

# Oldham

# Local Plan

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

December 2023



**Oldham**  
Council



# Oldham Site Allocations IA

| Site ref / name: HLA0029 Ashton Road Woodhouses | Potential Use: Residential | Area: 1.68ha   | Capacity: 48 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?<br><br>No / little concern = --<br><br>Site will require ecological assessment = ?<br><br>Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x   | ?                          | The site has some wetland habitats and trees.<br><br>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. | Ecology and tree surveys will be required The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.<br><br>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): --<br><br>Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?  | --                         | Site is immediately adjacent to Incised Urban Fringe Valley and will need to consider the guidance for this 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:<br><br>No heritage concerns: +<br><br>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --<br><br>Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?<br><br>Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X   | ?                          | On the boundary of Woodhouses conservation area.  | Any development should take into account views and vistas in and out of the conservation area. Most important feature of the conservation area is its predominantly linear form. Development should take this into account to preserve<br><br>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: +<br><br>Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?<br><br>Site does not pass Sequential Test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --<br><br>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception test: X<br><br>Sequential Test not applicable: N/A | +                          | Passes Sequential Test. FRA required.   | See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk. Flood Risk Assessment required to address surface water flood risk and as site is over 1 ha.<br><br>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) = +<br><br>The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?   | +                          | Site not within SPZ.  | N/A   |

| Site ref / name: HLA0029 Ashton Road Woodhouses | Potential Use: Residential     | Area: 1.68ha   | Capacity: 48 homes (major) | Minimum Density (as proposed in 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 (saved UDP phase 2 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 next to road exceeding or 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    | <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>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>   | ?                          | <p>Site is next to M60 (Approx 50 m) so some noise mitigation may be required.</p> <p>Woodhouses primary school and Woodhouses church is adjacent to site therefore may need to consider these uses.</p> | 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 | <p>Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++</p> <p>Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with high accessibility = +</p> <p>Major development with medium accessibility = X</p>   | XX                         | Site has low accessibility.  | 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.                                     |

| Site ref / name: HLA0029 Ashton Road Woodhouses | Potential Use: Residential                              | Area: 1.68ha  | Capacity: 48 homes (major) | Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph   |  |
|---|---|---|----------------------------|---|--|
| IA Objective                                    | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                      | Comments  | Mitigation   |
|   |   | Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX   |                            |   |  |
| 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 can 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>   | ?                          | Yes.  | Policies in the Local Plan such as; 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>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.   |
| 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> | X                          | Site has access to a primary school and church within 800m. There is a secondary school just over 800m from the site. | 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: HLA0029 Ashton Road Woodhouses | Potential Use: Residential  | Area: 1.68ha  | Capacity: 48 homes (major) | Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph   |  |
|---|---|---|----------------------------|---|--|
| IA Objective                                    | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                      | Comments  | Mitigation   |
| 2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 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 = ?<br/>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 = ?<br/>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> <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> <p>0 ha = --</p> <p>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X</p>  | N/A                        | N/A   | N/A  |

| Site ref / name: HLA0029 Ashton Road Woodhouses | Potential Use: Residential   | Area: 1.68ha   | Capacity: 48 homes (major) | Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph   |   |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|---|---|
| IA Objective                                    | Theme  | Criteria   | Score                      | Comments  | Mitigation  |
|   |  | -1ha + = XX  |                            |   |   |
| 18  | Proximity to deprived areas<br><br>(Index of Multiple Deprivation Score) | Red (scores 1-3 high deprivation): ++<br>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +<br>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --   | +                          | IMD score 6.<br><br>Site will make a moderate contribution to assisting regeneration of the borough.  | N/A   |
| 20  | Centres  | Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m of centre = +<br><br>Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --   | --                         | Not within 400m of centre.  | N/A   |
| 2 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 = +<br><br>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X<br><br>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 = +<br><br>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 = --<br><br>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<br><br>Yes (for any use other than employment) = x<br>No = +<br>Yes for employment: ?  | +                          | Not affected by waste allocations.  | N/A. GM Waste Plan sets out policies on waste.                |

The site is a Phase 2 UDP Housing Allocation which remains largely undeveloped, except for three homes which are currently under construction on a small part of the site (PA/341528/18).

The site has some wetland habitats and trees. Ecology and tree surveys will be required. 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 scored negatively against three IA objectives as it is a greenfield site and its location in Woodhouses which is more rural means that the site is low in terms of access to services and public transport accessibility (with access to only a primary school and a church within 800m).

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

The site scored positives against other criteria in particular those on flood risk, water quality highways and waste.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site would appear acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan Review, however deliverability will be further investigated.



# Oldham Site Allocations IA

| Site name / ref: HLA2351 Pretoria Road, Oldham | Potential use: Residential | Area: 0.46ha   | Indicative capacity: 14 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?<br><br>No / little concern = --<br><br>Site will require ecological assessment = ?<br><br>Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x   | --                                    | No overriding ecological concerns.<br><br>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.<br><br>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): --<br><br>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:<br><br>No heritage concerns: +<br><br>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --<br><br>Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?<br><br>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: +<br><br>Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?<br><br>Site does not pass Sequential test but Exception Test is likely to be passed: --<br><br>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X<br><br>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) = +<br><br>The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?   | +                                     | Site is not within SPZ.  | N/A   |

|  |                             |  |                                       |  |  |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Site name / ref: HLA2351 Pretoria Road, Oldham | Potential use: Residential  | Area: 0.46ha   | Indicative capacity: 14 homes (major) | Minimum density (as proposed in 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>   | ++                                    | 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.   | --                                    | 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 is close to exceeding or exceeds 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 is not considered to be affected by Local environmental quality.  | Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.  |

