

Pendle Local Plan Part 2 Site Allocations & Development Polices

Site Assessment Criteria

| SOURCE | | | CRITERIA | | TRAFFIC LIGHTING (STAGE 1) & SCORING (STAGE 2) | | | | | ADDITIONAL INFORMATION | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| SHLAA | ELR | Other | Ref | Issue | 5 pts | 4 pts | 3 pts | 2 pts | 1pt | How will it be measured? | Additional Comments | Linkages to legislation, guidance and Policy |
| 0 BASELINE INFORMATION | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B1 | 0.1 | Strategic Site | 0.1 | What is the overall area of the site? (hectares) | Over 0.25ha | | | | Under 0.25ha | PBC: GIS Mapping Landowners / Developers - Site Nomination Forms | | Planning practice Guidance - para ID: 3-010-20140306 |
| B2 | | | 0.2 | What is the indicative capacity of the site? (e.g. number of dwellings, employment floorspace etc.) | No score, contextual information only | | | | | PBC: GIS Mapping Landowners / Developers - Site Nomination Forms | | |
| S0 S6 | 8.1 | | 0.3 | Describe the location of the site in relation to nearest settlement. | Within Key Service Centre | Edge of Key of Service Centre or within a Local Service Centre | Edge of Local Service Centre or within a Rural Service Centre | Edge of Rural Service Centre or within or edge of a Rural Village | Other (e.g. isolated sites in the open countryside) | PBC: GIS Mapping | Urban edge sites must have at least part of their boundary co-existent with a defined settlement boundary. Sites within existing settlements are considered to be more sustainable than edge of settlement and remote rural locations. | NPPF - para 17 (BP5 and BP11) and para 55 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-016-130729 SHLAA Practice Guidance - para 38 Core Strategy - Policy SDP2 |
| S1 | 8.2 SD5 | Strategic Site | 0.4 | How much of the site can be regarded as previously developed land? (e.g. Brownfield / Greenfield split) | Brownfield | Predominantly Brownfield | Greenfield / Brownfield | Predominantly Greenfield | Greenfield or Brownfield of high environmental value | PBC: GIS Mapping & Site Visit | Determined in accordance with the NPPF definition for Previously Developed Land (PDL). Encourage the effective use of land by re-using PDL (brownfield land), provided it is not of high environmental value. | NPPF - paras 17 (BP8) & 111 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 8-024-20140306 Core Strategy - Policy SDP2 |
| 1 AVAILABILITY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A OWNERSHIP CONSTRAINTS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A4 | | DCLG | 1.1 | Is the site currently in an alternative use? | No The site is vacant and available for development | Yes All or part of the site is in use, but the occupier(s) are on a short-term lease, which will not be renewed. The site can be made available within six months. | Yes The site is still in use and it is unclear when it will become available for development. | | | PBC: Site Visits Landowners / Developers - Site Nomination Forms | Sites that are currently in another use are not considered to be available; except where a landowner or developer has provided evidence that the occupier of the site is on a short-term lease and operations will cease within a six month period. | NPPF: para 47 (Footnotes 11 & 12) Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-020-130729 SHLAA Practice Guidance - para 39 |
| A5 | 5.3 | | 1.2 | Is the number and identity of freehold or leasehold owners known? | Yes 1 owner | Yes 2 owners | Yes 3 or more owners | Don't know | | PBC: Business Rates / Property Services Landowners / Developers - Site Nomination Forms Estate Agents Land Registry | Sites in multiple ownership are often more difficult to assemble and make available for development. | Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-020-130729 SHLAA Practice Guidance - para 39 ELR Guidance Note - Box 4.4 |
| | 5.1 MA5 | | 1.3 | Is the site already owned by a developer or agency known to undertake development? | Yes | Don't know | | No | | PBC: Property Register Landowners / Developers - Site Nomination Forms Estate Agents | | ELR Guidance Note - Box 4.4 |
