

# Oldham

# Local Plan

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

December 2023



**Oldham**  
Council

Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref / name: HLA 2088 Bailey Mill, Delph	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.86 ha	Capacity: 50 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35 dph	
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>Some developing scrub woodland, but no overriding ecological constraints. TPO on site also.</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. Furthermore, proximity to South Pennine Moors necessitates assessment of site as potential functionally linked land.</p>	<p>Ecology surveys will be needed. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.</p> <p>In addition, policies 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>	--	Close proximity to LCT Open Moorland and enclosed uPland fringes therefore should consider landscape guidance.	PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	<p>Does the site have heritage concerns:</p> <p>No heritage concerns: +</p> <p>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --</p> <p>Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?</p> <p>Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X</p>	?	Bailey Mills is a Grade II listed asset. In New Delph conservation area. Other heritage assets within 250m.	<p>Although some parts of the listed mill complex have been demolished due to the fire, it is expected that rather than clearing the site for new development, as much of the historic mill as possible should be reused in any scheme to ensure the legacy and interpretation of the mill is still legible on the site.</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>	+	Passes Sequential Test. FRA required to address surface water flood risk.	<p>See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.</p> <p>In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.</p>

Site ref / name: HLA 2088 Bailey Mill, Delph	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.86 ha	Capacity: 50 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35 dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – eg a mill)			
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Outside of SPZ	N/A
1, 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++  Previously developed land in Green Belt = +  Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +  Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x  Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X	++	Mill complex.	N/A
12 and 14	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A	N/A	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	Housing:  Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?  Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --	--	Not in close proximity to road that exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE Policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and Policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	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).  No: --  Yes but could be mitigated: ?	--	There are employment uses opposite and along Delph New Road but no specific issues at present.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.

Site ref / name: HLA 2088 Bailey Mill, Delph	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.86 ha	Capacity: 50 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35 dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X			
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 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 within 400m of a bus stop but it is not frequent.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	<p>Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?</p> <p>Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?</p> <p>No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --</p>	--	No footpaths etc identified.	Policies in the Local Plan such as policy T2 'Creating Sustainable Streets'; Policy D1 – 'A Design-Led Approach for Residential & Mixed-Use Development'; and Policy D2 – 'A Design Led Approach to Non-Residential, Commercial and Employment Developments' will ensure account is taken of footpaths.
14, 15 and 16	Highways	<p>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	Is the site accessible to other key services	++	Delph village has a library, co-op, post office and a range of cafes / pubs and	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and

Site ref / name: HLA 2088 Bailey Mill, Delph	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.86 ha	Capacity: 50 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35 dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<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>		other services and a primary school within 800m of the site.	Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	<p>Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +</p> <p>Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --</p> <p>Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ?</p> <p>For employment: N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.

Site ref / name: HLA 2088 Bailey Mill, Delph	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.86 ha	Capacity: 50 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35 dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X  Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A			
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	For employment sites only - Is the site:  Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +  Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X  For housing sites: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	For employment / mixed use / housing sites in active or recent employment use:  1ha + = ++  0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +  0 ha = --  -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X  -1ha + = XX	N/A	N/A. Bailey Mill has been vacant for a considerable time.	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	Red (scores 1-3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	--	IMD score = 8	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m of centre = +  Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --	--	Not within or close to centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.

Site ref / name: HLA 2088 Bailey Mill, Delph	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.86 ha	Capacity: 50 homes (major)	Minimum Density (as proposed under policy H3): 35 dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A			
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Outside MSA	N/A. GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Outside waste allocations.	N/A

The site has some developing scrub woodland, but no overriding ecological constraints. Ecology surveys will be needed.

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. Furthermore, proximity to South Pennine Moors necessitates assessment of site as potential functionally linked land. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site is a Phase 1 Saved UDP Housing Allocation. The site scored negatively against one IA objective as the site does not have good public transport accessibility. However, Delph village has a co-op, post office and a range of cafes / pubs and other services and a primary school within 800m of the site and therefore within walking distance. This could be taken into consideration given the opportunity to redevelop the remains of a listed mill complex in a rural setting.

