpton, Abbey Village, Bretherton, Brindle, Charnock Richard, Gib Lane, Higher Wheelton, Houghton, Brinscall/Withnell, Gregson Lane, Mawdesley and Wheelton.

¹² This is the City Centre, Inner Urban Neighbourhoods and Northern Preston. The City Centre is defined as Stoneygate, Station Quarter, Harris Quarter and the University of Central Lancashire (main campus). Northern Preston is defined as Cottam, North West Preston and West Preston.

¹³ South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas is defined as Leyland, Chorley, Farington, Farington Moss, Midge Hall, Moss Side, Penwortham, Lostock Hall, Bamber Bridge and Walton-le-Dale.

¹⁴ Adlington, Euxton, Longridge, Longton, Clayton Brook/Green, Whittle-le-Woods, Buckshaw Village, Clayton-le-Woods and Coppull.

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within the Local and Rural Centres¹⁵, or the smaller Rural Villages and Hamlets¹⁶, will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites that are not adjacent to or within these areas will have a minor negative (-) effect. <p>Mixed use</p> <p>Mixed use site options that are within close proximity of the main urban areas in the CLLP area will ensure that residents have good access to the services and facilities in those areas. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within the Preston Main Urban Area¹⁷, South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas¹⁸ or the District Centres¹⁹ will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within the Local and Rural Centres²⁰, or the Smaller Rural Villages and Hamlets²¹, will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites that are not adjacent to or within any of these areas will have a minor negative (-) effect. <p>Proximity to GP surgeries is considered separately under IA objective 6, whilst proximity to primary and secondary schools is considered separately under IA objective 8.</p> |
| <p>IA8: Support improved educational attainment and skill levels for all.</p> | <p>Residential</p> <p>The effects of residential site options on the educational element of this objective will depend on the access that they provide to existing educational facilities, although there are uncertainties as the effects will depend on there being capacity at those schools to accommodate new pupils. New residential development could stimulate the provision of new schools/school places, particularly larger sites, but this cannot be assumed at this stage. Therefore:</p> |

¹⁵ Higher Walton, New Longton, Walmer Bridge, Croston, Eccleston, Hutton, Broughton and Grimsargh.

¹⁶ Coupe Green, Much Hoole, Mellor Brook, Barton, Goosnargh, Lea Town, Woodplumpton, Abbey Village, Bretherton, Brindle, Charnock Richard, Gib Lane, Higher Wheelton, Houghton, Brinscall/Withnell, Gregson Lane, Mawdesley and Wheelton.

¹⁷ This is the City Centre, Inner Urban Neighbourhoods and Northern Preston. The City Centre is defined as Stoneysgate, Station Quarter, Harris Quarter and the University of Central Lancashire (main campus). Northern Preston is defined as Cottam, North West Preston and West Preston.

¹⁸ South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas is defined as Leyland, Chorley, Farington, Farington Moss, Midge Hall, Moss Side, Penwortham, Lostock Hall, Bamber Bridge and Walton-le-Dale.

¹⁹ Adlington, Euxton, Longridge, Longton, Clayton Brook/Green, Whittle-le-Woods, Buckshaw Village, Clayton-le-Woods and Coppull.

²⁰ Higher Walton, New Longton, Walmer Bridge, Croston, Eccleston, Hutton, Broughton and Grimsargh.

²¹ Coupe Green, Much Hoole, Mellor Brook, Barton, Goosnargh, Lea Town, Woodplumpton, Abbey Village, Bretherton, Brindle, Charnock Richard, Gib Lane, Higher Wheelton, Houghton, Brinscall/Withnell, Gregson Lane, Mawdesley and Wheelton.