| | 5.2 MA6 | | 1.4 | Are the owner(s) of the site likely to sell or bring it forward for future development? | Development agreement already in place | Single owner willing to sell for future development | Single owner Intentions unknown or Multiple owners No issues identified | Multiple owners Issues identified but appear capable of resolution | Single or multiple owners Unwilling to develop and/or complex issues to resolve | PBC: Business Rates Landowners / Developers - Site Nomination Form Estate Agents Land Registry | | Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-020-20140306 ELR Guidance Note - Box 4.5 |
| B USER CONSTRAINTS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S4 | | Strategic Site | 1.5 | Is the site currently designated for a particular use in an adopted Development Plan Document? | Yes For the proposed use | No | Yes But the designated use is no longer relevant | Yes For an alternative use that is still appropriate | | PBC: Local Plan / Area Action Plan Parish Council: Neighbourhood Plan LCC: Minerals & Waste Plan | | NPPF - para 22 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-019-20140306 Core Strategy - para 2.6, Policy ENV1 |
| | 5.5 MA7 | | 1.6 | Is there a valid permission for the proposed use? | Yes Permission for proposed use | No Permission for proposed use has expired | No Planning application for proposed use not previously submitted | No Planning permission for proposed use has been refused | No Permission for alternative use | PBC: IDOX Uniform Database | | NPPF: para 47 (Footnote 11) Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-019-20140306 |
| V1 | 6.10 SD12 | | 1.7 | Is the proposed use the only acceptable form of built development on the site? | Yes | Don't know | | No | | PBC: GIS Mapping & Site Visit | | |
| | 6.11 PL1 | | 1.8 | Is the site likely to be reserved for a specific end user, or specialist use? | No | Possibly / Don't know | Yes | | PBC: Housing, Health & Economic Development Landowners / Developers - Site Nomination Forms | | ELR Guidance Note - Box 4.6 | |

| SOURCE | | CRITERIA | | TRAFFIC LIGHTING (STAGE 1) & SCORING (STAGE 2) | | | | | | ADDITIONAL INFORMATION | | |
|------------|-------------|----------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| | | C | TIMESCALES | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.11 | | 1.9 | When is the site likely to be available for development? | Immediate or within one year | 2-5 years | 6-10 years | 11-15 years | Over 15 years | Landowners / Developers: Site Nomination Forms Estate Agents | The Local Plan is required to allocate sites that will be available early in the plan period to address any backlog on delivery. | NPPF: para 47 (Footnotes 11 & 12) Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-020-20140306 ELR Guidance Note - Box 4.5 | |
| 4.7 MA3 | | 1.10 | PDL- If unoccupied, how long has the site been vacant? | Under 12 months | | 1-5 years | | > 5 years | PBC: Property Register & Business Rates | | NPPF - para 22 | |
| | | 2 | ACHIEVABILITY | | | | | | | | | |
| | | A | VIABILITY | | | | | | | | | |
| V3 | 4.10 MA8 | 2.1 | Does the residual valuation calculation show a good (positive) value for the site, without the need for public funding to resolve infrastructure or other on-site constraints? | Viable | | Marginal | | Unviable | PBC: EDU & Property Services Regenerate PL Estate Agents Developers | The economic viability of developing a site will often be the main factor in determining whether a site is likely to come forward for development. Sites are compared with the appropriate model benchmark in the Development Viability Study, which allows a broad-brush assessment of viability to be made. Site specific viability information may be provided by the landowner or developer. | NPPF - paras 173-177 | |
| | 9.5 PL3 | 2.2 | Is there sufficient public funding committed, to overcome any infrastructure or on-site constraints, to make the proposed use viable? | Yes | | Don't know | | No | PBC: Housing & Economic Regeneration | | | |
| | | B | MARKET CONDITIONS / PERCEPTION AND DEMAND | | | | | | | | | |
| V2 | 4.1 | Strategic Site | 2.3 | What is the strength of market demand in the area for the proposed development? (Assess the principal market segment in mixed-use developments) | Very strong | Strong | Moderate | Weak | Very weak | PBC: Internal data sets Estate Agents: House prices and demand data Land Registry: House prices Zoopla: House prices ONS: Various data sets | NPPF: para 159 Planning Practice Guidance: paras ID: 2a-019-20140306 and ID: 2a-030-20140306 SHLAA Practice Guidance: Appendix 2 ELR Practice Guidance: Box E.1 | |