| Site name / ref: HLA2351 Pretoria Road, Oldham | Potential use: Residential          | Area: 0.46ha  | Indicative capacity: 14 homes (major) | Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph  |   |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| IA Objective                                   | Theme                               | Criteria  | Score                                 | Comments   | Mitigation  |
| 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> <p>Major development with medium accessibility = X</p> <p>Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX</p>                                      | +                                     | Site is major development with high accessibility as it has access to a frequent bus route.  | N/A   |
| 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 highways concerns; the site is considered to be acceptable in principle.   | Detailed design required.   |
| 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>                      | +++                                   | Site is major development with access to five key services and facilities (including primary and secondary education, community facilities and health services) 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 name / ref: HLA2351 Pretoria Road, Oldham | Potential use: Residential  | Area: 0.46ha  | Indicative capacity: 14 homes (major) | Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph   |  |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| IA Objective                                   | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                                 | Comments  | Mitigation   |
|  |   | <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 = ?</p> <p>For employment sites = N/A</p>   | ?                                     | At this stage, the site would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy. | <p>Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.</p> <p>Development of the site will require mitigation in the form of replacement provision, in line with Local Planning policy.</p> |
| 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 = ?</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>  | N/A                                   | N/A   | N/A  |

| Site name / ref: HLA2351 Pretoria Road, Oldham | Potential use: Residential   | Area: 0.46ha   | Indicative capacity: 14 homes (major) | Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph  |  |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| IA Objective                                   | Theme  | Criteria   | Score                                 | Comments   | Mitigation   |
|  |  | For housing sites: N/A   |                                       |  |  |
| 18 and 19                                      | Net employment land gain / loss  | For employment / mixed use / housing site where employment is still in active / recent use:<br><br>1ha + = ++<br><br>0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +<br><br>0 ha = --<br><br>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X<br><br>-1ha + = XX  | X                                     | Site is still within active employment use, however it is not within an employment area.   | Mitigation is contained within the Local Plan which ensures that we are able to meet out employment land requirement. Our BEAs provide opportunities for business wishing to relocate. |
| 18   | Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score       | Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++<br>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +<br>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --  | +                                     | IMD score = 1<br><br>The site is in a significantly deprived area. Development of the site could promote regeneration and improve deprivation. | N/A  |
| 20   | Centres  | Housing / mixed use within centre / within 400m of centre = +<br><br>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 = +<br><br>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X<br><br>Other uses = N/A | ?                                     | Housing mix is not known at this stage. 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 = +<br><br>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 = --<br><br>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  | +                                     | Site not within a waste area / site.   | N/A  |

|  |                            |  |                                       |   |            |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|------------|
| Site name / ref: HLA2351 Pretoria Road, Oldham | Potential use: Residential | Area: 0.46ha   | Indicative capacity: 14 homes (major) | Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph |            |
| IA Objective                                   | Theme                      | Criteria   | Score                                 | Comments  | Mitigation |
|  |                            | Yes (for any use other than employment) = x<br>No for any use = +<br>Yes for employment: ? |                                       |   |            |

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 very positively for being accessible to several key services and facilities and public transport. The site also scores positively as it is previously developed land within the urban area.

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.

An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage.

The site scores potentially negatively in terms of loss of employment uses, as it is currently in active use for employment. Mitigation is contained within the Local Plan which ensures that we are able to meet out employment land requirement.

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: OLD0170 (SHA1728) Former Windsor Mill | Potential Use: Employment | Area: 0.60ha  | Indicative Capacity: N/A | Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph   |  |
|--|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| 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.</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 does not fall within an LCT.   | N/A  |
| 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>   | --                       | Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated, the site is a former mill site with potential archaeological finds. Former Hollinwood Gas Works Canal Bridge nominated for Local listing.                          | 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</p> | +                        | <p>Site is 100% within FZ1. Passes Sequential Test.</p> <p>See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.</p>  | 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             | <p>The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +</p> <p>The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?</p>   | +                        | The site is not within a 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>   | ++                       | Site is previously developed land in urban area   | N/A  |



| Site ref / name: OLD0170 (SHA1728) Former Windsor Mill | Potential Use: Employment      | Area: 0.60ha  | Indicative Capacity: N/A | Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph   |  |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| IA Objective   | Theme                          | Criteria  | Score                    | Comments  | Mitigation   |
|  |                                | Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +<br><br>Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x<br><br>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:<br><br>locating B2/B8 within close proximity (20m) to existing residential areas: ?<br><br>locating B2/B8 further than 20m from existing residential areas: --  | --                       | Site is not within 20m of an 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).<br><br>Local environmental quality<br>noise: housing site next to a motorway or major road or B2/B8 use<br>odour: site next to a waste management facility (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)<br><br>No: --<br><br>Yes but could be mitigated: ?<br><br>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X | --                       | Site is not in close proximity to homes so is not likely to cause amenity issues if it is developed as employment.  | 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 = ++<br><br>Major development with high accessibility = +<br><br>Major development with medium accessibility = X<br><br>Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX   | ++                       | Site is a major development site with very high accessibility as it is in close proximity to a frequent bus service and is within 800m of Hollinwood tram stop. | 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.                                     |



| Site ref / name: OLD0170 (SHA1728) Former Windsor Mill | Potential Use: Employment   | Area: 0.60ha  | Indicative Capacity: N/A | Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph   |                           |
|--|---|---|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| IA Objective   | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                    | Comments  | Mitigation                |
| 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 the site, however there is a Public Right of Way adjacent to the east of the site.   | 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>  | ?                        | Access off Hollins Road may be difficult due to the number of traffic signals and cycling / walking improvements currently being considered. Preferred access would potentially be off Albert Street but would also need to consider traffic accumulation of neighbouring uses. | Detailed design required. |
| 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>Employment: N/A</p>  | 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                      | N/A.  | N/A                       |