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are within 800m of at least one primary school and at least one secondary school may have a significant positive (++?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are within 800m of at least one primary school or at least once secondary school (but not both) may have a minor positive (+?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are not within 800m of an existing school may have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is uncertain. <p>Employment</p> <p>The location of employment site options will not affect educational attainment, although the delivery of employment sites may increase opportunities for work based learning and skills development. All sites are expected to have a negligible effect (0).</p> <p>Mixed use</p> <p>The effects of mixed use site options on the educational element of this objective will depend on the access that they provide to existing educational facilities, although there are uncertainties as the effects will depend on there being capacity at those schools to accommodate new pupils. New mixed use development could stimulate the provision of new schools/school places, particularly larger sites, but this cannot be assumed at this stage. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are within 800m of at least one primary school and at least one secondary school may have a significant positive (++?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are within 800m of at least one primary school or at least once secondary school (but not both) may have a minor positive (+?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are not within 800m of an existing school may have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is uncertain. |
| <p>IA9: Promote sustainable modes of transport.</p> | <p>Residential</p> <p>The proximity of residential site options to sustainable transport links will affect the extent to which people are able to make use of non-car based modes of transport to access services, facilities, and job opportunities, although the actual use of sustainable transport modes will depend on people's behaviour. It is possible that new transport links such as bus routes or cycle paths may be provided as part of new developments, particularly at larger sites, but this cannot be assumed.</p> <p>It is assumed that people would generally be willing to travel further to access a railway station than a bus stop. It is also recognised that many cyclists will travel on roads as well as dedicated cycle routes, and that the extent to which people choose to do so will depend on factors such as the availability of cycle storage facilities at their end destination, which is not determined by the location of sites. How safe or appealing particular</p> |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---------------|---|
| | <p>roads are for cyclists cannot be determined at this strategic level of assessment. However, the proximity of site options to existing cycle routes can be taken as an indicator of how likely people are to cycle to or from a development site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are within 800m of a railway station and 400m of a bus stop²² (regardless of proximity to cycle routes) will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites that are within 800m of a railway station or 400m of a bus stop (regardless of proximity to cycle routes) will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites that are more than 800m from any railway station and 400m from a bus stop but have an existing cycle route passing the site could have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is uncertain depending on whether the cycle route could be used for the purposes of commuting or undertaking day to day journeys. ■ Sites that are more than 800m from any railway station and 400m from a bus stop and that do not have an existing cycle route passing the site will have a significant negative (--) effect. <p>Furthermore, the proximity of residential site options to the main urban areas in the CLLP area will reduce the need for residents to travel long distances on a regular basis to access services and facilities. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within Preston Main Urban Area²³, South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas²⁴ or the District Centres²⁵ will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within the Local and Rural Centres²⁶, or the Smaller Rural Villages and Hamlets²⁷ will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites that are not adjacent to or within any of these areas will have a minor negative (-) effect. |

²² Planning for Walking. Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, 2015. This document states “The power of a destination determines how far people will walk to get to it. For bus stops in residential areas, 400m has traditionally been regarded as a cut-off point and, in town centres, 200m. People will walk up to 800m to get to a railway station, which reflects the greater perceived quality or importance of rail services.

²³ This is the City Centre, Inner Urban Neighbourhoods and Northern Preston. The City Centre is defined as Stonegate, Station Quarter, Harris Quarter and the University of Central Lancashire (main campus). Northern Preston is defined as Cottam, North West Preston and West Preston.

²⁴ South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas is defined as Leyland, Chorley, Farington, Farington Moss, Midge Hall, Moss Side, Penwortham, Lostock Hall, Bamber Bridge and Walton-le-Dale.

²⁵ Adlington, Euxton, Longridge, Longton, Clayton Brook/Green, Whittle-le-Woods, Buckshaw Village, Clayton-le-Woods and Coppull.

²⁶ Higher Walton, New Longton, Walmer Bridge, Croston, Eccleston, Hutton, Broughton and Grimsargh.

²⁷ Coupe Green, Much Hoole, Mellor Brook, Barton, Goosnargh, Lea Town, Woodplumpton, Abbey Village, Bretherton, Brindle, Charnock Richard, Gib Lane, Higher Wheelton, Houghton, Brinscall/Withnell, Gregson Lane, Mawdesley and Wheelton.

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|---|
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>The proximity of employment site options to sustainable transport links will affect the extent to which people are able to make use of non-car based modes of transport to access their workplace, although the actual use of sustainable transport modes will depend on people's behaviour. It is possible that new transport links such as bus routes or cycle paths may be provided as part of new developments, particularly at larger sites, but this cannot be assumed.</p> <p>It is assumed that people would generally be willing to travel further to access a railway station than a bus stop. It is also recognised that many cyclists will travel on roads as well as dedicated cycle routes, and that the extent to which people choose to do so will depend on factors such as the availability of cycle storage facilities at their end destination, which is not determined by the location of sites. How safe or appealing particular roads are for cyclists cannot be determined at this strategic level of assessment. However, the proximity of site options to existing cycle routes can be taken as an indicator of how likely people are to cycle to or from a development site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are within 800m of a railway station and 400m of a bus stop²⁸ (regardless of proximity to cycle routes) will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites that are within 800m of a railway station or 400m of a bus stop (regardless of proximity to cycle routes) will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ ■ Sites that are more than 800m from any railway station and 400m from a bus stop but have an existing cycle route passing the site could have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is uncertain depending on whether the cycle route could be used for the purposes of commuting. ■ Sites that are more than 800m from any railway station and 400m from a bus stop and that do not have an existing cycle route passing the site will have a significant negative (--) effect. |
| | <p>Mixed use</p> |
| <p>The proximity of mixed use site options to sustainable transport links will affect the extent to which people are able to make use of non-car based modes of transport to access services, facilities, and job opportunities, although the actual use of sustainable transport modes will depend on people's behaviour. It is possible that new transport links such as bus routes or cycle paths may be provided as part of new developments, particularly at larger sites, but this cannot be assumed.</p> | |