| | 4.2 | | 2.4 | What is the level of supply of comparable sites in the local area? (Including neighbouring authorities, where appropriate) | Shortage High demand | | Sufficient Enough sites to meet current demand | | Abundant Little or no demand evident | PBC: Property Register Estate Agents: Listings | NPPF: paras 22 and 23 (BPG) ELR Practice Guidance: paras 4.4, 4.28 and 6.32 | |
| | 4.4 | | 2.5 | Is there any potential to extend the proposed development onto adjacent land in the future? | Yes Substantial areas of adjacent land have no obvious restrictions for the proposed use | | Limited Some adjacent land is potentially suitable, but there may be some restrictions to development for the proposed use | | No No the adjacent land is protected or there are likely to be severe restrictions to development for the proposed use | PBC: GIS Mapping & Site Visits Landowners | | |
| | 4.5 MA4 | | 2.6 | Is the site being actively marketed for the proposed use? | Yes | | | No | PBC: Property Register Estate Agents | Identify if the property is being marketed for the proposed use. [N.B. scoring the length of time would adversely impact on property new to the market] | | |
| | | 3 | SUITABILITY | | | | | | | | | |
| | | A | INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS | | | | | | | | | |
| A1 A5 | 5.4 | | 3.1 | Is access to the site constrained? (e.g. presence of ransom strips or other known ownership constraints on development) | No | | Don't know | | Yes | PBC: Property Services Landowners / Developers: Site Nomination Form Estate Agents Land Registry | Planning Practice Guidance - paras ID: 3-020-20140306 SHLAA Practice Guidance - paras 39 ELR Guidance Note - Box E.1 | |
| A2 A3 | | Strategic Site | 3.2 | Is there an existing vehicular access into the site? | Yes There is an existing vehicular entrance with adequate visibility splays. | Yes There is a potential access point (e.g. farm gate/track) but it will require improvement to ensure that adequate visibility splays can be provided. | No There is currently no vehicular access into the site. A new access point will be required, but adequate visibility splays can be provided. | Yes There is a potential access point (e.g. farm gate/track) but it is unlikely that adequate visibility splays can be provided. | No There is currently no vehicular access into the site. It is unlikely that a new access with adequate visibility splays can be provided. | PBC: GIS Mapping, Aerial Photography & Site Visits Landowners / Developers: Site Nomination Form LCC: Highways | If vehicular access already exists then the site is considered to be ready and available. | Planning Practice Guidance - paras ID: 3-016-20140306 & ID: 3-020-20140306 SHLAA Practice Guidance - paras 38 & 39 |
| | | Strategic Site | 3.3 | Is the capacity of road network constrained in the immediate vicinity of site, or close by? | No | Yes But only minor congestion at peak times | Moderate Minor improvements in vicinity of site achievable through \$106/CIL | Significant Major improvements to highway network required through \$106/CIL | Significant Major improvements to highway network unlikely to occur | PBC: Engineering & Special Projects, Environmental Health LCC: Highways | | NPPF - para 30 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 54-005-20141010 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 |
| S7 S8 | 6.3 MA9 | Strategic Site | 3.4 | Are any infrastructure works required to provide adequate connections to essential utilities? (including water supply, sewage, drainage, electricity, gas and telecoms) | No All connections available within the site | Yes Some connections available within the site. Minor works required to make off-site connections | Yes No connections available within the site. Minor/moderate works required to make off-site connections. | Yes Diversion of power lines, sewers etc. likely to be required. | Yes Major constraints for one or more connections | PBC: Engineering & Special Projects Landowners / Developers: Site Nomination Form Utility Companies EA | | Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-016-20140306 |

| SOURCE | | | CRITERIA | TRAFFIC LIGHTING (STAGE 1) & SCORING (STAGE 2) | | | | | ADDITIONAL INFORMATION | | | |