|   |  |  |                             |  |            |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|------------|
| Site ref / name: OLD0170<br>(SHA1728) Former Windsor Mill | Potential Use:<br>Employment   | Area: 0.60ha   | Indicative Capacity:<br>N/A | Minimum Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph  |            |
| IA Objective  | Theme  | Criteria   | Score                       | Comments   | Mitigation |
| 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                  | For employment sites only - Is the site:<br><br>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area mixed use site or centre = +<br><br>Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X<br><br>For housing sites: N/A                                      | +                           | The site is within the Hollinwood Business District BEA.   | N/A        |
| 18 and 19   | Net employment land gain / loss  | For employment / mixed use/ or housing sites where employment is still in active / recent use:<br><br>1ha + = ++<br><br>0.01ha to 0.99ha of land = +<br><br>0 ha = --<br><br>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X<br><br>-1ha + = XX  | +                           | Site would provide around 0.6ha of employment land.  | N/A        |
| 18  | Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score)      | Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++<br>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +<br>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --  | +                           | IMD score = 4<br><br>The site is in a deprived area. Development of the site could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.                                     | N/A        |
| 20  | Centres  | Office use within centre: +<br>Office use outside of centre: x / ?<br>Industrial / warehousing use within centre: x<br>Industrial / warehousing outside of centre: --  | ?                           | Site is an out of centre location but it is unknown if it will be developed for office or industry and warehousing so scored uncertain for this stage of assessment. | 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 = +<br><br>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X<br><br>Other uses = N/A | N/A                         | N/A  | N/A        |

|   |   |   |                                 |  |  |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Site ref / name: OLD0170 (SHA1728) Former Windsor Mill</b> | <b>Potential Use: Employment</b>                            | <b>Area: 0.60ha</b>   | <b>Indicative Capacity: N/A</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>                                    |
| 23 and 26   | Gypsy and Travellers:<br>Number of transit pitches provided | providing for pitches = +<br><br>0 pitches = --   | N/A                             | N/A  | N/A  |
| 24  | Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)    | Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --<br><br>Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ?<br><br>(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<br><br>Yes (for any use other than employment) = x<br>No for any use = +<br>Yes for employment: ? | +                               | Site not within a waste area / site.                     | N/A  |

The site has limited ecological interest, 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. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scores significantly positively in relation the objectives around brownfield land and public transport accessibility and positives for the objectives around flood risk, being in an employment area and with regards deprivation. It scores a number of neutral scores due minerals safeguarding areas not being present and for not being in close proximity to existing residential areas. 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 and the objective regarding access to the site is undetermined and therefore scored uncertain. 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.

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: SHA1029<br>Kaskenmoor School, Roman Rd | Potential use:<br>Residential | Area: 5.11ha   | Indicative<br>capacity:<br>137 homes | Minimum Density (as<br>proposed in policy H3):<br>35dph   |   |
|---|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| IA Objective  | Theme                         | Criteria   | Score                                | Comments  | Mitigation  |
| 1   | Ecology                       | Does the site have ecological concerns?<br><br>No / little concern = --<br><br>Site will require ecological assessment = ?<br><br>Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x   | ?                                    | No overriding ecological constraints, however mature trees should be retained.<br><br>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.<br><br>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): --<br><br>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:<br><br>No heritage concerns: +<br><br>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --<br><br>Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?<br><br>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: +<br><br>Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?<br><br>Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --<br><br>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X<br><br>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) = +<br><br>The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?   | +                                    | Site is not within SPZ.   | N/A   |
| 1 , 2, 6, 11 and 18                                     | Land and soils                | Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++  | x                                    | Site is mixed as there are areas of grassed land/ former sports pitches onsite which  | N/A   |

| Site ref / name: SHA1029<br>Kaskenmoor School, Roman Rd | Potential use:<br>Residential  | Area: 5.11ha   | Indicative<br>capacity:<br>137 homes | Minimum Density (as<br>proposed in policy H3):<br>35dph  |  |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| IA Objective  | Theme                          | Criteria   | Score                                | Comments   | Mitigation   |
|   |                                | Previously developed land in Green Belt = +<br><br>Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +<br><br>Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x<br><br>Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X   |                                      | surround the footprint of the former school building (to the north). Less than 50% of the site is brownfield.  |  |
| 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                    | Housing:<br><br>Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?<br><br>Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --  | --                                   | Site is not within close proximity to a road which is close to exceeding or exceeds the legal limit for NO2 emissions.<br><br>Site is partially within an AQMA.                                | 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).<br><br>Local environmental quality<br>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)<br><br>No: --<br><br>Yes but could be mitigated: ?<br><br>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X | ?                                    | Site is adjacent to the M60 motorway (although at a different level) which could cause noise/ amenity issues which would need to be mitigated. However, there are several other houses nearby. | 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 = ++<br><br>Major development with high accessibility = +<br><br>Major development with medium accessibility = X<br><br>Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX  | +                                    | Site is major development with high accessibility as it is partly within 800m of Hollinwood Metrolink stop and partly accessible to a bus stop with a frequent service.                        | N/A  |

| Site ref / name: SHA1029<br>Kaskenmoor School, Roman Rd | Potential use:<br>Residential                                       | Area: 5.11ha   | Indicative<br>capacity:<br>137 homes | Minimum Density (as<br>proposed in policy H3):<br>35dph  |   |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| IA Objective  | Theme   | Criteria   | Score                                | Comments   | Mitigation  |
| 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>  | ?                                    | A PROW runs through the site alongside the western boundary.   | Development would need to consider how proposals would link up to / enhance footpath within the site, incorporating it as part of development of the site.  |
| 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 required.   |
| 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> <p>Major housing site with no access to key services = XX</p> | ++                                   | Site is major development with access to two key services and facilities (including primary and 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. |
| 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>  | ?                                    | 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.  |

