

# Oldham

# Local Plan

**Local Plan Review: Draft Local Plan Integrated  
Assessment Appendix 17: IA of Site  
Allocations - North**

December 2023



**Oldham**  
Council



# Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref / name: HLA2094 Lilac View Close	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.59 ha	Indicative capacity: 18 (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No / little concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	No overriding ecological constraints. Adjacent water course will need protection.  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	No mitigation identified at this stage however site has a pending Planning application, and this may identify mitigation measures.  The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	Adjacent to LCT Pennine Foothills (West / South Pennines).	Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	+	No heritage concerns.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential Test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – e.g. a mil)	+	Passes Sequential Test. FRA would be required to address surface water flood risk.	See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.  In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC4 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	?	Site falls within SPZ.	Mitigation would be required to control pollutants in line with Planning policies and guidance.

Site ref / name: HLA2094 Lilac View Close	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.59 ha	Indicative capacity: 18 (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1, 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	<p>Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++</p> <p>Previously developed land in Green Belt = +</p> <p>Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +</p> <p>Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x</p> <p>Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X</p>	X	Site is greenfield on the edge of Shaw although it is a saved phase 2 UDP housing allocation.	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A	N/A	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	<p>Housing:</p> <p>Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?</p> <p>Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --</p>	--	Not within close proximity to road that exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE Policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and Policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	<p>Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).</p> <p>(a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>	--	Site is surrounded by residential and open land to north, east and south. To the west is employment uses however no known specific issues at present.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process. Site has a pending Planning application which will identify any necessary conditions.
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	<p>Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++</p> <p>Major development with high accessibility = +</p>	++	Very high accessibility as has access to bus stop with frequent service and Shaw Metrolink stop.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.

Site ref / name: HLA2094 Lilac View Close	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.59 ha	Indicative capacity: 18 (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Major development with medium accessibility = X  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX			
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	?	PROW 108 passes through site	Policies in the Local Plan such as policy T2 'Sustainable Streets'; Policy D1 – 'A Design-Led Approach for Residential & Mixed-Use Development'; and Policy D2 – 'A Design Led Approach to Non-Residential, Commercial and Employment Developments' will ensure account is taken of footpaths.
14, 15 and 16	Highways	Site acceptable in principle (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?  Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X	?	Acceptability subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing requirements of a transport assessment where necessary.	Site has a pending Planning application which will identify any mitigation required.
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	Potential positive impact on highway network = +  No impact on highway network = --  Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown at this stage= ?	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	Is the site accessible to other key services  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services include an education and health facility = +++  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++  Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +  Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X	+++	Site has access to a GP, primary school, post office and community facilities within 800m	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.

Site ref / name: HLA2094 Lilac View Close	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.59 ha	Indicative capacity: 18 (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Major housing site with no access to key services = XX			
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	<p>Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +</p> <p>Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --</p> <p>Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +</p> <p>Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X</p> <p>For housing sites: N/A</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	<p>For employment / mixed use site or housing site in active or recent employment use:</p> <p>1ha + = ++</p> <p>0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +</p> <p>0 ha = --</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A

Site ref / name: HLA2094 Lilac View Close	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.59 ha	Indicative capacity: 18 (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X -1ha + = XX			
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	Red (scores 1-3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	--	IMD Score = 8  The site will make a limited contribution to tackling deprivation.	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m to centre = +  Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --	--	Not within or close to centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Adjacent to MSA.	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Not close to waste sites / area.	N/A

The site has a pending Planning application for residential development FUL/350791/23 (21 residential units).

The site has no overriding ecological constraints. It is adjacent a water course which will need protection.

The site has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scored positives against criteria in particular those in heritage, flood risk and waste. The site scores significantly positive for public transport accessibility.

This site is a saved phase two UDP housing allocation. The site scored negatively against one IA objective as it is a greenfield site. However, the site has access to a number of key services, including health services and a primary school. NPPF does allow for a mix of sites so although the Local Plan aims to maximise the proportion of previously developed land that is used to meet development needs it is recognised that some greenfield sites can make up the housing land supply.

There are some uncertainties where details are not likely to be known until later in Plan process or Planning application stage in relation to source protection zone, footpaths, highways and contributions to health and education. Policies are in place to ensure that appropriate mitigation is implemented to support Planning approvals.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site does appear to be acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan Review.



# Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref/ name: HLA2452 Blackshaw Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.55ha	Indicative capacity: 15 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No / little concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	?	Site has developed some ecological interest and will require habitat and tree surveys.  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	Site does not fall within an LCT.	N/A
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: -  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	+	Site is within 250m of a listed building, however overall there are no heritage concerns.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A	+	Site is 100% within Flood Zone 1 and therefore passes the sequential test. See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.	See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk. In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Site is not within SPZ.	N/A

Site ref/ name: HLA2452 Blackshaw Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.55ha	Indicative capacity: 15 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1, 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	<p>Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++</p> <p>Previously developed land in Green Belt = +</p> <p>Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +</p> <p>Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x</p> <p>Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X</p>	X	Site is greenfield in the urban area.	
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies.	--	No known opportunities at this stage from available mapping.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	<p>Housing:</p> <p>Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?</p> <p>Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --</p>	--	Site is not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 emissions.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	<p>Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).</p> <p>Local environmental quality noise: housing site next to a motorway or major road or B2/B8 use odour: site next to a waste management facility (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>	--	Site does not appear to be in close proximity to any uses that would cause amenity harm.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++	+	Site is major development with high accessibility as it has access to a bus	N/A