²⁸ Planning for Walking. Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, 2015. This document states "The power of a destination determines how far people will walk to get to it. For bus stops in residential areas, 400m has traditionally been regarded as a cut-off point and, in town centres, 200m. People will walk up to 800m to get to a railway station, which reflects the greater perceived quality or importance of rail services.

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---------------|---|
| | <p>It is assumed that people would generally be willing to travel further to access a railway station than a bus stop. It is also recognised that many cyclists will travel on roads as well as dedicated cycle routes, and that the extent to which people choose to do so will depend on factors such as the availability of cycle storage facilities at their end destination, which is not determined by the location of sites. How safe or appealing particular roads are for cyclists cannot be determined at this strategic level of assessment. However, the proximity of site options to existing cycle routes can be taken as an indicator of how likely people are to cycle to or from a development site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are within 800m of a railway station and 400m of a bus stop²⁹ (regardless of proximity to cycle routes) will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites that are within 800m of a railway station or 400m of a bus stop (regardless of proximity to cycle routes) will have a minor positive (+) effect. ■ Sites that are more than 800m from any railway station and 400m from a bus stop but have an existing cycle route passing the site could have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is uncertain depending on whether the cycle route could be used for the purposes of commuting or undertaking day to day journeys. ■ Sites that are more than 800m from any railway station and 400m from a bus stop and that do not have an existing cycle route passing the site will have a significant negative (--) effect. <p>Furthermore, the proximity of mixed use site options to the main urban areas in the CLLP area will reduce the need for residents to travel long distances on a regular basis to access services and facilities. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within Preston Main Urban Area³⁰, South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas³¹ or the District Centres³² will have a significant positive (++) effect. ■ Sites that are adjacent to or within the Local and Rural Centres³³, or the Smaller Rural Villages and Hamlets³⁴ will have a minor positive (+) effect. |

²⁹ Planning for Walking. Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, 2015. This document states “The power of a destination determines how far people will walk to get to it. For bus stops in residential areas, 400m has traditionally been regarded as a cut-off point and, in town centres, 200m. People will walk up to 800m to get to a railway station, which reflects the greater perceived quality or importance of rail services.

³⁰ This is the City Centre, Inner Urban Neighbourhoods and Northern Preston. The City Centre is defined as Stoneysgate, Station Quarter, Harris Quarter and the University of Central Lancashire (main campus). Northern Preston is defined as Cottam, North West Preston and West Preston.

³¹ South Ribble and Chorley Main Urban Areas is defined as Leyland, Chorley, Farington, Farington Moss, Midge Hall, Moss Side, Penwortham, Lostock Hall, Bamber Bridge and Walton-le-Dale.

³² Adlington, Euxton, Longridge, Longton, Clayton Brook/Green, Whittle-le-Woods, Buckshaw Village, Clayton-le-Woods and Coppull.

³³ Higher Walton, New Longton, Walmer Bridge, Croston, Eccleston, Hutton, Broughton and Grimsargh.

³⁴ Coupe Green, Much Hoole, Mellor Brook, Barton, Goosnargh, Lea Town, Woodplumpton, Abbey Village, Bretherton, Brindle, Charnock Richard, Gib Lane, Higher Wheelton, Houghton, Brinscall/Withnell, Gregson Lane, Mawdesley and Wheelton.