| Site ref / name: SHA1029<br>Kaskenmoor School, Roman Rd | Potential use:<br>Residential                                     | Area: 5.11ha  | Indicative<br>capacity:<br>137 homes | Minimum Density (as<br>proposed in policy H3):<br>35dph   |  |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| IA Objective  | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                                | Comments  | Mitigation   |
|   |   | <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>   |                                      | Site includes former sports pitches relating to previous school use that will need to be considered/ mitigated as part of development of the site.    | Consider existing onsite open space provision in line with Local Planning policy.  |
| 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 = ?</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> <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 (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 = 2</p> <p>The site is in a significantly deprived area. Development of the site could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.</p> | N/A  |



| Site ref / name: SHA1029<br>Kaskenmoor School, Roman Rd | Potential use:<br>Residential   | Area: 5.11ha   | Indicative<br>capacity:<br>137 homes | Minimum Density (as<br>proposed in policy H3):<br>35dph  |   |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| IA Objective  | Theme   | Criteria   | Score                                | Comments   | Mitigation  |
| 20  | Centres   | Housing / mixed use within centre / within 400m of centre = +<br><br>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:<br>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 = +<br><br>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X<br><br>Other uses = N/A | ?                                    | Housing mix is not known at this stage. 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:<br>Number of transit pitches provided               | providing for pitches = +<br><br>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 = --<br><br>Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ?<br>(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<br><br>Yes (for any use other than employment) = x<br>No for any use = +<br>Yes for employment: ?  | +                                    | Site not within a waste area / site.   | N/A   |

The site has no overriding ecological constraints, however the mature trees should be retained. 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 positively for being in an accessible location with access to several transport options and positive for 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 uncertain as it is mixed land within the urban area but appears that less than 50% of the site is brownfield, as a result of former sports pitches onsite from previous school use

An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage.

The site also scores uncertain in terms of amenity due to being located adjacent to the M60 motorway, although the site is at a different level and within other residential properties nearby. It is considered that any impact can be mitigated in line with Planning policy.

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: SHA1033 Higher Lime Recreation Ground, Limeside | Potential use: Residential | Area: 3.98ha   | Indicative capacity: 110 homes (major) | Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph  |   |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| IA Objective   | Theme                      | Criteria   | Score                                  | Comments   | Mitigation  |
| 1  | Ecology                    | Does the site have ecological concerns?<br><br>No / little concern = --<br><br>Site will require ecological assessment = ?<br><br>Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x   | ?/x                                    | Significant areas of semi-natural habitat, mature broadleaved trees.<br><br>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 ecology surveys. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.<br><br>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): --<br><br>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:<br><br>No heritage concerns: +<br><br>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --<br><br>Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?<br><br>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: +<br><br>Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so exception test is required - ?<br><br>Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --<br><br>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X<br><br>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) = +   | +                                      | Site is not within SPZ.  | N/A   |

|  |                             |  |  |   |  |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Site name / ref: SHA1033 Higher Lime Recreation Ground, Limeside | Potential use: Residential  | Area: 3.98ha   | Indicative capacity: 110 homes (major) | Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph   |  |
| 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>   | X                                      | Site is greenfield within 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.   | --                                     | 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 is close to exceeding or exceeds 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 is adjacent to the M60 motorway (although at a different level) which could cause noise/ amenity issues which would need to be mitigated. However, it is a primarily residential area. | Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.  |

| Site name / ref: SHA1033 Higher Lime Recreation Ground, Limeside | Potential use: Residential          | Area: 3.98ha  | Indicative capacity: 110 homes (major) | Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph  |   |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| IA Objective   | Theme                               | Criteria  | Score                                  | Comments   | Mitigation  |
| 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> <p>Major development with medium accessibility = X</p> <p>Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX</p>                                      | X                                      | Site is major development with medium accessibility as it is only has access to a bus stop (not with a frequent service).  | N/A   |
| 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 highways concerns; the site is considered to be acceptable in principle.   | Detailed design required.   |
| 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>                      | ++                                     | Site is major development with access to four key services and facilities (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 name / ref: SHA1033 Higher Lime Recreation Ground, Limeside | Potential use: Residential  | Area: 3.98ha  | Indicative capacity: 110 homes (major) | Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| IA Objective   | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                                  | Comments   | Mitigation   |
|  |   | <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 = ?</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>Site is identified as natural/semi-natural open space.</p> | <p>Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.</p> <p>Development of the site will require mitigation in the form of replacement provision, in line with Local Planning policy.</p> |
| 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 = ?</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>  | N/A                                    | N/A  | N/A  |

| Site name / ref: SHA1033 Higher Lime Recreation Ground, Limeside | Potential use: Residential   | Area: 3.98ha   | Indicative capacity: 110 homes (major) | Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph  |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| IA Objective   | Theme  | Criteria   | Score                                  | Comments   | Mitigation  |
|  |  | For housing sites: N/A   |  |  |   |
| 18 and 19  | Net employment land gain / loss  | For employment / mixed use / housing site where employment is still in active / recent use:<br><br>1ha + = ++<br><br>0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +<br><br>0 ha = --<br><br>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X<br><br>-1ha + = XX  | N/A                                    | N/A  | N/A   |
| 18   | Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score)      | Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++<br>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +<br>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --  | +                                      | IMD score = 1<br><br>The site is in a significantly deprived area. Development of the site could promote regeneration and improve deprivation. | N/A   |
| 20   | Centres  | Housing / mixed use within centre / within 400m of centre = +<br><br>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 = +<br><br>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X<br><br>Other uses = N/A | ?                                      | Housing mix is not known at this stage. 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 = +<br><br>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 = --<br><br>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  | +                                      | Site not within a waste area / site.   | N/A   |

|   |                                   |  |   |  |                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------|
| <b>Site name / ref: SHA1033 Higher Lime Recreation Ground, Limeside</b> | <b>Potential use: Residential</b> | <b>Area: 3.98ha</b>  | <b>Indicative capacity: 110 homes (major)</b> | <b>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> |
|   |                                   | Yes (for any use other than employment) = x<br>No for any use = +<br>Yes for employment: ? |   |  |                   |

The site has some ecological interest and will require ecology 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 very positively for being accessible to several key services and facilities (including primary education, secondary education and community facilities) within 800m. However the site scores potentially negative in terms of access to public transport.