Site ref/ name: HLA2452 Blackshaw Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.55ha	Indicative capacity: 15 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>Major development with high accessibility = +</p> <p>Major development with medium accessibility = X</p> <p>Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX</p>		stop/route with frequent service.	
1 and 16	Footpaths	<p>Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?</p> <p>Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?</p> <p>No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --</p>	--	Site does not have any footpaths running through site that would be impacted.	N/A
14, 15 and 16	Highways	<p>Site acceptable in principle (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +</p> <p>Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?</p> <p>Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X</p>	+	No specific concerns. Acceptable in principle subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing requirements of a transport assessment where necessary.	Detailed design needed.
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network	<p>Potential positive impact on highway network = +</p> <p>No impact on highway network = --</p> <p>Potential adverse impact on highway network = X</p> <p>Unknown = ?</p>	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	<p>Is the site accessible to other key services:</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services include an education and health facility = +++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +</p> <p>Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X</p>	++	Site is major development with access to several key services (including primary education, secondary education and community facilities) within 800m.	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.

Site ref/ name: HLA2452 Blackshaw Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.55ha	Indicative capacity: 15 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Major housing site with no access to key services = XX			
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well-being: Provision of health facilities or open space	<p>Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +</p> <p>Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --</p> <p>Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ?</p> <p>For employment sites = N/A</p>	?	<p>At this stage, the site would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.</p> <p>The site is currently identified as natural/semi-natural open space and as such development will require compensatory measures to replace open space provision.</p>	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss of education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ?</p> <p>For employment sites = N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +</p> <p>Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X</p> <p>For housing sites: N/A</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	<p>For employment / mixed use / housing sites where employment is still in active / recent use:</p> <p>1ha + = ++</p> <p>0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A

Site ref/ name: HLA2452 Blackshaw Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.55ha	Indicative capacity: 15 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		0 ha = -- -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X -1ha + = XX			
18	Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score)	Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	+	IMD score = 6. Site is within a moderately deprived area. Development of the site could improve deprivation.	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre / within 400m of centre = + Housing site outside of centre / not within 400m of centre: --	--	Site outside of centre and not within 400m of centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = + Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X Other uses = N/A	?	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan for ensuring the right mix, size and type of housing.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = + 0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment.	N/A. See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = -- Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Site not within MSA.	N/A. GM Minerals Plan contains policies on Minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Site not within a waste area / site.	N/A

The site has developed some ecological concerns a will require tree and protected species surveys.

The site has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scores significantly positive for being in an accessible, sustainable location with access to several key services. The site is also located within a deprived area so the site would assist with regeneration. The site also either scores positive where the site is not affected by a constraint / not likely to impact or neutral because no adverse impacts are expected.

There are a few uncertainties around provision of health and education, which at this stage all housing would be expected to contribute to in line with Planning policy. In addition, the site scored uncertain against promoting and protecting open space as the site is currently identified as natural/semi-natural open space. It is noted that replacement provision would be required as a result of development of this site as a compensatory measure, and in line with Planning policy. Site specific criteria relating to health, education and open space to address this could be added to an allocation if the allocation progresses. An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage.

The site scores potentially negative against using brownfield land efficiently as it is a greenfield site. The site has previously been allocated for housing in the Local Plan. Other policies will ensure that this land is used efficiently.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site does appear to be acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan Review.

# Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref / name: HLA2785 Thornham Mill, Oozewood Road, Royton	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.64 ha	Indicative capacity: 60 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	<p>Does the site have ecological concerns?</p> <p>No / little concern = --</p> <p>Site will require ecological assessment = ?</p> <p>Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x</p>	--	<p>No overriding ecological constraints. Bat surveys will be needed at application stage.</p> <p>Site does have Planning permission for housing therefore acceptable with conditions attached relating to ecology.</p> <p>However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.</p>	<p>The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.</p> <p>In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.</p>
3 and 5	Landscape Character	<p>Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --</p> <p>Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?</p>	--	Site is not within an LCT.	PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	<p>Does the site have heritage concerns:</p> <p>No heritage concerns: +</p> <p>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --</p> <p>Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?</p> <p>Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X</p>	--	Planning application approved for loss of mill which was justified.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	<p>Site passes the Sequential Test: +</p> <p>Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?</p> <p>Site does not pass Sequential Test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --</p> <p>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X</p> <p>Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – eg a mill conversion)</p>	+	Site passes Sequential Test as it is in Flood Zone 1. A Flood Risk Assessment for any future application should be submitted to address surface water flood risk.	<p>See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.</p> <p>In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and policy CC4 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.</p>



<b>Site ref / name: HLA2785 Thornham Mill, Oozewood Road, Royton</b>	<b>Potential Use: Residential</b>	<b>Area: 0.64 ha</b>	<b>Indicative capacity: 60 homes (major)</b>	<b>Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph</b>	
<b>IA Objective</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Site outside SPZ.	N/A
1, 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++  Previously developed land in Green Belt = +  Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +  Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x  Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X	++	Site is previously developed (a mill complex).	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A	N/A	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	Housing:  Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?  Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --	--	Not within close proximity to a road that exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limits for NO2.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE Policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and Policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).  (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)  No: --  Yes but could be mitigated: ?  Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X	?	No neighbour uses that would appear to conflict although demolition of mill would need to be managed (noise, dust etc).  Site has Planning permission which includes conditions for a demolition environment Plan and construction environment Plan. An air quality assessment was also requested. Subject to conditions the application was found to not have an unacceptable impact.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.