There are some uncertainties where details are not likely to be known until later in Plan process or Planning application stage in relation to ecology, heritage and 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. A significantly positive score was given for previously developed land.

Based on the IA and HRA and taking into account the need to find sustainable uses for heritage assets the site would appear acceptable to progress through the next stages of the Local Plan review.



Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref/ name: HLA0076 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	No overriding ecological constraints.  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.  Policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type: --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--/?	Site falls within LCT and therefore would need to consider guidance for 'Open Moorlands and Enclosed Upland Fringes (West / South Pennines)'.	PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	?	The site is adjacent to the Green Belt and a Listed Building and is also within Denshaw Conservation Area.  The development of the site could remove the sense of space and isolation that the grade II listed Dumfries Farmhouse benefits from, being sat within its surrounding fields, maintaining its rural feel. Additionally, the development of the site would also impact upon the grade II listed 21 Ripponden Road, with both the front and rear of the property benefitting from open rural aspects across undeveloped land. Therefore, the development of this site could introduce an unacceptable impact upon the setting of both designated heritage assets. Additionally, any development would have to respect the historic character of the conservation area, with this pocket of undeveloped land also acting as a positive	See previous column.  Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.



Site ref/ name: HLA0076 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
				contributor to the conservation area.	
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 but Exception Test is likely to be passed: --</p> <p>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X</p> <p>Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – e.g. a mill conversion)</p>	+	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	<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 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 / edge of settlement = X</p>	X	Greenfield site in Denshaw.	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>	--	Not within close proximity to road exceeding or close to exceeding legal limit for NO2.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.

Site ref/ name: HLA0076 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --			
15	Local environmental quality	Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).  (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)  No: --  Yes but could be mitigated: ?  Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X	--	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.
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++  Major development with high accessibility = +  Major development with medium accessibility = X  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX	X	Site has access to a bus stop without frequent service.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside Strategic Policy 7, Policies T1-3, CO9 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	--	Site does not have any footpaths running through site that would be impacted.	N/A
14, 15 and 16	Highways	No Highway concerns (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?	+	No specific concerns. Acceptable in principle subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing	Mitigation would be identified through transport assessments etc.

Site ref/ name: HLA0076 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X		requirements of a transport assessment where necessary.	
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	Potential positive impact on highway network = +  No impact on highway network = --  Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown at this stage= ?	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage.	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	Is the site accessible to other key services  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services include an education and health facility = +++  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++  Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +  Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X  Major housing site with no access to key services = XX	++	Site has access to a primary school, secondary school and community facilities all within 800m	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +  Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --  Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X  Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.

Site ref/ name: HLA0076 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>			
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / 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 in active or recent employment 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 1-3 high deprivation): ++</p> <p>Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): +</p> <p>Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --</p>	--	<p>IMD = 7</p> <p>The site is not within a deprived area so will not make a significant contribution to reducing deprivation and disparity.</p>	N/A
20	Centres	<p>Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m of centre = +</p> <p>Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --</p>	--	Not within or close to centre	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.

Site ref/ name: HLA0076 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X		appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) (Mapping GM)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Not within an MSA.	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = X No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Not within / close to a waste site / area.	N/A

Overall, 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 also either scored positive where the site is not within a constraint / not likely to impact or neutral because no adverse impacts are expected. There is uncertainty in relation to heritage concerns, because of the proximity of the site to existing heritage assets, however mitigation may be possible.

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

The site also scored negative for consisting of greenfield land and for having medium public transport accessibility which reflects its more rural setting; however, it scored positively for access to services and facilities. NPPF does allow for a mix of sites so although the Local Plan aims to maximise the proportion of previously developed land that is used to meet development needs it is recognised that some greenfield sites can make up the housing land supply.