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 potentially negatively as it is greenfield land within the urban area and is identified as natural/semi-natural open space. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation to account for the loss of the open space, including providing replacement provision, in line with Local Planning policy.

An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage.

The site also scores uncertain in terms of amenity due to being located adjacent to the M60 motorway, although the site is at a different level and within a primarily residential area. It is considered that any impact can be mitigated in line with Planning policy.

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: SHA1225 Land at Higher Memorial Park, Joseph St, Failsworth | Potential Use: Residential | Area: 0.25  | Capacity: 10 homes (Major) | Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 50dph  |   |
|---|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|---|
| IA Objective  | Theme                      | Criteria  | Score                      | Comments  | Mitigation  |
| 1   | Ecology                    | Does the site have ecological concerns?<br><br>No / little concern = --<br><br>Site will require ecological assessment = ?<br><br>Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x  | --                         | No overriding ecological constraints.<br><br>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.<br><br>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): --<br><br>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:<br><br>No heritage concerns: +<br><br>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --<br><br>Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?<br><br>Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X  | +                          | No heritage concerns. Site does come within the 250m buffers of both a listed building (St John's Church) and the Failsworth Conservation Area.   | 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: +<br><br>Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so exception test is required - ?<br><br>Site does not pass Sequential Test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --<br><br>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X<br><br>Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – eg a mill – we are assuming we will retain) | +                          | 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.<br><br>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   |   |



|   |                             |  |                            |   |  |
|---|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|--|
| Site ref/ name: SHA1225 Land at Higher Memorial Park, Joseph St, Failsworth | Potential Use: Residential  | Area: 0.25   | Capacity: 10 homes (Major) | Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 50dph  |  |
| 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>   | ++                         | Not clear what, if anything was on the site previously. Site is tarmacked and appears to be used as open storage/car parking. | 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.   | ?                          | 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 (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>  | +                          | 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> <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> | --                         | Site is a residential area, no concerns in relation to Local environmental quality apart from passing traffic.                |  |



| Site ref/ name: SHA1225 Land at Higher Memorial Park, Joseph St, Failsworth | Potential Use: Residential                              | Area: 0.25  | Capacity: 10 homes (Major) | Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 50dph  |  |
|---|---|---|----------------------------|---|--|
| 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 = ++ <sup>1</sup><br><br>Major development with high accessibility = + <sup>2</sup><br><br>Major development with medium accessibility = X <sup>3</sup><br><br>Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX <sup>4</sup> | ++1                        | Within the 800m buffer of Failsworth Metrolink. Very High Accessibility.  | 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.<br><br>Or N/A   |
| 1 and 16  | Footpaths   | Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?<br><br>Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?<br><br>No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --                | --                         | No PROW present.  | Policies in the Local Plan such as 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) = +<br><br>Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?<br><br>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 | N/A  |
| 14, 15 and 16   | Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet) | Potential positive impact on highway network = +<br><br>No impact on highway network = --<br><br>Potential adverse impact on highway network = X<br><br>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<br><br>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services include an education and health facility = +++   | +++                        | Site has access to several key services and facilities (including health and education services) 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.  |

<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 ref/ name: SHA1225 Land at Higher Memorial Park, Joseph St, Failsworth | Potential Use: Residential  | Area: 0.25  | Capacity: 10 homes (Major) | Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 50dph  |  |
| IA Objective  | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                      | Comments  | Mitigation   |
|   |   | <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 = ?</p>   | ?                          | At this stage, the site 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 = ?</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 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  |

|   |  |   |                            |  |   |
|---|--|---|----------------------------|--|---|
| Site ref/ name: SHA1225 Land at Higher Memorial Park, Joseph St, Failsworth | Potential Use: Residential   | Area: 0.25  | Capacity: 10 homes (Major) | Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 50dph   |   |
| IA Objective  | Theme  | Criteria  | Score                      | Comments   | Mitigation  |
| 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<br><br>(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 3. The site is in a deprived area. Development of the site could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.  | N/A   |
| 20  | Centres  | <p>Housing / mixed use within centre = +</p> <p>Housing/ mixed use outside of centre: --</p>  | --                         | Site is within the 400m of Failsworth Town 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> | 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<br><br>(same response for all housing. Clare put N/A for emp) | <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 Safeguarding Area (MSA) (Mapping GM)  | <p>Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --</p> <p>Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)</p>  | --                         | Site not within MSA.   | GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.               |
| 25  | Waste (see Proposals map)  | Is the development within / close to waste management site / area   | +                          | Site not within a waste area / site.   | N/A   |

|  |                                   |                   |                                   |   |                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| <b>Site ref/ name: SHA1225 Land at Higher Memorial Park, Joseph St, Failsworth</b> | <b>Potential Use: Residential</b> | <b>Area: 0.25</b> | <b>Capacity: 10 homes (Major)</b> | <b>Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 50dph</b> |                   |
| <b>IA Objective</b>  | <b>Theme</b>                      | <b>Criteria</b>   | <b>Score</b>                      | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Mitigation</b> |
|  | Higginshaw / Failsworth area only | Yes = x<br>No = + |                                   |   |                   |

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 scores positively as it is previously developed land. 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 some 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.

In terms of highways the site is acceptable in principle subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing requirements of a transport assessment where necessary.