<b>Site ref / name: HLA2785 Thornham Mill, Oozewood Road, Royton</b>	<b>Potential Use: Residential</b>	<b>Area: 0.64 ha</b>	<b>Indicative capacity: 60 homes (major)</b>	<b>Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph</b>	
<b>IA Objective</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++  Major development with high accessibility = +  Major development with medium accessibility = X  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX	+	Site has access to bus stop with frequent service.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3, D1 and D2 in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	--	No footpaths etc	Site specific mitigation as required  Policies in the Local Plan such as policy T2 'Creating Sustainable Streets'; Policy D1 'A Design-Led Approach for Residential & Mixed-Use Development'; and Policy D2 'A Design Led Approach to Non-Residential, Commercial and Employment Developments' will ensure account is taken of footpaths.
14, 15 and 16	Highways	Site acceptable in principle (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?  Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X	+	Site has obtained Planning permission for housing which recognised the site was in an established residential area with access to public transport and a wide range of Local amenities. A significant amount of additional traffic as a result of the development was not anticipated to the detriment of highway safety.	Specific conditions were attached to the Planning approval.
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	Potential positive impact on highway network = +  No impact on highway network = --  Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown at this stage= ?	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	Is the site accessible to other key services  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two	X	Has access to primary schools within 800m. Other key services are within 1000m.	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.

Site ref / name: HLA2785 Thornham Mill, Oozewood Road, Royton	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.64 ha	Indicative capacity: 60 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>services include an education and health facility = +++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +</p> <p>Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X</p> <p>Major housing site with no access to key services = XX</p>		Planning committee report notes the site is within a 15-minute walk to Royton centre.	
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	<p>Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +</p> <p>Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --</p> <p>Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>	?	<p>At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.</p> <p>This site has Planning approval and it was found that based on the viability report the applicant would be taking reduced profit to make the scheme viable and that open space contributions was not possible. However, any future application would need to be re-assessed.</p>	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss of education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>	? / x	<p>At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.</p> <p>This site has Planning approval and it was found that based on the viability report the applicant would be taking reduced profit to make the scheme viable and that education contributions was not possible. However, any future application would need to be re-assessed.</p>	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	For employment sites only - Is the site:	N/A	N/A	N/A

Site ref / name: HLA2785 Thornham Mill, Oozewood Road, Royton	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.64 ha	Indicative capacity: 60 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +</p> <p>Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X</p> <p>For housing sites: N/A</p>			
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	<p>For employment/ mixed use site / housing site is active or recent employment:</p> <p>1ha + = ++</p> <p>0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +</p> <p>0 ha = --</p> <p>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X</p> <p>-1ha + = XX</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas	<p>Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++</p> <p>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +</p> <p>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --</p>	+	<p>IMD score = 5</p> <p>The site will make a moderate contribution to regeneration of deprived areas.</p>	N/A
20	Centres	<p>Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m of centre = +</p> <p>Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --</p>	--	Not within or close to centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	<p>Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +</p> <p>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X</p> <p>Other uses = N/A</p> <p>For employment: N/A</p>	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy	N/A. See housing policies in PFE and Local Plan.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	<p>providing for pitches = +</p> <p>0 pitches = --</p>	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --	--	Not in an MSA	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.

<b>Site ref / name: HLA2785 Thornham Mill, Oozewood Road, Royton</b>	<b>Potential Use: Residential</b>	<b>Area: 0.64 ha</b>	<b>Indicative capacity: 60 homes (major)</b>	<b>Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph</b>	
<b>IA Objective</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
	Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)			
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Not within / adjacent to waste site / area	N/A

The site has limited ecological concerns, however it has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site has an extant planning permission for 60 residential units (FUL/346141/21). The planning application process has considered several of these objectives as part of the approval process to ensure sustainable development. Should the approved development scheme not come forward, any future development of the site would be expected to come forward in line with local planning policy.

The site has scored a mixture of positive and neutrals with regards to ecology, landscape, heritage, flood risk, water quality, air quality, waste, minerals and public transport accessibility. A significantly positive score was given for the site being previously developed in the urban area.

There are a number of uncertainties around contributions to health and education and strategic highway network although it should be noted the site does benefit from a planning approval. The site scored a negative against access to services as only primary schools are within 800 metres. A number of other key services are within 1000m and the site was within a 15-minute walk to Royton centre.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site does appear to be acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan Review.

# Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref/ name: HLA3981 Shaw Distribution Centre, Linney Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 12.45ha	Indicative capacity: 400 (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	No overriding ecology concerns. Site has Planning permission which has considered ecological impact.  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  The site has permission for residential development and ecology impact mitigation has been considered as part of the approved application.  Policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type: --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	Site not within LCT.	PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	--	The site is within 250m of Conservation Area and Listed Building.  Site has Planning permission which has considered impact on the historic environment.	See previous column.  Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – e.g. a mill conversion)	+	Passes Sequential Test if development avoids areas of flood zone 3b, 3 and 2.  Site has Planning permission which has considered flood risk.	Site has Planning permission which has considered flood risk. If a new application was required, an updated FRA would be needed to address surface water flood risk and high climate change modelling. See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.  In addition, Policy JP-S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +	?	Site is within a SPZ.	N/A

Site ref/ name: HLA3981 Shaw Distribution Centre, Linney Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 12.45ha	Indicative capacity: 400 (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?			
1, 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	<p>Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++</p> <p>Previously developed land in Green Belt = +</p> <p>Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +</p> <p>Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x</p> <p>Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X</p>	++	Site is previously developed land in the urban area.	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A	N/A	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	<p>Housing:</p> <p>Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?</p> <p>Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --</p>	--	Not within close proximity to road exceeding or close to exceeding legal limit for NO2.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	<p>Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).</p> <p>(a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>	?	Site is adjacent to the Metrolink Line. Site has Planning permission which has considered impact on Local environmental quality.	Mitigation for Local environmental impact is including within the Planning conditions.

Site ref/ name: HLA3981 Shaw Distribution Centre, Linney Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 12.45ha	Indicative capacity: 400 (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++  Major development with high accessibility = +  Major development with medium accessibility = X  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX	++	Site has very high accessibility to public transport as it is within 400m of a frequent bus route and 800m of a Metrolink Stop.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3, CO9 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	--	Site does not have any footpaths running through site that would be impacted.	N/A
14, 15 and 16	Highways	No Highway concerns (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?  Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X	+	No specific concerns. Acceptable in principle subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing requirements of a transport assessment where necessary.  The Planning application considered access and highways issues.	The Planning application considered access and highways issues.
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	Potential positive impact on highway network = +  No impact on highway network = --  Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown at this stage= ?	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	Is the site accessible to other key services  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services	+++	Site has partial access to five types of key services including schools and health.	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.



Site ref/ name: HLA3981 Shaw Distribution Centre, Linney Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 12.45ha	Indicative capacity: 400 (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>include an education and health facility = +++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +</p> <p>Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X</p> <p>Major housing site with no access to key services = XX</p>			
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	<p>Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +</p> <p>Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --</p> <p>Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criterions for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criterions for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A



Site ref/ name: HLA3981 Shaw Distribution Centre, Linney Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 12.45ha	Indicative capacity: 400 (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X  For housing sites: N/A			
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	For employment / mixed use / housing sites in active or recent employment use:  1ha + = ++  0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +  0 ha = --  -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X  -1ha + = XX	XX	The site has an extant Planning permission which has considered the loss of the employment uses which were formerly onsite. Demolition has begun onsite as part of the redevelopment of the site.  The site is identified as part of BEA 9 within the existing Local Plan. However, the boundary of the existing BEA is proposed to be amended to remove the application site, as part of the Local Plan Review.	The Planning application process has considered the loss of the employment uses which were formerly onsite.  The Local Plan will ensure that there is sufficient employment land.
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	Red (scores 1-3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	+	IMD = 4  The site is in a moderately deprived area. Development of the site could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m of centre = +  Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --	+	Site is within 400m of Shaw centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) (Mapping GM)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Not within an MSA.	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.

<b>Site ref/ name: HLA3981 Shaw Distribution Centre, Linney Lane</b>	<b>Potential use: Residential</b>	<b>Area: 12.45ha</b>	<b>Indicative capacity: 400 (major)</b>	<b>Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph</b>	
<b>IA Objective</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Not within / close to a waste site / area.	N/A

The site has outline planning permission for 400 homes (OUT/345898/20). The Planning application process has considered several of these objectives as part of the approval process to ensure sustainable development. Should the approved development scheme not come forward, any future development of the site would be expected to come forward in line with Local Planning policy.

The site has limited ecological concerns, however it has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scores a significantly positive for having good access to key services, facilities and public transport. The site also either scores positive where the site is not within a constraint / not likely to impact or neutral because no adverse impacts are expected.

The site scores significantly positive against using brownfield land efficiently as it is a previously developed site in the urban area. The site also scores positively against ensuring the vitality of the borough's centres as it is within 400m of Shaw centre.

There are a few uncertainties around provision of health and education, which at this stage all housing would be expected to contribute to in line with planning policy. However, site specific criteria to address this could be added to an allocation if the allocation progresses. An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage.

The site has scored negatively against loss of employment uses because the site was formerly used for employment purposes. The planning application process has considered the loss of the employment uses and demolition of the site has since begun. The Local Plan will ensure there is sufficient employment land to meet needs.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment and taking into account the extant Planning permission, the site is acceptable to progress to the next Local Plan Review stage.

# Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site name / ref: SHA0164 Shaw Health Centre, High Street, Shaw	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.26	Indicative Capacity: 14 homes (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No / little concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	No overriding ecological concerns.  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	N/A	PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: -  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	+	No heritage concerns.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so exception test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – eg a mill – we are assuming we will retain)	+	100% of the site is in FZ1	See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.  In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +	+	Site is outside of Groundwater Source Protection Zone	N/A

Site name / ref: SHA0164 Shaw Health Centre, High Street, Shaw	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.26	Indicative Capacity: 14 homes (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?			
1, 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	<p>Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++</p> <p>Previously developed land in Green Belt = +</p> <p>Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +</p> <p>Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x</p> <p>Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X</p>	++	Site is currently occupied and in use as the Health Centre, however a new Health Centre has been applied for on land to the north on Westway. Would be classed as previously developed land.	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score is given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A		Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	<p>Housing:</p> <p>Within close proximity (20m) to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?</p> <p>Not within close proximity (20m) to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = +</p> <p>Employment:</p> <p>locating B2/B8 within close proximity (20m) to existing residential areas: ?</p> <p>locating B2/B8 further than 20m from existing residential areas: --</p>	+	Site is not within 20m of a road exceeding the legal limit.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	<p>Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).</p> <p>(a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p>	?	There may be some concerns in relation to passing motor traffic as it located close to the A663	Detailed design required.