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: HLA0112 Land at Knowls Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 9.8ha	Indicative capacity: 234 (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	Part of site is priority habitat and green corridor. Site has Planning permission which has considered ecological impact. No overriding ecological concerns.  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  The site has permission for residential development and ecology impact mitigation has been considered as part of the approved application.  Policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type: --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	Part of site falls within LCT and development of the site would therefore need to consider guidance for 'Incised Urban Fringe Valleys (Manchester Pennine Fringe)'.	PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	--	The site is within 250m of Conservation Area and Listed Building.  Site has Planning permission which has considered impact on the historic environment.	See previous column.  Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – e.g. a mill conversion)	+	Passes Sequential Test if development avoids areas of flood zone 3b, 3 and 2.  Site has Planning permission which has considered flood risk.	Site has Planning permission which has considered flood risk. If a new application was required, an updated FRA would be needed to address surface water flood risk and tree Planting catchment. 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.

Site ref/ name: HLA0112 Land at Knowls Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 9.8ha	Indicative capacity: 234 (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Site 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 = ++  Previously developed land in Green Belt = +  Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +  Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x  Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X	X	Greenfield site on edge of Lees.	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A	N/A	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	Housing:  Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?  Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --	--	Not within close proximity to road exceeding or close to exceeding legal limit for NO2.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).  (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)  No: --  Yes but could be mitigated: ?  Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X	?	Site has Planning permission which has considered impact on Local environmental quality.	Mitigation for Local environmental impact is including within the Planning conditions.



Site ref/ name: HLA0112 Land at Knowls Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 9.8ha	Indicative capacity: 234 (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	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++  Major development with high accessibility = +  Major development with medium accessibility = X  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX	+	Site has access to a bus stop with a frequent service.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3, CO9 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	?	PROWs run throughout the site	Policies in the Local Plan such as policy D1 'A Design-Led Approach for Residential & Mixed-Use Development' and T1 'Delivering Oldham's Transport Priorities' will ensure account is taken of footpaths as part of development.
14, 15 and 16	Highways	No Highway concerns (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?  Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X	+	No specific concerns. Acceptable in principle subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing requirements of a transport assessment where necessary.  The Planning application considered access and highways issues.	Mitigation would be identified through transport assessments etc.
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	Potential positive impact on highway network = +  No impact on highway network = --  Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown at this stage = ?	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	Is the site accessible to other key services  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services	+++	Site has access to a primary school, secondary school, GP, dentist, post office and community facilities within	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: HLA0112 Land at Knowls Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 9.8ha	Indicative capacity: 234 (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<p>include an education and health facility = +++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +</p> <p>Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X</p> <p>Major housing site with no access to key services = XX</p>		800m. The site is also within 800m of Lees town centre.	
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	<p>Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +</p> <p>Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --</p> <p>Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criterions for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criterions for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A

Site ref/ name: HLA0112 Land at Knowls Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 9.8ha	Indicative capacity: 234 (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X  For housing sites: N/A			
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	For employment / mixed use / housing sites in active or recent employment use:  1ha + = ++  0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +  0 ha = --  -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X  -1ha + = XX	N/A	N/A.	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	Red (scores 1-3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	++	IMD = 1  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 within 400m of centre = +  Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --	+	Part of the site is within 400m of Lees centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) (Mapping GM)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Not within an MSA.	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area	+	Not within / close to a waste site / area.	N/A

Site ref/ name: HLA0112 Land at Knowls Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 9.8ha	Indicative capacity: 234 (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?			

The site has extant planning permission for 234 homes (RES/350225/22). The planning application process has considered several of these objectives as part of the approval process to ensure sustainable development. Should the approved development scheme not come forward, any future development of the site would be expected to come forward in line with local planning policy.

The site has some ecological concerns which have been considered through the extant planning permission and it has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

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

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

The site scored negative for consisting of greenfield land. NPPF does allow for a mix of sites so although the Local Plan aims to maximise the proportion of previously developed land that is used to meet development needs it is recognised that some greenfield sites can make up the housing land supply.