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: SHA2044 Land at James Street, Windsor Street, Failsworth, M35 9PY | Potential Use: Residential | Area: 0.26ha  | Indicative capacity: 10 (Major) | Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph  |   |
|--|----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|---|
| 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, although mature trees should be retained if possible or replaced if not – bats have been recorded feeding over the site, but it is too small to sustain local bat populations which will rely on the wider landscape.</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>Policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary 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 does not fall within an LCT.  | N/A   |
| 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>   | +                               | <p>Site is within 250m of a conservation area.</p> <p>Development of the site should have consideration to this, but overall, there are no heritage concerns.</p>  | <p>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.</p>  |
| 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</p> | +                               | <p>Site is 100% within Flood Zone 1 and therefore passes the Sequential Test.</p> <p>See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.</p>   | <p>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.</p> |

|  |                             |   |                                 |  |  |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Site ref / name: SHA2044 Land at James Street, Windsor Street, Failsworth, M35 9PY | Potential Use: Residential  | Area: 0.26ha  | Indicative capacity: 10 (Major) | Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph  |  |
| IA Objective   | Theme                       | Criteria  | Score                           | Comments   | Mitigation   |
| 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>   | +                               | Site is not within 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 = X</p>   | x                               | Site includes cleared previously developed land, however there are portions of grassed land within the boundary, and the cleared building footprint is now grassed over. | N/A  |
| 12   | Low carbon energy           | No score is 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 the legal limit for NO2 = --</p>  | --                              | Site scores a neutral as it is not within close proximity to a road which 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>Local environmental quality<br/>noise: housing site next to a motorway or major road or B2/B8 use odour: site next to a waste management facility<br/>(a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)</p> <p>No: --</p> | --                              | Site is in a residential area and unlikely to be affected or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues.  | Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.  |

| Site ref / name: SHA2044 Land at James Street, Windsor Street, Failsworth, M35 9PY | Potential Use: Residential          | Area: 0.26ha  | Indicative capacity: 10 (Major) | Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph  |   |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|---|
| 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>  |                                 |  |   |
| 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> <p>Major development with medium accessibility = X</p> <p>Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX</p>                                      | ++                              | Site is major development with very high accessibility. Due to its proximity to a frequent bus service and because it is within 800m of a tram stop.                   | N/A   |
| 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>  | +                               | 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. Need to explore wider improvements to deal with cumulative impacts. |
| 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>   | ?                               | This assessment will be completed at a later stage   | N/A   |



| Site ref / name: SHA2044 Land at James Street, Windsor Street, Failsworth, M35 9PY | Potential Use: Residential  | Area: 0.26ha  | Indicative capacity: 10 (Major) | Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph  |   |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------|--|---|
| IA Objective   | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                           | Comments   | Mitigation  |
|  |   | Unknown = ?   |                                 |  |   |
| 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 has access to four types of key services including primary and secondary education, community facilities and health services, 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 | <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>   | ?                               | At this stage all housing sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy, unsure as to the additional pressure the site will cause at this stage though. | 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 = ?</p>   | ?                               | At this stage all housing sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy, unsure as to the additional pressure the site will cause at this stage though.           | 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                                      | For housing sites: N/A  | N/A                             | N/A  | N/A   |



| Site ref / name: SHA2044 Land at James Street, Windsor Street, Failsworth, M35 9PY | Potential Use: Residential   | Area: 0.26ha   | Indicative capacity: 10 (Major) | Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph   |   |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|---|---|
| IA Objective   | Theme  | Criteria   | Score                           | Comments  | Mitigation  |
|  | to areas of employment   |  |                                 |   |   |
| 18 and 19  | Net employment land gain / loss  | For employment / mixed use/ or housing sites where employment is still in active / recent use:<br><br>1ha + = ++<br><br>0.01ha to 0.99ha of land = +<br><br>0 ha = --<br><br>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X<br><br>-1ha + = XX  | N/A                             | N/A   | N/A   |
| 18   | Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score)      | Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++<br>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +<br>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --  | ++                              | IMD score = 3<br><br>The site is in a significantly deprived area. Development of the site could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.  | N/A   |
| 20   | Centres  | Housing / mixed use within centre or 400m of a centre = +<br><br>Housing site outside of centre or 400m of a centre: --  | +                               | The site is outside of a centre but it is within 400m of Failsworth 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 = +<br><br>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X<br><br>Other uses = N/A | N/A                             | At this stage if the site is developed for housing 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 = +<br><br>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 = --<br><br>Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ?<br><br>(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<br><br>Yes (for any use other than employment) = x   | +                               | Site not within a waste area / site.  | N/A   |

|   |                                   |   |  |  |                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------|
| <b>Site ref / name: SHA2044 Land at James Street, Windsor Street, Failsworth, M35 9PY</b> | <b>Potential Use: Residential</b> | <b>Area: 0.26ha</b>                         | <b>Indicative capacity: 10 (Major)</b> | <b>Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph</b> |                   |
| <b>IA Objective</b>   | <b>Theme</b>                      | <b>Criteria</b>                             | <b>Score</b>                           | <b>Comments</b>  | <b>Mitigation</b> |
|   |                                   | No for any use = +<br>Yes for employment: ? |  |  |                   |

The site has some landscape features onsite, such as mature trees, foraging bats have also been sited, although there is no overriding ecological concern in relation to the site. 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 site scored significantly positively for access to services and public transport. The site scored significantly positive for assisting with regeneration as it is within a deprived area. The site also scores positive for objectives such as with 400m of a centre, for flood risk and for not being in a SPZ.

The site scores potentially negatively for being a mixed site within the urban area where it is considered that less than 50% of the site is previously developed.

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.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site would appear acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan review.