Site name / ref: SHA0164 Shaw Health Centre, High Street, Shaw	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.26	Indicative Capacity: 14 homes (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X  Note from CD – as the air quality one above should prob be a ? If its for commercial use and there is resi loacted close by.			
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++ <sup>1</sup>  Major development with high accessibility = + <sup>2</sup>  Major development with medium accessibility = X <sub>3</sub>  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX <sup>4</sup>	++	Very High Accessibility. Lies within the 800m buffer for Shaw & Crompton Metrolink stop.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	--	No PROW associated with the site.	Policies in the Local Plan such as policy T2 'Creating Sustainable Streets' ; Policy D1 – 'A Design-Led Approach for Residential & Mixed-Use Development'; and Policy D2 – 'A Design Led Approach to Non-Residential, Commercial and Employment Developments' will ensure account is taken of footpaths.
14, 15 and 16	Highways	In principle site acceptable (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?  Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X	+	General caveat: No specific concerns. Acceptable in principle subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing requirements of a transport assessment where necessary. Town centre location caveat: In addition to the above, site is in a town centre sustainable and accessible location as such no parking provision necessary.	Detailed design required.

<sup>1</sup> Very High Accessibility: within 400 metres of a bus stop with a frequent route and 800 metres of a rail station or Metrolink stop

<sup>2</sup> High Accessibility: within 400 metres of a bus stop with a frequent route or 800 metres of a rail station or Metrolink stop

<sup>3</sup> Medium Accessibility: within 400 metres of a bus stop (not frequent) or within 800 metres of a rail station or Metrolink stop

<sup>4</sup> Low Accessibility: not within approximately 400 metres of a bus stop or 800 metres of a Metrolink or rail stop.

Site name / ref: SHA0164 Shaw Health Centre, High Street, Shaw	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.26	Indicative Capacity: 14 homes (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	<p>Potential positive impact on highway network = +</p> <p>No impact on highway network = --</p> <p>Potential adverse impact on highway network = X</p> <p>Unknown at this stage= ?</p>	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	<p>Is the site accessible to other key services</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services include an education and health facility = +++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +</p> <p>Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X</p> <p>Major housing site with no access to key services = XX</p>	+++	Site is within 800m of a Dentist, GP and Primary School. Site is also within Shaw Town Centre.	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	<p>Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +</p> <p>Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --</p> <p>Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ?</p> <p>For employment: N/A</p>	N/A	N/A	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.

Site name / ref: SHA0164 Shaw Health Centre, High Street, Shaw	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.26	Indicative Capacity: 14 homes (major)	Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ?</p> <p>For employment: na</p>			
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area or centre = +</p> <p>Outside of BEA / SEA or centre = X</p> <p>For housing sites: N/A</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	<p>For employment / or housing sites where employment is still in active / recent use:</p> <p>1ha + = ++</p> <p>0.01ha to 0.99ha of land = +</p> <p>0 ha = --</p> <p>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X</p> <p>-1ha + = XX</p> <p>CD note - Consider existing use when doing this one.</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	<p>Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++</p> <p>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +</p> <p>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --</p>	++	IMD Score of 1	
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre = +	+	Site lies within Shaw Town Centre, a high density scheme would help protect and enhance the vitality of Shaw Town Centre	
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	<p>Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +</p> <p>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X</p> <p>Other uses = N/A</p>	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	<p>providing for pitches = +</p> <p>0 pitches = --</p>	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.



<b>Site name / ref: SHA0164 Shaw Health Centre, High Street, Shaw</b>	<b>Potential Use: Residential</b>	<b>Area: 0.26</b>	<b>Indicative Capacity: 14 homes (major)</b>	<b>Density (as proposed under policy H3): 70dph</b>	
<b>IA Objective</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
	(same response for all housing. Clare put N/A for emp)			Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) (Mapping GM)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = -- Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	N/A	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.
25	Waste (see Proposals map)  Higginshaw / Failsworth area only	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes = x No = +	+	N/A	N/A

The site has limited ecological concerns, however it has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scores positively for being in an accessible location with access to several transport options and in terms of access to services and facilities.

The site scores positively as it is located within a very deprived area whereby development of the site would assist with regeneration. The site also either scores positive where the site is not affected by a constraint / not likely to impact or neutral because no adverse impacts are expected.

There are a few uncertainties around provision of health and education, which at this stage all housing would be expected to contribute to in line with Planning policy. Site specific criteria to address this could be added to an allocation if the allocation progresses.

The site scores positively as it is previously developed land.

The site scored positive in terms of highway impact / access as in principle the site is acceptable (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc). An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site does appear to be acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan Review.



# Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site name / ref: SHA1372 Former Lancaster House, Rochdale Road, Royton	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.11	Capacity: 5 homes(minor)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	<p>Does the site have ecological concerns?</p> <p>No / little concern = --</p> <p>Site will require ecological assessment = ?</p> <p>Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x</p>	--	<p>No overriding ecological constraints.</p> <p>However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.</p>	<p>The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.</p> <p>In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.</p>
3 and 5	Landscape Character	<p>Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --</p> <p>Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?</p>	--	N/A	PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	<p>Does the site have heritage concerns:</p> <p>No heritage concerns: +</p> <p>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --</p> <p>Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?</p> <p>Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X</p>	+	No heritage concerns. Site does not hit any Heritage buffers either.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	<p>Site passes the Sequential Test: +</p> <p>Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?</p> <p>Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --</p> <p>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X</p> <p>Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – eg a</p>	+	100% of the site is in FZ1	<p>See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.</p> <p>In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.</p>

Site name / ref: SHA1372 Former Lancaster House, Rochdale Road, Royton	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.11	Capacity: 5 homes(minor)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		mill – we are assuming we will retain)			
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Site is outside of Groundwater Source Protection Zone	
1 , 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++  Previously developed land in Green Belt = +  Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +  Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x  Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X	++	Site has been cleared and is covered with vegetation.	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score is given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A		Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	Housing:  Within close proximity (20m) to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?  Not within close proximity (20m) to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = +	+	Site is not within 20m of a road exceeding the legal limit.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy CO8 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).  (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)  No: --	?	Site may be affected by passing traffic in relation to noise pollution and being adjacent to a pub.	

Site name / ref: SHA1372 Former Lancaster House, Rochdale Road, Royton	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.11	Capacity: 5 homes(minor)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p> <p>Note from CD – as the air quality one above should prob be a ? If its for commercial use and there is resi loacted close by.</p>			
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	<p>Minor development with very high accessibility = +++</p> <p>Minor development with medium or high accessibility = ++</p> <p>Minor development with low accessibility = +</p> <p>Minor development not achieving at least low accessibility = X</p>	++	GMAL Score of 5. High Accessibility.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	<p>Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?</p> <p>Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?</p> <p>No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --</p>	--	No PROW present.	Policies in the Local Plan such as policy T2 'Creating sustainable Streets' ; policy D1 – 'A Design-Led Approach for Residential & Mixed-Use Development'; and policy D2 – 'A Design Led Approach to Non-Residential, Commercial and Employment Developments' will ensure account is taken of footpaths.
14, 15 and 16	Highways	<p>In principle site acceptable (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +</p> <p>Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?</p> <p>Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X</p>	?	Housing and access with parking would have to be carefully considered due to proximity of junctions onto two side streets with Rochdale Road. If flats, in a sustainable location and therefore would not require on-street parking.	N/A
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	<p>Potential positive impact on highway network = +</p> <p>No impact on highway network = --</p>	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A

Site name / ref: SHA1372 Former Lancaster House, Rochdale Road, Royton	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.11	Capacity: 5 homes(minor)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown at this stage= ?			
7, 8, 14, 16, 17 , 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	Is the site accessible to other key services  Minor housing site with access to at least two key services and where two services include an education and health facility = +++  Minor housing site with access to at two key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++  Minor housing site with access to at least two key services = +  Minor housing site with access to one key service = X  Minor housing site with no access to key services = XX  Other uses: N/A	+++	Site is within 800m of a GP, dentist, primary school, secondary school, community facilities. The site is also within the 400m buffer of Failsworth Town Centre.	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +  Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --  Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X  Unknown at current stage = ?	?	At this stage, the site would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.

Site name / ref: SHA1372 Former Lancaster House, Rochdale Road, Royton	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.11	Capacity: 5 homes(minor)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ?</p>			
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area or centre = +</p> <p>Outside of BEA / SEA or centre = X</p> <p>For housing sites: N/A</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	<p>For employment / or housing sites where employment is still in active / recent use:</p> <p>1ha + = ++</p> <p>0.01ha to 0.99ha of land = +</p> <p>0 ha = --</p> <p>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X</p> <p>-1ha + = XX</p> <p>CD note - Consider existing use when doing this one.</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	<p>Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++</p> <p>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +</p> <p>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --</p>	+	IMD Score of 6	
	Centres	<p>Housing / mixed use within centre = +</p> <p>Housing/ mixed use outside of centre: --</p>	--	Site is within the 400m buffer of Failsworth Town Centre.	

Site name / ref: SHA1372 Former Lancaster House, Rochdale Road, Royton	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.11	Capacity: 5 homes(minor)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
20	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided  (same response for all housing. Clare put N/A for emp)	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
23 and 26	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) (Mapping GM)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	N/A	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.
24	Waste (see Proposals map)  Higginshaw / Failsworth area only	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes = x No = +	+	N/A	N/A

The site has limited ecological concerns, however it has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scores positively for being in an accessible location with access to several transport options and key services and facilities.

The site scores positively as it is located within a deprived area whereby development of the site would assist with regeneration. The site also either scores positive where the site is not affected by a constraint / not likely to impact or neutral because no adverse impacts are expected.

There are a few uncertainties around provision of health and education, which at this stage all housing would be expected to contribute to in line with Planning policy. Site specific criteria to address this could be added to an allocation if the allocation progresses. An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage.

The site scores positively as it is mixed land within the urban area and appears that more than 50% of the site is brownfield.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site does appear to be acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan Review.

# Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref / name: SHA2153 Royton Waste Water Treatment Facility, Middleton Road	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 5.69ha	Indicative capacity: 150 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	? / x	Since remediation the site is likely to have considerable interest. Both the greenspace and the remaining buildings will need ecological survey for nesting birds, bats and the value of the habitats created. Within blue river corridor.  Site not within 150m of Local nature designation or 250m of SAC/SPA/SSSI and no priority habitats noted. Partly within green corridor and links and part of site currently overlaps with Other Protected Open Land (OPOL) designation.  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	Will require ecological surveys for bats, nesting birds and the value of the habitats created.  Site should avoid development on OPOL and avoid severing green corridor.  The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	Site adjacent to Pennine Foothills (West / South Pennines) therefore landscape guidance should be taken into account.	PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	+	No heritage comments.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?	+	Site passes sequential test if development avoids small area of Flood Zone 3a. FRA required to address fluvial and surface water flood risk.	See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.  In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local



Site ref / name: SHA2153 Royton Waste Water Treatment Facility, Middleton Road	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 5.69ha	Indicative capacity: 150 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --</p> <p>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X</p> <p>Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – eg a mill – we are assuming we will retain)</p>			Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	<p>The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +</p> <p>The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?</p>	+	Outside SPZ.	N/A
1, 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	<p>Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++</p> <p>Previously developed land in Green Belt = +</p> <p>Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +</p> <p>Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x</p> <p>Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X</p>	+	Previously developed land – cleared waste water works. Most site is pdl however some landscaping and small area of open land / open space.	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A	N/A	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	<p>Housing:</p> <p>Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?</p> <p>Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --</p>	--	Not within close proximity	<p>If close to link will need to say something specific</p> <p>Development will need to come forward in line with PfE Policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and Policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.</p>
15	Local environmental quality	Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).	?	Site is in close proximity to A627 therefore may be issues of noise etc that would need to be mitigated.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.



<b>Site ref / name: SHA2153 Royton Waste Water Treatment Facility, Middleton Road</b>	<b>Potential Use: Residential</b>	<b>Area: 5.69ha</b>	<b>Indicative capacity: 150 homes (major)</b>	<b>Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph</b>	
<b>IA Objective</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
		(a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)  No: --  Yes but could be mitigated: ?  Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X			
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++  Major development with high accessibility = +  Major development with medium accessibility = X  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX	+	Site has access to a bus stop with a frequent service.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	?	Several PROW run through the site.	Policies in the Local Plan such as Policy T2 'Creating Sustainable Streets'; Policy D1 'A Design-Led Approach for Residential & Mixed-Use Development'; and Policy D2 'A Design Led Approach to Non-Residential, Commercial and Employment Developments' will ensure account is taken of footpaths.
14, 15 and 16	Highways	No Highway concerns (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?  Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X	+	No specific concerns. Acceptable in principle subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing requirements of a transport assessment where necessary.	See previous column.
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	Potential positive impact on highway network = +  No impact on highway network = --	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A

<b>Site ref / name: SHA2153 Royton Waste Water Treatment Facility, Middleton Road</b>	<b>Potential Use: Residential</b>	<b>Area: 5.69ha</b>	<b>Indicative capacity: 150 homes (major)</b>	<b>Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph</b>	
<b>IA Objective</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
		Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown at this stage= ?			
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	Is the site accessible to other key services  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services include an education and health facility = +++  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++  Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +  Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X  Major housing site with no access to key services = XX	X	Site has access to a primary school and community facilities within 800m.	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +  Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --  Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X  Unknown at current stage = ?  For employment: N/A	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.  Site includes an area of natural / semi-natural open space on the area that is covered by other protected open land designation. Development of the site will be required to take this into consideration in line with Local Planning policy if the site boundary as currently proposed was taken forward.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.  Consider removing OPOL from site allocation.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +  Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.

Site ref / name: SHA2153 Royton Waste Water Treatment Facility, Middleton Road	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 5.69ha	Indicative capacity: 150 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X  Unknown at current stage = ?  For employment: N/A			
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	For employment sites only - Is the site:  Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / Mixed use site or centre = +  Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X  For housing sites: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	For employment / mixed use / housing sites in active or recent employment use:  1ha + = ++  0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +  0 ha = --  -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X  -1ha + = XX	N/A	N/A. Site would have provided some employment being a wastewater treatment works but these will have relocated. The site was not an employment site.	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	+	IMD score = 4  The site would make a moderate contribution to tackling deprivation.	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m of centre = +  Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --	--	Not within or close to centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.

<b>Site ref / name: SHA2153 Royton Waste Water Treatment Facility, Middleton Road</b>	<b>Potential Use: Residential</b>	<b>Area: 5.69ha</b>	<b>Indicative capacity: 150 homes (major)</b>	<b>Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph</b>	
<b>IA Objective</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
		Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A			
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Outside MSA.	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Outside waste area / site.	N/A

The site has ecological interest, owing to its remediation and it has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scores positive for being a previously developed site and positive for having good public transport accessibility and having moderate deprivation so the site would assist with regeneration and tackling deprivation. The site also either scores positive where the site is not within a constraint / not likely to impact or neutral because no adverse impacts are expected.

There are a few uncertainties around provision of health and education, which at this stage all housing would be expected to contribute to in line with Planning policy. However, site specific criteria to address this could be added to an allocation if the allocation progresses. An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage. Environmental health issues would need to be further assessed with regards to issues such as noise and appropriate mitigation implemented. PROW would need to be considered within the design of the development.