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|----------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites that are not adjacent to or within any of these areas will have a minor negative (-) effect. |
| IA10: Improve air quality. | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>Residential site options that are within close proximity to one of the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the CLLP area could increase levels of air pollution in those areas as a result of increased vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites within 500m of an AQMA are likely to have a significant negative (--) effect on air quality. Sites within 3km of an AQMA are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect on air quality. All other sites are expected to have a negligible (0) effect on air quality. <p>Transport is considered separately under IA objective 9.</p> |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>Employment site options that are within close proximity to one of the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the CLLP area could increase levels of air pollution in those areas as a result of increased vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites within 500m of an AQMA are likely to have a significant negative (--) effect on air quality. Sites within 3km an AQMA are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect on air quality. All other sites are expected to have a negligible (0) effect on air quality. <p>Transport is considered separately under IA objective 9.</p> |
| | <p>Mixed use</p> |
| | <p>Mixed use site options that are within close proximity to one of the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in the CLLP area could increase levels of air pollution in those areas as a result of increased vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites within 500m of an AQMA are likely to have a significant negative (--) effect on air quality. |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites within 3km of an AQMA are likely to have a minor negative (-) effect on air quality. ■ All other sites are expected to have a negligible (0) effect on air quality. <p>Transport is considered separately under IA objective 9.</p> |
| <p>IA11: Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green infrastructure and geodiversity assets.</p> | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>Residential site options that are within close proximity of an internationally, nationally or locally designated conservation site have the potential to affect the biodiversity or geodiversity of that site/feature, e.g. through habitat damage/loss, fragmentation, disturbance to species, air pollution, increased recreation pressure etc. Conversely, there may be opportunities to promote habitat connectivity if new developments include green infrastructure. Therefore, while proximity to designated sites provides an indication of the potential for an adverse effect, uncertainty exists, as appropriate mitigation may avoid adverse effects and may even result in beneficial effects. In addition, the potential impacts on biodiversity present on each site, or undesignated habitats and species adjacent to potential development sites, cannot be determined at this strategic level of assessment. This would be determined once more specific proposals are developed and submitted as part of a planning application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Residential sites that are within 250m of one or more internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity sites, or sites that are less than 250m from a National Nature Reserve or Local Nature Reserve and/or less than 100m from a Priority Habitat or Ancient Woodland may have a significant negative (--?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Residential sites that are between 250m and 1km of one or more internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity sites, or sites that are 250-750m from a National Nature Reserve or Local Nature Reserve and/or 100-250m from a Priority Habitat or Ancient Woodland may have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this uncertain. ■ Sites that are more than 1km from any internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity site and that are located beyond 750m from a National Nature Reserve Local Nature Reserve and/or beyond 250m from a Priority Habitat or Ancient Woodland will have a negligible (0) effect. |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| <p>Employment site options that are within close proximity of an internationally, nationally or locally designated conservation site have the potential to affect the biodiversity or geodiversity of that site/feature, e.g. through habitat damage/loss, fragmentation, disturbance to species, air pollution, increased recreation pressure etc. Conversely, there may be opportunities to promote habitat connectivity if new developments include green infrastructure. Therefore, while proximity to designated sites provides an indication of the potential for an adverse effect, uncertainty exists, as appropriate mitigation may avoid adverse effects and may even result in beneficial effects. In addition, the potential impacts on biodiversity present on each site, or undesignated habitats and species adjacent to potential development sites, cannot be determined at this strategic level of assessment. This would be determined once more specific proposals are developed and submitted as part of a planning application.</p> | |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Employment sites that are within 250m of one or more internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity sites, or sites that are less than 250m from a National Nature Reserve or Local Nature Reserve and/or less than 100m from a Priority Habitat or Ancient Woodland, may have a significant negative (--?) effect, although this is certain. ■ Employment sites that are between 250m and 1km of one or more internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity sites, or sites that are 250-750m from a National Nature Reserve or Local Nature Reserve and/or 100-250m from a Priority Habitat or Ancient Woodland may have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are more than 1km from any internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity site and that are located beyond 750m from a National Nature Reserve or Local Nature Reserve and/or beyond the 250m from a Priority Habitat or Ancient Woodland will have a negligible (0) effect. <p data-bbox="573 708 689 735">Mixed use</p> <p data-bbox="573 767 2132 959">Mixed use site options that are within close proximity of an internationally, nationally or locally designated conservation site have the potential to affect the biodiversity or geodiversity of that site/feature, e.g. through habitat damage/loss, fragmentation, disturbance to species, air pollution, increased recreation pressure etc. Conversely, there may be opportunities to promote habitat connectivity if new developments include green infrastructure. Therefore, while proximity to designated sites provides an indication of the potential for an adverse effect, uncertainty exists, as appropriate mitigation may avoid adverse effects and may even result in beneficial effects. In addition, the potential impacts on biodiversity present on each site, or undesignated habitats and species adjacent to potential development sites, cannot be determined at this strategic level of assessment. This would be determined once more specific proposals are developed and submitted as part of a planning application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Mixed use sites that are within 250m of one or more internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity sites, or sites that are less than 250m from a National Nature Reserve or Local Nature Reserve and/or less than 100m from a Priority Habitat or Ancient Woodland may have a significant negative (--?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Mixed use sites that are between 250m and 1km of one or more internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity sites, or sites that are 250-750m from a National Nature Reserve or Local Nature Reserve and/or 100-250m from a Priority Habitat or Ancient Woodland may have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this uncertain. ■ Sites that are more than 1km from any internationally or nationally designated biodiversity or geodiversity site and that are located beyond 750m from a National Nature Reserve or Local Nature Reserve and/or beyond 250m from a Priority Habitat or Ancient Woodland will have a negligible (0) effect. |