|------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Blackburn-with-Darwen | 3.5 | Is any part of the site within the buffer zone of high pressure gas pipeline (150m) or overhead electricity cables (100m)? | No | Yes Electricity cables Buffer Zone (Gas) | Yes Outer Zone (Gas) | Yes Middle Zone (Gas) | Yes Inner Zone (Gas) | PBC: GIS Mapping Utility Companies HSE | | Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-016-20140306 |
| S10 | 6.2 0.4 | Strategic Site | 3.6 | Will the topography of the site lead to a reduction to the net developable area, or require engineering solutions that will constrain the size and shape of the plots / plateau available for development. | None Minimal loss of developable land | Minor Up to 25% of the site may be undevelopable | Moderate 25-50% of the site may be undevelopable | Significant Less than half the site may be developable | Critical The site is undevelopable | PBC: GIS Mapping, Aerial Photography & Site Visits Landowners / Developers: Site Nomination Form | | Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 3-016-20140306 |
| | | | B | NATURAL ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | | | |
| S33 S34 | 6.4 SD6 | Strategic Site | 3.7 | Would development of the site be likely to result in any adverse impacts for a site designated as being of importance for its ecological or biodiversity value? | No Not in close proximity to a designated site, and/or no adverse impacts identified. | No But the site is within an Ecology Standing Advice Consultation Zone | No Within the buffer zone for a BHS/GHS/LNR | Yes BHS/GHS/LNR adjoins or present on the site | Yes Potential for adverse impact on SAC/SPA/SSSI | PBC: GIS Mapping LCC: LERN Environment Records & MapZone Lancashire Wildlife Trust (LNP) | Recommended buffer zones: Special Area of Conservation (SAC) = 1000m Ancient Woodland = 500m Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) = 250m Priority Habitat / Priority Species = 250m Local Wildlife Site (BHS, LNI) = 250m Local Nature Reserve (LNR) = 100m Local Geodiversity Site (LGS) = 50m (Source: Environmental Networks, Shropshire Council, September 2013) | NPPF - paras 9,109, 114 & 117 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 8-009-20140306 Core Strategy - Policy ENV1 |
| | | | 3.8 | Do records show the presence of priority habitats or priority species on, or near, the site? | No | | Yes Within buffer zone | Yes Adjoins site | Yes On site | PBC: GIS Mapping LCC: LERN Environment Records & MapZone Lancashire Wildlife Trust (LNP) | As above | NPPF - paras 9,109, 114 & 117 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 8-017-20140306 Core Strategy - Policy ENV1 |
| | 6.4 SD6 | | 3.9 | Would development of the site be likely to result in any adverse impacts for an ecological network or a wildlife corridor? | No | Yes Minimal impact, mitigation possible. Not within an Ecology Standing Advice Consultation Zone | Yes Moderate impact, mitigation possible. Within an Ecology Standing Advice Consultation Zone. | Yes Significant impact, mitigation possible. Within an Ecology Standing Advice Consultation Zone. | Yes Significant impact, mitigation not possible. Within an Ecology Standing Advice Consultation Zone. | PBC: GIS Mapping LCC: LERN Environment Records & MapZone Lancashire Wildlife Trust (LNP) | | |
| S32 | | | 3.10 | Would development of the site be likely to result in the loss of trees, hedgerows or shrubs protected by a TPO? | No There are no TPOs on the site. The site is not within the 15m buffer for a TPO tree. | | Partial The site is within the 15m buffer for a TPO tree. | | Yes The site contains a TPO. | PBC: GIS Mapping | | NPPF - paras 118 (BP5) Planning Practice Guidance - para ID:36-001-20140306 Core Strategy - Policy ENV1 |
| | | | 3.11 | Would development of the site be likely to result in the loss of agricultural land? | No Urban | | Yes Grade 5 | Yes Grade 4 | Yes Grade 3 | LCC: MapZone | | NPPF - paras 109, 112 & 143 (BP8) Planning Practice Guidance - para ID:8-026-20140306 |
| | 6.4 SD6 | | 3.12 | Would development of the site be likely to result in the loss of Green Belt land? | No | | | | Yes | PBC: GIS Mapping | Also refer to Site Assessment Criterion 3.17, which considers the potential for the coalescence of settlements. | NPPF - paras 79-91 Core Strategy - Policies ENV1 & ENV2 |