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

Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref / name: HLA2234 Land at Springhey Mill, Huddersfield Road	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.34ha	Indicative Capacity: 30 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	<p>Does the site have ecological concerns?</p> <p>No / little concern = --</p> <p>Site will require ecological assessment = ?</p> <p>Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x</p>	--	<p>No overriding ecological constraints</p> <p>However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.</p>	<p>Avoid hard to any ecological features on site as part of any development proposals.</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>	--	The site formerly had a mill and associated reservoirs.	<p>Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated by sympathetic development.</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 in flood zone 1 and passes Sequential Test. FRA required to surface water flood risk.</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>
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

Site ref / name: HLA2234 Land at Springhey Mill, Huddersfield Road	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.34ha	Indicative Capacity: 30 homes (major)	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 = X</p>	++	Site is previously developed land in urban area	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>	--	The site is not in close proximity to a road that exceeds NO2 legal limit or is close to exceeding 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>Local environmental quality noise: housing site next to a motorway or major road or B2/B8 use odour: site next to a waste management facility (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>	--	Site does not appear to have any bad neighbour uses.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.

Site ref / name: HLA2234 Land at Springhey Mill, Huddersfield Road	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.34ha	Indicative Capacity: 30 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>	+	Site is major development with high accessibility due to its proximity to a frequent bus 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 cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries 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>	+	No specific concerns. Acceptable in principle subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing requirements of a transport assessment where necessary.	Detailed design needed. 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> <p>Unknown = ?</p>	?	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	+++	The site is a major site and has access to health facilities, a primary school,	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9



Site ref / name: HLA2234 Land at Springhey Mill, Huddersfield Road	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.34ha	Indicative Capacity: 30 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 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>		a secondary school, post office and community facilities within 800m	'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 to areas of employment	<p>For employment / mixed use/ or housing sites where employment is still in active / recent use:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area mixed use site or centre = +</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A

Site ref / name: HLA2234 Land at Springhey Mill, Huddersfield Road	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.34ha	Indicative Capacity: 30 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X  For housing sites: N/A			
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	For employment / mixed use/ or housing sites where employment is still in active / recent use:  1ha + = ++  0.01ha to 0.99ha of land = +  0 ha = --  -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X  -1ha + = XX	+	N/A	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score)	Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	++	IMD score = 1  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 within 400m of a centre = +  Housing site outside of centre or 400m of a centre: --	--	The site is not within one of our centres.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A	N/A	At this stage 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 = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment.	N/A. See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ?  (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Site not within MSA.	N/A. GM Minerals Plan contains policies on Minerals.

Site ref / name: HLA2234 Land at Springhey Mill, Huddersfield Road	Potential Use: Residential	Area: 0.34ha	Indicative Capacity: 30 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Site not within a waste area / site.	N/A

The site has no overriding ecological constraints. However, the site has been screened in by the HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scores significantly positive for being a previously developed site but also a deprived area so the site would assist with regeneration. The site also scores positively in relation to access to services, flood risk, not being located within a SPZ or waste designation and due to it being acceptable in principle in relation to highways.

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.

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 uncertainties can be further investigated.

Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site name / ref: HLA2664 Land at Derker (Abbotsford Road)	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.27ha	Indicative capacity: 51 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns? No / little concern = -- Site will require ecological assessment = ? Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	No overriding ecological constraints.  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policies N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	Site does not fall within an LCT.	N/A
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns: No heritage concerns: + Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: -- Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ? Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	+	Site is within 250m of a listed building however, overall there are limited heritage concerns.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: + Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ? Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: -- Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X Sequential Test not applicable: N/A	+	Site is 100% within Flood Zone 1 and therefore passes the sequential test. See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.	See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk. In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Site is not within SPZ.	N/A

Site name / ref: HLA2664 Land at Derker (Abbotsford Road)	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.27ha	Indicative capacity: 51 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1 , 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	<p>Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++</p> <p>Previously developed land in Green Belt = +</p> <p>Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +</p> <p>Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x</p> <p>Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X</p>	++	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 exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 emissions.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	<p>Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>	--	Site does not appear to be in close proximity to any uses that would cause amenity harm.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	<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>	++	Site is major development with very high accessibility as it has access to a bus stop/route with frequent service and is within 800m of Derker Metrolink stop.	N/A