| | Residential |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|--|--|
| <p>IA12: Ensure communities, developments and infrastructure are resilient to the effects of climate change.</p> | <p>The extent to which the location of residential site options would facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars (and therefore contributions to climate change) is considered under IA objective 9.</p> <p>Flood risk, which is expected to increase as a result of climate change, is considered separately under IA objective 13.</p> |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>The extent to which the location of employment site options would facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars (and therefore contributions to climate change) is considered under IA objective 9.</p> <p>Flood risk, which is expected to increase as a result of climate change, is considered separately under IA objective 13.</p> |
| | <p>Mixed use</p> <p>The extent to which the location of mixed use site options would facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars (and therefore contributions to climate change) is considered under IA objective 9.</p> <p>Flood risk, which is expected to increase as a result of climate change, is considered separately under IA objective 13.</p> |
| <p>IA13: Reduce the risk of flooding to people and property.</p> | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>The effects of new development on this IA objective will depend to some extent on its design which will not be influenced by the location. Where residential site options are located in areas of high flood risk, it could increase the risk of flooding in those areas (particularly if the sites are not previously developed) and would increase the number of people and assets at risk from flooding. As such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are on greenfield land and that are partially or entirely located within Flood Zone 3 and/or are at high risk (1 in 30 year) of surface water flooding will have a significant negative (--) effect. ■ Sites that are on greenfield land and that are partially or entirely located within Flood Zone 2 and/or are at medium risk (1 in 100 year) of surface water flooding will have a minor negative (-) effect. ■ Sites that are on greenfield land and that are partially or entirely located within Flood Zone 1 and/or are at low risk (1 in 1,000 year) or no risk of surface water flooding will have a negligible (0) effect. <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are on brownfield land will have a minor positive (+) effect. |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---------------|---|
| | <p data-bbox="573 371 2145 416">Employment</p> <p data-bbox="573 427 2145 512">The effects of new development on this IA objective will depend to some extent on its design which will not be influenced by the location. Where residential site options are located in areas of high flood risk, it could increase the risk of flooding in those areas (particularly if the sites are not previously developed) and would increase the number of people and assets at risk from flooding. As such:</p> <ul data-bbox="573 531 2145 754" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="573 531 2145 595">■ Sites that are on greenfield land and that are partially or entirely located within Flood Zone 3b and/or at high risk (1 in 30 year) of surface water flooding will have a significant negative (--) effect. <li data-bbox="573 611 2145 675">■ Sites that are on greenfield land and that are partially or entirely located within Flood Zones 3a or 2 and/or at medium risk (1 in 100 year) of surface water flooding will have a minor negative (-) effect. <li data-bbox="573 691 2145 754">■ Sites that are on greenfield land and that are partially or entirely located within Flood Zone 1 and/or at low risk (1 in 1,000 year) or no risk of surface water flooding will have a negligible (0) effect. <p data-bbox="573 770 696 794">In addition:</p> <ul data-bbox="573 818 1346 842" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="573 818 1346 842">■ Sites that are on brownfield land will have a minor positive (+) effect. <p data-bbox="573 874 2145 919">Mixed use</p> <p data-bbox="573 930 2145 1015">The effects of new development on this IA objective will depend to some extent on its design which will not be influenced by the location. Where residential site options are located in areas of high flood risk, it could increase the risk of flooding in those areas (particularly if the sites are not previously developed) and would increase the number of people and assets at risk from flooding. As such:</p> <ul data-bbox="573 1034 2145 1257" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="573 1034 2145 1098">■ Sites that are on greenfield land and that are partially or entirely located within Flood Zone 3 and/or at high risk (1 in 30 year) of surface water flooding will have a significant negative (--) effect. <li data-bbox="573 1114 2145 1177">■ Sites that are on greenfield land and that are partially or entirely located within Flood Zone 2 and/or at medium risk (1 in 100 year) of surface water flooding will have a minor negative (-) effect. <li data-bbox="573 1193 2145 1257">■ Sites that are on greenfield land and that are partially or entirely located within Flood Zone 1 and/or at low risk (1 in 1,000 year) or no risk of surface water flooding will have a negligible (0) effect. <p data-bbox="573 1273 696 1297">In addition:</p> <ul data-bbox="573 1321 1346 1345" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="573 1321 1346 1345">■ Sites that are on brownfield land will have a minor positive (+) effect. |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|--|---|
| <p>IA14: Protect and improve the quality and availability of water resources.</p> | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>The effects of new development on water quality will depend on factors such as whether there is capacity at the relevant sewage treatment works to accommodate the new development, which cannot be assessed at this stage. It is recognised that policies in the Local Plan may require any necessary upgrades to be made before development proceeds. However, the effects could also be influenced by the proximity of residential site options to Source Protection Zones. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites within Source Protection Zone 1 could have a significant negative (--?) effect on water quality, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites within Source Protection Zones 2 or 3 could have a minor negative (-?) effect on water quality, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are not within a Source Protection Zone are likely to have a negligible (0) effect on water quality. |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>The effects of new development on water quality will depend on factors such as whether there is capacity at the relevant sewage treatment works to accommodate the new development, which cannot be assessed at this stage. It is recognised that policies in the Local Plan may require any necessary upgrades to be made before development proceeds. However, the effects could also be influenced by the proximity of residential site options to Source Protection Zones. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites within Source Protection Zone 1 could have a significant negative (--?) effect on water quality, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites within Source Protection Zones 2 or 3 could have a minor negative (-?) effect on water quality, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are not within a Source Protection Zone are likely to have a negligible (0) effect on water quality. |