| SS | 6.4 SD6 | | 3.13 | Would development of the site be likely to result in the loss of designated open space, common land, village green or local green space? | No loss | | Partial loss Off-site replacement feasible | | Significant / total loss Off-site replacement not feasible | PBC: GIS Mapping | | NPPF - paras 74 & 77 Core Strategy - Policy ENV1 |
| | 6.4 SD6 | | 3.14 | Would development of the site be likely to result in any adverse impacts on the Forest of Bowland AONB? | No Not within the vicinity of the AONB | | Yes Located outside the AONB, but potential for impact on views out of the AONB | Yes Within the AONB, but minor and/or localised impact anticipated | Yes Within or adjacent to the AONB, but is likely to have a significant impact | PBC: GIS Mapping LCC: Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan | Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONB. | NPPF - paras 14 (Footnote 9), 115 and 165 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 8-004-20140306 and ID: 8-005-20140306 Core Strategy - Policies ENV1 & ENV2 |
| | | | 3.15 | Identify the principal landscape character type for the area in which the site is located. | No score, contextual information only | | | | | Natural England: National Character Areas LCC: Landscape Character Assessment | Where possible, proposed developments should be of a size, type and density that is in sympathy with the prevailing landscape character | |
| | | | 3.16 | In the context of the landscape character type in which the site is situated, describe how development of the site for the proposed use would be likely to impact on the wider landscape. | Little or none (e.g. self contained site within a settlement boundary) | Minor (e.g. urban edge site enclosed on 2-3 sides by development) | Moderate (e.g. urban edge site with development along one boundary) | Substantial (e.g. sustainable development on a site within 400m of the settlement boundary of a key, local or rural service centre) | Significant & adverse (e.g. incongruous development on an isolated site within the open countryside) | PBC: GIS Mapping Natural England: National Character Areas LCC: Landscape Character Assessment | | NPPF - para 109 (BP1) Planning Practice Guidance: para ID: 8-001-20140306 Core Strategy: Policy ENV1 |
| | | Strategic Site | 3.17 | How visible is the site in the landscape from public vantage points? (e.g. roads, railway lines, public rights of way, viewpoints etc.) | Not visible | Visible Minor impact, site well screened | Visible Moderate impact (visible in distant views) | Visible Local detrimental impact minimal / no screening | Highly visible Significant adverse impact | PBC: GIS & Lidar Mapping, Aerial Photography, Site Visits | | NPPF - para 109 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 8-001-20140306 Core Strategy - Policies SDP2, ENV1 and ENV2 |

| SOURCE | | | CRITERIA | | TRAFFIC LIGHTING (STAGE 1) & SCORING (STAGE 2) | | | | ADDITIONAL INFORMATION | | | |
|-------------------|------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | D HISTORIC & BUILT ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | | | | |
| S28 S29 S30 | 6.4 SD6 | Strategic Site | 3.18 | Would development of the site be likely to result in any harm to the significance of a heritage asset, its setting or the wider historic environment? (e.g. listed buildings, scheduled monuments, conservation areas, townscape features, archaeological remains etc.) | No No adverse impacts identified. No data relating to archaeological remains available for this site. | Yes Conservation Area adjacent to the site; setting may be affected. Potential harm to an asset identified on a Local List. | Yes All or part of the site lies within a Conservation Area. Potential harm to a Grade II Listed Building or its setting. No data relating to archaeological remains available for this site. Further investigation may be required. | Yes Potential harm to a Grade II Listed Building or its setting. | Yes Potential harm to a Grade I Listed Building, a Scheduled Ancient Monument or their setting. Site contains known archaeological remains. Further investigation must be carried out. | PBC: GIS Mapping and Site Visits LCC: Environment Directorate & MapZone Historic England: Advice Note 3 | What if any protected species or habitats are likely to be present? Record the presence of natural and heritage assets in the immediate vicinity of the site. | NPPF - paras 126-141 Planning Practice Guidance - para Core Strategy - Policy ENV1 |