Site name / ref: HLA2664 Land at Derker (Abbotsford Road)	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.27ha	Indicative capacity: 51 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
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 link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?</p> <p>No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --</p>	--	Site does not have any footpaths running through site that would be impacted.	N/A
14, 15 and 16	Highways	<p>Site acceptable in principle (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +</p> <p>Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?</p> <p>Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X</p>	+	No specific concerns. Site has a pending Planning application which will consider highway impact and measures required to ensure safe access.	<p>Detailed design will be considered as part of the Planning application.</p> <p>Should the proposed development be approved and not commence, any future scheme on this site would need a detailed design.</p>
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>	+++	<p>Site has access to health facilities, a primary school, a secondary school, post office and community facilities, within 800m.</p> <p>In addition, Oldham Town Centre is 1km from the site where there are a range of services and facilities.</p>	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: HLA2664 Land at Derker (Abbotsford Road)	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.27ha	Indicative capacity: 51 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
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.	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> <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 site where employment is still in active / recent use:</p> <p>1ha + = ++</p> <p>0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A



Site name / ref: HLA2664 Land at Derker (Abbotsford Road)	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.27ha	Indicative capacity: 51 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		0 ha = -- -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X -1ha + = XX			
18	Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score)	Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	++	IMD score = 1  The site is in a significantly deprived area. Development of the site, in addition to other nearby cleared sites, could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre / within 400m of centre = +  Housing site outside of centre / not within 400m of centre: --	--	Site outside of centre/ not within 400m of centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A	+	Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.  The site has a pending Planning application which will consider housing mix.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan for ensuring the right mix, size and type of housing.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment.	N/A. See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Site not within MSA.	N/A. GM Minerals Plan contains policies on Minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Site not within a waste area / site.	N/A

The site has 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 significantly positive for being in an accessible location with access to several transport options. The site also scored positively in terms of access to key services. In addition, the site is within 1km of Oldham Town Centre where there are a range of services and facilities. Also being located within a very deprived area 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 significantly positive against using brownfield land efficiently as it is a previously developed site in the urban area.

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: HLA3147 Land at Ward Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	<p>Does the site have ecological concerns?</p> <p>No 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 is immediately adjacent to the Huddersfield Narrow Canal Site of Biological Importance (SBI) and is also a Green Corridor, which the site falls within. The SBI will need to be protected during the course of any development. Site could have bird interest (including Lapwings). Ecology surveys will be required, although it is noted that the site has a previous permission, and no overriding ecological constraints were identified during surveys at this time (2013). Site also falls within 1.4km of South Pennine Moors SPA, SAC, SSSI.</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: --</p> <p>Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?</p>	--/?	<p>Site does not fall within LCT but is adjacent and therefore would still need to consider guidance for 'Open Moorlands and Enclosed Upland Fringes (West / South Pennines)'.</p>	<p>PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.</p>
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>The site is within 250m buffer for listed building. Overall, there are limited heritage concerns.</p>	<p>See previous column.</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>

Site ref/ name: HLA3147 Land at Ward Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
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 but Exception Test is likely to be passed: --</p> <p>Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X</p> <p>Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – e.g. a mill conversion)</p>	+	Site is 100% within Flood Zone 1 and passes the Sequential Test. Site is within canal buffer and has some low and medium SWF and therefore may require FRA. 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	<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 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 / edge of settlement = X</p>	X	Greenfield site in Diggle.	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A	N/A	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	<p>Housing:</p> <p>Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?</p> <p>Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --</p>	--	Not within close proximity to road exceeding or close to exceeding legal limit for NO2.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.

Site ref/ name: HLA3147 Land at Ward Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
15	Local environmental quality	<p>Is the site likely to be affected by or cause local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).</p> <p>(a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>	--	Site is 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.
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 has access to a bus stop without frequent service.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3, CO9 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	<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 is adjacent to footpath which runs along the adjacent canal. Development of the site is unlikely to impact the footpath.	N/A
14, 15 and 16	Highways	<p>No Highway concerns (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.	Mitigation would be identified through transport assessments etc.