| <p>Mixed use</p> | |
| <p>The effects of new development on water quality will depend on factors such as whether there is capacity at the relevant sewage treatment works to accommodate the new development, which cannot be assessed at this stage. It is recognised that policies in the Local Plan may require any necessary upgrades to be made before development proceeds. However, the effects could also be influenced by the proximity of residential site options to Source Protection Zones. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites within Source Protection Zone 1 could have a significant negative (--?) effect on water quality, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites within Source Protection Zones 2 or 3 could have a minor negative (-?) effect on water quality, although this is uncertain. | |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are not within a Source Protection Zone are likely to have a negligible (0) effect on water quality. |
| <p>IA15: Increase energy efficiency, encourage low-carbon generation and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>The location of residential site options will not affect the achievement of this objective – effects will depend largely on the detailed proposals for design and construction of the sites. Energy efficiency will also depend on new residents’ behaviour and the inclusion of renewable energy generation in development. The extent to which the location of residential site options would facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars is considered under IA objective 9 above.</p> |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>The location of residential site options will not affect the achievement of this objective – effects will depend largely on the detailed proposals for design and construction of the sites. Energy efficiency will also depend on new residents’ behaviour and the inclusion of renewable energy generation in development. The extent to which the location of residential site options would facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars is considered under IA objective 9 above.</p> |
| <p>IA16a: Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, in addition to the local character and distinctiveness of the CLLP area.</p> | <p>Mixed use</p> |
| | <p>The location of residential site options will not affect the achievement of this objective – effects will depend largely on the detailed proposals for design and construction of the sites. Energy efficiency will also depend on new residents’ behaviour and the inclusion of renewable energy generation in development. The extent to which the location of residential site options would facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport in place of cars is considered under IA objective 9 above.</p> |
| <p>IA16a: Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, in addition to the local character and distinctiveness of the CLLP area.</p> | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>Residential development could have some effect on the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and/or townscape, which has been assessed in the Stage 2 Landscape Sensitivity report. All effects are recorded as uncertain as the actual effects will depend on the final design, scale and layout of development. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are recorded as having high or moderate-high sensitivity are expected to have a significant negative (--?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are recorded as having moderate or low-moderate sensitivity are expected to have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is uncertain. |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are recorded as having low sensitivity or which are located within an existing settlement and were therefore not assessed as part of the Stage 2 Landscape Sensitivity report are expected to have a negligible (0?) effect, although this is uncertain. |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>Employment development could have some effect on the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and/or townscape, which has been assessed in the Stage 2 Landscape Sensitivity report. All effects are recorded as uncertain as the actual effects will depend on the final design, scale and layout of development. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are recorded as having high or moderate-high sensitivity are expected to have a significant negative (--?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are recorded as having moderate or low-moderate sensitivity are expected to have a minor negative (-?) effect, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are recorded as having low sensitivity or which are located within an existing settlement and were therefore not assessed as part of the Stage 2 Landscape Sensitivity report are expected to have a negligible (0?) effect, although this is uncertain. |
| | <p>Mixed use</p> |
| <p>IA16b: Conserve and/or enhance heritage assets and their setting</p> | <p>Residential</p> <p>The NPPF states that "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be)". However, development could</p> |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---------------|---|
| | <p>also enhance the significance of the asset (provided that the development preserves those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset).</p> <p>In all cases, effects will be uncertain at this stage as the potential for negative or positive effects on historic and heritage assets will depend on the exact scale, design and layout of the new development and opportunities which may exist to enhance the setting of heritage features (e.g. where sympathetic development replaces a derelict brownfield site which is currently having an adverse effect).</p> <p>The CLAs are in the process of working with Lancashire County Council and Historic England to develop an appropriate assessment methodology for establishing the potential for site options to generate significant effects on the significance and setting of the built and buried historic environment in the CLLP area. The assessment will consider the potential for effects on designated and non-designated historic assets.</p> <p>In the absence of this forthcoming evidence the following precautionary assumptions have been applied as an indication of potential effects on historic and heritage assets from development of any of the site options. The following assumptions and evidence will be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Where a site is more than 500m from the nearest designated heritage asset, it could have a negligible effect (0?), although this is uncertain as there is still some potential for impacts on non-designated heritage features and effects may extend beyond 500m in some cases. <p>Where a site is within 500m of a designated heritage asset, personal judgement and evidence will be used to inform judgements. Where there are potential impacts on multiple heritage assets this will also be taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites which have potential for heritage assets to be enhanced and their significance to be better revealed could have a minor positive (+?) or significant positive (++) effect on this objective. ■ Sites which are unlikely to cause adverse impacts on heritage assets could have a negligible (0?) effect on this objective. ■ Sites which have the potential to cause harm to heritage assets, but can be mitigated, would have a minor negative (-?) effect on this objective. ■ Sites which have the potential to cause harm to heritage assets where it is unlikely that these can be adequately mitigated would have a significant negative (--?) effect on this objective. |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>The NPPF states that "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be)". However, development could also enhance the significance of the asset (provided that the development preserves those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset).</p> |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---------------|--|