| | 6.4 SD6 | | 3.19 | Would development of the site be likely to contribute towards the coalescence of settlements? | No | Yes Will marginally reduce the size of the gap between two settlements | | Yes Will significantly reduce the size of the gap between two settlements | Yes Could potentially close the gap between two settlements | PBC: GIS Mapping | | NPPF - paras 80 |
| | | | E OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS | | | | | | | | | |
| S9 | 6.5 SD8 | Strategic Site | 3.20 | Have any potential sources of contamination been identified? | No No issues identified. | | Yes Within 250m buffer zone of a landfill site | Yes Potential for on-site contamination (e.g. former landfill site) | Yes Officially designated contaminated site | PBC: GIS Mapping, Environmental Health LCC: Minerals & Waste EA: Landfill Maps | | NPPF - paras 109, 120 & 121 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 33-001-20140306 Core Strategy - Policy ENV5 |
| | 6.6 SD8 | | 3.21 | Are there any potential adverse impacts arising from on-site structures, unstable land, culverted watercourse etc.? | No No issues identified. | | Yes Minor engineering works required, with little or no loss of developable land. | | Yes Significant engineering works required, and some loss of developable land | PBC: GIS Mapping & Site Visit Lancashire County Council: Asset register EA: Asset register | | NPPF - para 109, 102 & 121 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 45-001-20140306 Core Strategy - Policy ENV5 |
| S39 S40 | 6.9 | Strategic Site | 3.22 | Is the site potentially affected by former coal mining activities, or are there any potentially workable mineral deposits on or under the site? | Off Coal Area / Not within a Mineral Safeguarding Area | | Standing Advice Area for Coal | | Development Referral Area (Coal) or Mineral Safeguarding Area | PBC: GIS Mapping LCC: Minerals & Waste Coal Authority: Planning Team | GIS layers are available for coal referral and standing advice areas and for mineral safeguarding areas. | NPPF - para 143 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 27-147-20140306 Core Strategy - Policies ENV1 & ENV6 |
| S11 | 6.8 SD9 | Strategic Site | 3.23 | What is the likely risk and extent of flooding on the site? (N.B. undeveloped sites only) | Zone 1 | <25% in Flood Zone 2 or 3 | 25-50% in Flood Zone 2 or 3 | 50-75% in Flood Zone 2 or 3 | >75% in Flood Zone 2 or 3 | PBC: GIS Mapping EA: GIS mapping - Flood risk from rivers or the sea and flood risk from reservoirs | The extent of Flood Zones 2&3 are available to view on the EA and LCC (MapZone) websites and PBC has access to these GIS layers. Mapping to show the extent of Flood Zones 3a and 3b is not readily available, but will be assessed for any sites considered for allocation. | NPPF - paras 99-104 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 7-001-20140306 and ID: 7-003-20140306 Core Strategy - Policy ENV7 |
| | | | 3.24 | What is the likely risk and extent of surface water flooding on the site? (undeveloped sites only) | Very Low | Low | | Medium | High | PBC: GIS Mapping EA: GIS Mapping and Flood risk from surface water | The extent of surface water flooding is available to view on the EA website and PBC has access to the GIS layers. | NPPF - paras 99-104 Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 7-013-20140306 Core Strategy - Policy ENV7 |
| | | Strategic Site | 3.25 | Is there any evidence of groundwater or aquifers on the site, or is the site within a drinking water safeguarded zone? | No | | Yes Minor constraints | | Yes Significant constraints | PBC: GIS Mapping EA: Aquifer superficial drift and bedrock mapping | The extent of Flood Zones 2&3 are available to view on the EA and LCC (MapZone) websites and PBC has access to the GIS layers. | NPPF - paras 109 (BP4) Planning Practice Guidance - para ID: 34-010-20161116 Core Strategy - Policy ENV7 |
| | | | F QUALITY OF THE WIDER ENVIRONMENT | | | | | | | | | |
| S9 S35 | 1.2 | Strategic Site | 3.26 | Is the proposed development likely to have an adverse impact on surrounding uses? If yes, could these be overcome through mitigation measures? | No | | Yes Mitigation measures should overcome any issues | | Yes Mitigation either not possible or will have limited impact | PBC: GIS Mapping (consideration and recording of surrounding uses), Environmental Health records and site visits. | Consider both from the site and adjacent uses. | Planning Practice Guidance - para ID3-016-130729 SHLAA Practice Guidance - para 38 |