The site does not have good access to services, owing to its edge of town location, and scored negatively, with only a primary school and community facilities such as a post office within 800m.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site does appear to be acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan Review.

# Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref / name: B1.1.21 Former British Gas Site, Higginshaw Lane	Potential Use: Employment	Area: 4.55ha	Indicative Capacity: N/A		
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No / little concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	Site has been cleared no ecological constraints.  The site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects.	The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	Site does not fall within an LCT.	N/A
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	+	No heritage concerns.	N/A
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A	+	Site is 100% within FZ1. Passes Sequential Test. FRA needed to address Surface Water flood risk.  See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.	See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk. In addition, Policy JP—S5 ‘Flood Risk and the Water Environment’ and Policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	?	The site is within a SPZ.	N/A
1, 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++  Previously developed land in Green Belt = +	++	Site is previously developed land in urban area	N/A

Site ref / name: B1.1.21 Former British Gas Site, Higginshaw Lane	Potential Use: Employment	Area: 4.55ha	Indicative Capacity: N/A		
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +  Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x  Greenfield in urban area = X			
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies.	--	No known opportunities at this stage from available mapping.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	Employment:  locating B2/B8 within close proximity (20m) to existing residential areas: ?  locating B2/B8 further than 20m from existing residential areas: --	--	Site is more than 20m away from nearest existing residential area.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE Policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and Policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).  Local environmental quality noise: housing site next to a motorway or major road or B2/B8 use odour: site next to a waste management facility (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)  No: --  Yes but could be mitigated: ?  Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X	--	The site is not in close proximity to any uses that would cause amenity harm.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++  Major development with high accessibility = +	+	Site is a major development site with high accessibility due to its proximity to a frequent bus service.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context

Site ref / name: B1.1.21 Former British Gas Site, Higginshaw Lane	Potential Use: Employment	Area: 4.55ha	Indicative Capacity: N/A		
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Major development with medium accessibility = X  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX			for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	--	Site does not have any footpaths running through site that would be impacted, although there is one adjacent to the site.	N/A
14, 15 and 16	Highways	Site acceptable in principle (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?  Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X	+	No specific concerns. Site has extant Planning permission which has considered highway impact.	Site has extant Planning permission. Should the approved development not be delivered, any future development of the site would require detailed highway design at Planning application stage.
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network	Potential positive impact on highway network = +  No impact on highway network = --  Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown = ?	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	Is the site accessible to other key services  Employment: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	Employment: N/A	N/A	As the proposed use is for employment development the site would not be expected to contribute towards open space	N/A



Site ref / name: B1.1.21 Former British Gas Site, Higginshaw Lane	Potential Use: Employment	Area: 4.55ha	Indicative Capacity: N/A		
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
				<p>provision in line with Local Plan policies.</p> <p>It is noted that the site has been identified as natural / semi natural open space due to its linkages with Oldham Edge. Any development will be considered in line with Local Planning policy.</p>	
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	Employment: N/A	N/A	N/A.	N/A
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use or centre = +</p> <p>Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use or centre = X</p> <p>For housing sites: N/A</p>	+	The site is within BEA 7.	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	<p>For employment only:</p> <p>1ha + = ++</p> <p>0.01ha to 0.99ha of land = +</p> <p>0 ha = --</p> <p>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X</p> <p>-1ha + = XX</p>	++	Site would provide around 4.5ha of employment land.	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score)	<p>Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++</p> <p>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +</p> <p>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --</p>	+	<p>IMD score = 4</p> <p>The site is in a deprived area. Development of the site could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.</p>	N/A
20	Centres	<p>Office use within centre: +</p> <p>Office use outside of centre: x / ?</p> <p>Industrial / warehousing use within centre: x</p> <p>Industrial / warehousing outside of centre: --</p>	?	Site is an out of centre location but it is unknown if it will be for office or industry and warehousing so scored uncertain for this stage of assessment.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +	N/A	N/A	N/A



Site ref / name: B1.1.21 Former British Gas Site, Higginshaw Lane	Potential Use: Employment	Area: 4.55ha	Indicative Capacity: N/A		
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
	mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A			
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	N/A	N/A	N/A
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Site not within MSA.	N/A. GM Minerals Plan contains policies on Minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	?	Site is within a waste area.	GM Waste Plan contains policies on the waste areas, some employment uses may be compatible with the waste designation.

The site has no ecological constraints. The site has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site has an extant Planning permission for the erection of two buildings for a storage and distribution unit with ancillary office (PA/344755/20). The Planning application process has considered several of these objectives as part of the approval process to ensure sustainable development. Should the approved development scheme not come forward, any future development of the site would be expected to come forward in line with Local Planning policy.

The site scores positively in relation objectives around flood risk, historic assets and public transport accessibility. There are some non-applicable responses too as some of the objectives relate to site we are proposing as housing allocations rather than employment ones such as provision of open space, education and health facilities. An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage. Another uncertain is the effect on our centres, this is because it is unknown as yet if the site will be suitable for office or industrial and warehousing.

The site also scored uncertain in relation to the waste objective as the site is within a designated waste area however as it is not yet known if the site is most suitable for office or industry and warehousing the impact is uncertain, it also scored uncertain with regards to ecology as there is priority habitats present.

No negative scores were given.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site does appear to be acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan Review, where some of the more uncertain answers can be investigated further.