| | <p>In all cases, effects will be uncertain at this stage as the potential for negative or positive effects on historic and heritage assets will depend on the exact scale, design and layout of the new development and opportunities which may exist to enhance the setting of heritage features (e.g. where sympathetic development replaces a derelict brownfield site which is currently having an adverse effect).</p> <p>As an indication of potential effects on historic and heritage assets from development of any of the site options, the following assumptions and evidence will be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Where a site is more than 500m from the nearest designated heritage asset, it could have a negligible effect (0?), although this is uncertain as there is still some potential for impacts on non-designated heritage features and effects may extend beyond 500m in some cases. <p>Where a site is within 500m of a designated heritage asset, personal judgement and evidence will be used to inform judgements. Where there are potential impacts on multiple heritage assets this will also be taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites which have potential for heritage assets to be enhanced and their significance to be better revealed could have a minor positive (+?) or significant positive (++?) effect on this objective. ■ Sites which are unlikely to cause adverse impacts on heritage assets could have a negligible (0?) effect on this objective. ■ Sites which have the potential to cause harm to heritage assets, but can be mitigated, would have a minor negative (-?) effect on this objective. ■ Sites which have the potential to cause harm to heritage assets where it is unlikely that these can be adequately mitigated would have a significant negative (--?) effect on this objective. |
| | <p>Mixed use</p> <p>The NPPF states that "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be)". However, development could also enhance the significance of the asset (provided that the development preserves those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset).</p> <p>In all cases, effects will be uncertain at this stage as the potential for negative or positive effects on historic and heritage assets will depend on the exact scale, design and layout of the new development and opportunities which may exist to enhance the setting of heritage features (e.g. where sympathetic development replaces a derelict brownfield site which is currently having an adverse effect).</p> |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|--|---|
| | <p>The CLAs are in the process of working with Lancashire County Council and Historic England to develop an appropriate assessment methodology for establishing the potential for site options to generate significant effects on the significance and setting of the built and buried historic environment in the CLLP area. The assessment will consider the potential for effects on designated and non-designated historic assets.</p> <p>In the absence of this forthcoming evidence the following precautionary assumptions have been applied as an indication of potential effects on historic and heritage assets from development of any of the site options. The following assumptions and evidence will be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Where a site is more than 500m from the nearest designated heritage asset, it could have a negligible effect (0?), although this is uncertain as there is still some potential for impacts on non-designated heritage features and effects may extend beyond 500m in some cases. <p>Where a site is within 500m of a designated heritage asset, personal judgement and evidence will be used to inform judgements. Where there are potential impacts on multiple heritage assets this will also be taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites which have potential for heritage assets to be enhanced and their significance to be better revealed could have a minor positive (+?) or significant positive (++?) effect on this objective. ■ Sites which are unlikely to cause adverse impacts on heritage assets could have a negligible (0?) effect on this objective. ■ Sites which have the potential to cause harm to heritage assets, but can be mitigated, would have a minor negative (-?) effect on this objective. ■ Sites which have the potential to cause harm to heritage assets where it is unlikely that these can be adequately mitigated would have a significant negative (--?) effect on this objective. |
| <p>IA17: Ensure that land resources are allocated and used in an efficient and sustainable manner to meet the housing and employment needs of the CLLP area, whilst reducing land contamination.</p> | <p>Residential</p> <p>Development on brownfield land represents more efficient use of land in comparison to the development of greenfield sites. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are on greenfield land classed as Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land will have a significant negative (--) effect. This will be uncertain (--?) if the site is within Grade 3 land, as only Grade 3a is classed as high quality but the GIS data available does not distinguish between Grades 3a and 3b. ■ Sites that are on greenfield land classed as Grade 4 or 5 agricultural land, or urban land, will have a minor negative (-) effect. ■ Sites that are on brownfield land will have a minor positive (+) effect. |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---|--|
| | <p>Furthermore, all new development will result in the increased consumption of minerals for construction, but this will not be influenced by the location of the development. The location of development sites can influence the efficient use of minerals as development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas may sterilise mineral resources and restrict the availability of resources in the CLLP area. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area are expected to have a minor negative (-?) effect with uncertainty. ■ Sites that do not fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area are expected to have a negligible (0) effect. |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>Development on brownfield land represents more efficient use of land in comparison to the development of greenfield sites. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are on greenfield land classed as Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land will have a significant negative (--) effect. This will be uncertain (--?) if the site is within Grade 3 land, as only Grade 3a is classed as high quality but the GIS data available does not distinguish between Grades 3a and 3b. ■ Sites that are on greenfield land classed as Grade 4 or 5 agricultural land, or urban land, will have a minor negative (-) effect. ■ Sites that are on brownfield land will have a minor positive (+) effect. <p>Furthermore, all new development will result in the increased consumption of minerals for construction, but this will not be influenced by the location of the development. The location of development sites can influence the efficient use of minerals as development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas may sterilise mineral resources and restrict the availability of resources in the CLLP area. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area are expected to have a minor negative (-?) effect with uncertainty. ■ Sites that do not fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area are expected to have a negligible (0) effect. |
| | <p>Mixed use</p> |
| <p>Development on brownfield land represents more efficient use of land in comparison to the development of greenfield sites. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are on greenfield land classed as Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land will have a significant negative (--) effect. This will be uncertain (--?) if the site is within Grade 3 land, as only Grade 3a is classed as high quality but the GIS data available does not distinguish between Grades 3a and 3b. ■ Sites that are on greenfield land classed as Grade 4 or 5 agricultural land, or urban land, will have a minor negative (-) effect. | |