# Oldham Site Allocations IA

| Site ref / name: B1.1.3 Land at Mersey Rd North / Albert Street | Potential Use: Employment | Area: 0.89ha   | Indicative Capacity: N/A |  |   |
|---|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|---|
| IA Objective  | Theme                     | Criteria   | Score                    | Comments   | Mitigation  |
| 1   | Ecology                   | Does the site have ecological concerns?<br><br>No / little concern = --<br><br>Site will require ecological assessment = ?<br><br>Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x   | ?                        | No overriding ecological constraints, although mature trees should be retained.<br><br>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. | The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.<br><br>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): --<br><br>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:<br><br>No heritage concerns: +<br><br>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --<br><br>Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?<br><br>Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X   | +                        | No heritage concerns.  | N/A   |
| 9 and 13  | Flood Risk                | Site passes the Sequential Test: +<br><br>Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?<br><br>Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --<br><br>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X<br><br>Sequential Test not applicable: N/A | +                        | Site is 100% within FZ1. Passes Sequential Test.<br><br>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) = +<br><br>The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?   | +                        | The site is not within a SPZ.  | N/A   |

| Site ref / name: B1.1.3 Land at Mersey Rd North / Albert Street | Potential Use: Employment   | Area: 0.89ha  | Indicative Capacity: N/A |  |  |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|--|
| 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 = X</p>   | ++                       | Site is previously developed land in 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.  | --                       | 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>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 within 20m away of existing residential area so could potentially cause some air quality issues depending on the use.                                | 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<br/>noise: housing site next to a motorway or major road or B2/B8 use odour: site next to a waste management facility<br/>(a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)</p> <p>No: --</p> | ?                        | Site is in close proximity to homes so depending on the employment use proposed there may be amenity issues to consider such as traffic or noise disruption. | Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at planning application stage.  |

| Site ref / name: B1.1.3 Land at Mersey Rd North / Albert Street | Potential Use: Employment           | Area: 0.89ha  | Indicative Capacity: N/A |  |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|--|
| 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>  |                          |  |  |
| 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> <p>Major development with medium accessibility = X</p> <p>Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX</p>                                      | ++                       | Site is a major development site with very high accessibility due to its proximity to a frequent bus service and as it is within 800m of Hollinwood tram stop.     | 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                           | <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>  | ?                        | Access would most likely need to be off Mersey Road North, however it may be unlikely that the site would be suitable to service HGV's given the surrounding uses. | Detailed design required.  |
| 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>   | ?                        | This assessment will be completed at a later stage   | N/A  |

| Site ref / name: B1.1.3 Land at Mersey Rd North / Albert Street | Potential Use: Employment   | Area: 0.89ha  | Indicative Capacity: N/A |  |            |
|---|---|---|--------------------------|--|------------|
| IA Objective  | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                    | Comments   | Mitigation |
|   |   | Unknown = ?   |                          |  |            |
| 7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26                                 | Accessibility   | Is the site accessible to other key services<br><br>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                      | N/A.   | N/A        |
| 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               | For employment sites only - Is the site:<br><br>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +<br><br>Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X<br><br>For housing sites: N/A | +                        | The site is within the Hollinwood Business District BEA.   | N/A        |
| 18 and 19   | Net employment land gain / loss                                     | For employment / mixed use/ or housing sites where employment is still in active / recent use:<br><br>1ha + = ++<br><br>0.01ha to 0.99ha of land = +<br><br>0 ha = --<br><br>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X<br><br>-1ha + = XX                 | +                        | Site would provide around 0.9 of employment land.  | N/A        |
| 18  | Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score)   | Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++<br>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +<br>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --   | +                        | IMD score = 4<br><br>The site is in a deprived area. Development of the site could promote regeneration and improve deprivation. | N/A        |

| Site ref / name: B1.1.3 Land at Mersey Rd North / Albert Street | Potential Use: Employment  | Area: 0.89ha   | Indicative Capacity: N/A |   |  |
|---|--|--|--------------------------|---|--|
| IA Objective  | Theme  | Criteria   | Score                    | Comments  | Mitigation   |
| 20  | Centres  | Office use within centre: +<br>Office use outside of centre: x / ?<br>Industrial / warehousing use within centre: x<br>Industrial / warehousing outside of centre: --  | ?                        | Site is an out of centre location, but it is unknown if it will be developed for office or industry and warehousing so scored uncertain for this stage of assessment. | 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 = +<br><br>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X<br><br>Other uses = N/A | N/A                      | N/A   | N/A  |
| 23 and 26   | Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided               | providing for pitches = +<br><br>0 pitches = --  | N/A                      | N/A   | N/A  |
| 24  | Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)               | Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --<br><br>Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ?<br><br>(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<br><br>Yes (for any use other than employment) = x<br>No for any use = +<br>Yes for employment: ?  | +                        | Site not within a waste area / site.  | N/A  |

The site has limited ecological concerns, although it is noted that the mature trees on the site should be retained. 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. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scores significantly positively in relation objectives around brownfield land and public transport accessibility and positive for objectives such as flood risk, historic assets and deprivation. It scores a number of neutral scores due constraints not being present such as ecological features, minerals safeguarding areas or footpaths.

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 and there may be some mitigation needed regarding the access, so this has also scored uncertain.

Another uncertain is the effect on our centres, this is because it is unknown at this stage if the site will be suitable for office or industrial and warehousing.

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 issues can be investigated further.