| S36 S37 | 2.1 SD7 | | 3.27 | What is the potential for adjacent land uses to constrain the type and quality of uses that could potentially occupy the site? (i.e. in terms of noise and light pollution, traffic generation etc.) | Minimal or no impact | | Moderate negative impact. Mitigation measures should overcome any issues | Significant negative impact. Major mitigation work required or not possible. | Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in immediate vicinity. Major mitigation work required or not possible. | PBC: Site Visit & Environmental Health | Assess the compatibility of adjacent occupiers/uses. Consider the extent to which development of the site may be constrained by amenity considerations arising from these occupiers/uses (i.e. in terms of pollution, noise, light or traffic generation) | Planning Practice Guidance - para ID3-016-130729 SHLAA Practice Guidance - para 38 ELR Practice Guidance - Box E.1 |
| | 2.2 | | 3.28 | What is the overall perception of the area in the immediate vicinity of the site? | Positive | | Neutral / Mixed | | Negative | PBC: Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IDB) & Site Visit Estate Agents: House prices and demand data Land Registry: House prices | Consider the general condition of the site/estate/premises (i.e. the provision of soft landscaping elements etc.), the appearance of the streetscape and the quality of adjacent occupiers. | ELR Practice Guidance - Box E.1 |

| SOURCE | | | CRITERIA | | TRAFFIC LIGHTING (STAGE 1) & SCORING (STAGE 2) | | | | | | ADDITIONAL INFORMATION | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | E | ACCESSIBILITY | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3.1 MA10 | Strategic Site | 3.29 | Access to the motorway network. | <1km | 1-2km | 2-3km | 3-5km | >5km | PBC: GIS Mapping | Distance travelled to access the nearest motorway junction. | Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| | 6.1 SD9 3.2 MA10 | Strategic Site | 3.30 | Access to the nearest main road. | Direct access onto motorway network | Direct access onto A or B road, no issues | Direct access onto A or B road, some issues to resolve | Indirect access onto A or B road <2km journey along distributor road / residential street | Indirect access onto A or B road >2km journey with critical restrictions to HGV access requiring off-site works | PBC: GIS Mapping, Engineering & Special Projects LCC: Highways | Restrictions may include narrow roads, restrictive height and weight restrictions on bridges. Distance travelled to access the nearest junction with an A Road (or the B6383 in West Craven) | NPPF - paras 17 (BP11), 30 and 35 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S12 S13 S13a | 7.2 SD1 | Strategic Site | 3.31 | Access by public transport, from the nearest key service centre. | Bus stop with <20 min service interval, or railway station within a 5 min walk | Bus stop with 20-40 min service interval, or railway station within a 5-10 min walk | Bus stop with 40-60 min service interval, or railway station within a 5-10 min walk | Bus stop with 1 route and >60 min service interval, or railway station within a 5-10 min walk | No bus stops or railway station within a 5-10 min walk | PBC: GIS Mapping Transdev/Northern Rail: Service timetables | Based on distance from the centre of a site, using a safe and direct route: WALKING 5 minutes upto 400m (flat) 10 minutes upto 800m (flat), or 400m (with a long or steep slope) 15 minutes upto 1200m (flat) or 800m (with a long or steep slope) 20 minutes upto 1600m (flat) or 1200m (with a long or steep slope) DRIVING 5 minutes upto 1km (high density urban) or 2-3km (low density/rural) 10 minutes upto 4km (high density urban) or 4-8km (low density/rural) 15 minutes upto 12km | NPPF - paras 30, 34 & 35 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S21 | | | 3.32 | Ease of access to nearest source of significant employment. (e.g. business park, town centre, retail park etc.) | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Within a 30 min walk or a 10-15 min drive | Over 30 min walk or 15 min drive | PBC: Local Plan / GIS Mapping RegeneratePL: Spatial Plan | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S19 | 2.3 SD2 | Strategic Site | 3.33 | Ease of access to nearest Town or Local Shopping