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are on brownfield land will have a minor positive (+) effect. <p>Furthermore, all new development will result in the increased consumption of minerals for construction, but this will not be influenced by the location of the development. The location of development sites can influence the efficient use of minerals as development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas may sterilise mineral resources and restrict the availability of resources in the CLLP area. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area are expected to have a minor negative (-?) effect with uncertainty. ■ Sites that do not fall within a Minerals Safeguarding Area are expected to have a negligible (0) effect. |
| <p>IA18: Promote sustainable consumption of resources and support the implementation of the waste hierarchy.</p> | <p>Residential</p> |
| | <p>The effects of new residential development on waste generation will depend largely on residents' behaviour. However, where development takes place on previously developed land there may be opportunities to reuse onsite buildings and materials, thereby reducing waste generation. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are on brownfield land will have a minor positive (+?) effect on reducing waste generation, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are on greenfield land will have a negligible (0) effect on reducing waste generation. |
| | <p>Employment</p> |
| | <p>The effects of new employment development on waste generation will depend largely on the nature and practices of the businesses that locate there. However, where development takes place on previously developed land there may be opportunities to reuse onsite buildings and materials, thereby reducing waste generation. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are on brownfield land will have a minor positive (+?) effect on reducing waste generation, although this is uncertain. ■ Sites that are on greenfield land will have a negligible (0) effect on reducing waste generation. |
| <p>Mixed use</p> | |
| <p>The effects of new mixed use development on waste generation will depend largely on residents' behaviour and the nature and practices of the businesses that locate there. However, where development takes place on previously developed land there may be opportunities to reuse onsite buildings and materials, thereby reducing waste generation. Therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sites that are on brownfield land will have a minor positive (+?) effect on reducing waste generation, although this is uncertain. | |

Appendix A
Site Assessment Criteria

Central Lancashire Local Plan: Integrated Assessment
November 2022

| IA objectives | Assumptions |
|---------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Sites that are on greenfield land will have a negligible (0) effect on reducing waste generation. |