# Oldham Site Allocations IA

| Site ref / name: B1.2.6<br>Albert Street | Potential Use:<br>Employment | Area: 6.75ha  | Indicative<br>Capacity: N/A |  |   |
|--|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|---|
| 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>The site supports semi-natural habitat with reasonable bird interest. The site will require habitat and bird surveys.</p> <p>The site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects.</p> | <p>GMEU have commented that development should look to retain trees along motorway, to act as screening and reduce offsite BNG requirements.</p> <p>Further liaison with GMEU will take place.</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 does not fall within an LCT.  | N/A   |
| 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.  | N/A   |
| 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</p> | +                           | Site is 100% within FZ1. Passes Sequential Test. FRA needed to address surface water flood risk and because the site is over 1ha. 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 is not within a SPZ.  | N/A   |

| Site ref / name: B1.2.6<br>Albert Street | Potential Use:<br>Employment   | Area: 6.75ha   | Indicative<br>Capacity: N/A |  |  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|
| 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 = X</p>  | ++                          | Site is previously developed land in 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.   | --                          | 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>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 an 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    | <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<br/>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 is not in close proximity to homes so is not likely to cause amenity issues if it is developed as employment. | 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 | <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>   | +                           | Site is a major development site with high accessibility due to being within 800m of the Hollinwood tram stop.     | PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3, D1 and D2 in the local plan that provide the policy context for  |

| Site ref / name: B1.2.6<br>Albert Street | Potential Use:<br>Employment           | Area: 6.75ha   | Indicative<br>Capacity: N/A |  |  |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--|
| IA Objective                             | Theme                                  | Criteria   | Score                       | Comments   | Mitigation   |
|  |  | Major development with medium accessibility = X<br><br>Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX   |                             |  | 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?<br><br>Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?<br><br>No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = -- | ?                           | Site has two Public Rights of Way running through site that might be impacted.                                     | Public Rights of Way will need to be considered as part of the design of the site.   |
| 14, 15 and 16                            | Highways                               | Site acceptable in principle (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +<br><br>Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?<br><br>Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X  | +                           | Access arrangements are already in place. 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 = +<br><br>No impact on highway network = --<br><br>Potential adverse impact on highway network = X<br><br>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<br><br>Employment: N/A  | N/A                         | N/A  | N/A  |
| 2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26                | Health and well being:<br>Provision of | Employment: N/A  | N/A                         | N/A.   | N/A  |

| Site ref / name: B1.2.6<br>Albert Street | Potential Use:<br>Employment  | Area: 6.75ha  | Indicative<br>Capacity: N/A |   |            |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------|---|------------|
| IA Objective                             | Theme   | Criteria  | Score                       | Comments  | Mitigation |
|  | health facilities<br>or open space  |   |                             |   |            |
| 7, 17 and 22                             | Provision of<br>education<br>facilities   | Employment: N/A   | N/A                         | N/A.  | N/A        |
| 18, 19, 20 and 26                        | Is the site in<br>close proximity<br>to areas of<br>employment                        | For employment sites only - Is the site:<br><br>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth<br>Employment Area or centre = +<br><br>Outside of BEA / SEA or centre = X<br><br>For housing sites: N/A  | +                           | The site is within the Hollinwood<br>Business District BEA.   | N/A        |
| 18 and 19                                | Net<br>employment<br>land gain / loss   | For employment / mixed use/ or housing sites where<br>employment is still in active / recent use:<br><br>1ha + = ++<br><br>0.01ha to 0.99ha of land = +<br><br>0 ha = --<br><br>-0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X<br><br>-1ha + = XX  | ++                          | Site would provide over 6ha of<br>employment land.  | N/A        |
| 18                                       | Proximity to<br>deprived areas<br>(Index of<br>multiple<br>deprivation<br>score)      | Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++<br>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +<br>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --   | ++                          | IMD score = 2<br><br>The site is in a significantly<br>deprived area. Development of the<br>site could promote regeneration<br>and improve deprivation. | N/A        |
| 20                                       | Centres   | Office use within centre: +<br><br>Office use outside of centre: x / ?<br><br>Industrial / warehousing use within centre: x<br><br>Industrial / warehousing outside of centre: --   | ?                           | Site is an out of centre location,<br>unknown if it will be developed for<br>office or industry and warehousing<br>so both scores noted.                | N/A        |
| 23 and 26                                | Housing:<br>provide an<br>appropriate<br>mix of type,<br>size, tenure<br>and density? | Development would have a positive effect on the<br>contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type,<br>size, tenure and density = +<br><br>Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of<br>housing type, size, tenure and density = X<br><br>Other uses = N/A | N/A                         | N/A   | N/A        |
| 23 and 26                                | Gypsy and<br>Travellers:  | providing for pitches = +<br><br>0 pitches = --   | N/A                         | N/A   | N/A        |

|  |  |  |                                     |                                      |  |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Site ref / name: B1.2.6<br/>Albert Street</b> | <b>Potential Use:<br/>Employment</b>                     | <b>Area: 6.75ha</b>  | <b>Indicative<br/>Capacity: N/A</b> |                                      |  |
| <b>IA Objective</b>                              | <b>Theme</b>   | <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Score</b>                        | <b>Comments</b>                      | <b>Mitigation</b>                                    |
|  | Number of transit pitches provided                       |  |                                     |                                      |  |
| 24   | Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) | Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --<br><br>Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ?<br><br>(prior extraction would need to be considered)       | --                                  | Site not within MSA.                 | N/A. GM Minerals Plan contains policies on Minerals. |
| 25   | Waste  | Does the site conflict with a designated waste site / area:<br><br>Is the development within a waste management site / area<br><br>Yes = x<br>No = + | +                                   | Site not within a waste area / site. | N/A  |

The site supports semi-natural habitat with reasonable bird interest. The site will require habitat and bird 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. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site has an extant planning permission for the erection of employment led mixed-use development (PA/333717/13). 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 significantly positively in relation the objectives around brownfield land and regeneration and positives for the objectives around public transport accessibility, flood risk and historic assets. It scores a number of neutral scores due minerals safeguarding areas not being present and for not being in close proximity to existing residential areas. 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, an ecological assessment may be needed so that also scores uncertain and the presence of PRoW on site has also scored uncertain, which would need to be taken into account in the detailed layout and design of the site.

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.