Centre (excludes out of town retail) | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Within a 30 min walk or a 10-15 min drive | Over 30 min walk or 15 min drive | PBC: Local Plan / GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S20 | | | 3.34 | Ease of access to nearest superstore | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Within a 30 min walk or a 10-15 min drive | Over 30 min walk or 15 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S23 | | | 3.35 | Ease of access to nearest convenience store (e.g. Spar, Nisa, Premier, Co-op etc.) | Within a 5 min walk | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Over 20 min walk or 10 min drive | PBC: Local Plan / GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S14 | | | 3.36 | Ease of access to nearest primary school or nursery | Within a 5 min walk | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Over 20 min walk or 10 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S15 | | | 3.37 | Ease of access to nearest secondary school | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Within a 30 min walk or a 10-15 min drive | Over 30 min walk or 15 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S17 | | | 3.38 | Ease of access to nearest doctors surgery or health centre | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Within a 30 min walk or a 10-15 min drive | Over 30 min walk or 15 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| | | | 3.39 | Ease of access to nearest dentist | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Within a 30 min walk or a 10-15 min drive | Over 30 min walk or 15 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S18 | | | 3.40 | Ease of access to nearest hospital | Within a 25 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | | Within a 25-50 min walk or a 10-15 min drive | | Over 50 min walk or 15 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S16 | | | 3.41 | Ease of access to nearest sports or leisure centre | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Within a 30 min walk or a 10-15 min drive | Over 30 min walk or 15 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S16 | | | 3.42 | Ease of access to nearest cultural facility (e.g. theatre, cinema, art gallery, museum etc.) | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Within a 30 min walk or a 10-15 min drive | Over 30 min walk or 15 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S25 | | | 3.43 | Ease of access to nearest amenity open space (including parks, equipped play areas etc.) | Within a 5 min walk | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Over 20 min walk or 10 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |
| S26 S27 | | | 3.44 | Ease of access to nearest public right of way (e.g. footpath, bridleway or cycleway) | Within a 5 min walk | Within a 10 min walk | Within a 15 min walk or a 5 min drive | Within a 20 min walk or a 5-10 min drive | Over 20 min walk or 10 min drive | PBC: Local Plan & GIS Mapping | As above | NPPF - paras 17 (bullet point 11) 30, 34, 35, 37 and 38 Core Strategy - Policy ENV4 | |

| SOURCE | CRITERIA | TRAFFIC LIGHTING (STAGE 1) & SCORING (STAGE 2) | | | ADDITIONAL INFORMATION | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|----|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| | F SOCIAL AND REGENERATION POLICY | | | | | | |
| | 3.45 Is the site within a designated Neighbourhood Area? | No score, contextual information only | | | | | |
| 9.3 9.4 PL2 PL4 | 3.46 Has the site been identified (in an existing or proposed strategy/masterplan) as a key opportunity to deliver economic development, or other spatial policy objectives? | Yes (Adopted document) | Yes (Draft document) | No | PBC: Local Plan, Housing & Economic Regeneration PLA: Spatial Guide, ED Strategy LEP: Lancashire Growth Plan | | ELR Practice Guidance - para 2.11 |

| KEY | Stage 1: High Level Assessment | Stage 2: Detailed Assessment | Abbreviations |
|-----|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | Traffic Lighting (RAG) | Scoring | |
| | Positive | 5 pts Positive | PBC = Pendle Borough Council |
| | Neutral / Mixed | 4 pts ↓ | LCC = Lancashire County Council |
| | Negative | 3 pts ↓ | LEP = Lancashire Enterprise Partnership |
| | Negative - Critical Impact | 2 pts ↓ | PLA = Pennine Lancashire Authorities |
| | | 1pt Negative | EA = Environment Agency |

DRAFT