Site ref/ name: HLA3147 Land at Ward Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	<p>Potential positive impact on highway network = +</p> <p>No impact on highway network = --</p> <p>Potential adverse impact on highway network = X</p> <p>Unknown at this stage= ?</p>	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage.	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	<p>Is the site accessible to other key services</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services include an education and health facility = +++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++</p> <p>Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +</p> <p>Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X</p> <p>Major housing site with no access to key services = XX</p>	++	Site has access to a primary school, secondary school and a post office 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 = ? 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>	?	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.

Site ref/ name: HLA3147 Land at Ward Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X  Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A			
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	For employment sites only - Is the site:  Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +  Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X  For housing sites: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	For employment / mixed use / housing sites in active or recent employment use:  1ha + = ++  0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +  0 ha = --  -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X  -1ha + = XX	N/A	N/A.	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	Red (scores 1-3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	--	IMD = 9  The site is not within a deprived area so will not make a significant contribution to reducing deprivation and disparity.	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m of centre = +  Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --	--	Not within or close to centre	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.



Site ref/ name: HLA3147 Land at Ward Lane	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.67	Indicative capacity: 19 homes (major)	Minimum density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) (Mapping GM)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Not within an MSA.	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Not within / close to a waste site / area.	N/A

The site is immediately adjacent to the Huddersfield Narrow Canal Site of Biological Importance (SBI) and is also a Green Corridor, which the site falls within. Ecology surveys will be required, although it is noted that the site has a previous permission, and no overriding ecological constraints were identified during surveys at this time (2013). 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 also either scored positive where the site is not within a constraint / not likely to impact or neutral because no adverse impacts are expected.

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

The site also scored negative for consisting of greenfield land and for having medium public transport accessibility which reflects its more rural setting; however it scored positively for access to services and facilities. NPPF does allow for a mix of sites so although the Local Plan aims to maximise the proportion of previously developed land that is used to meet development needs it is recognised that some greenfield sites can make up the housing land supply.

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: HLA3982 Land adjacent to Huddersfield Road, Diggle	Potential use: Residential	Area: 2.67ha	Indicative capacity: 77 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	<p>Does the site have ecological concerns?</p> <p>No 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>	? / x	<p>Site looks to include improved grassland. Fields form part of riparian habitat. Surveys for bats would need to be needed. Within 150m of SBI (Huddersfield Narrow Canal) and to avoid impacts via hydrological connectivity a Construction Environmental Method Statement condition was attached to the Planning permission that the site has.</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. Furthermore, proximity to South Pennine Moors necessitates assessment of site as potential functionally linked land.</p>	<p>Habitat surveys including bats.</p> <p>The site has permission for residential development and a contribution for off-site habitat enhancement was agreed to compensate for loss of ground nesting bird habitat.</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: --</p> <p>Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?</p>	--	<p>Site does not fall within LCT however site would need to consider guidance still given proximity to LCTs 'Open Moorlands and Enclosed Upland Fringes (West / South Pennines)' and ' Open Moorlands and Enclosed Upland Fringes (Dark peak)'.</p>	<p>PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.</p>
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>The scale and design of new development should respond sensitively to the surrounding historic context and safeguard the character and setting of the nearby Listed Buildings. Any development should ensure that the clock tower of the grade II listed W.H. Shaw Ltd. Dobcross Works Office Building, remains as a prominent Local landmark.</p>	<p>See previous column.</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>Passes Sequential Test if development avoids small areas of flood zone 3 and 2.</p>	<p>FRA required to address surface water flood risk reservoir extent and canal hazard zone. See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.</p> <p>In addition, Policy JP-S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local</p>

Site ref/ name: HLA3982 Land adjacent to Huddersfield Road, Diggle	Potential use: Residential	Area: 2.67ha	Indicative capacity: 77 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – e.g. a mill conversion)			Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Site 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 = ++  Previously developed land in Green Belt = +  Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +  Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x  Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X	X	Greenfield site in Diggle	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A	N/A	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	Housing:  Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?  Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --	--	Not within close proximity to road exceeding or close to exceeding legal limit for NO2.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE Policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and Policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).  (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)	?	A new school is located to the east of the site. Site has planning permission, and this required landfill gas and contaminated land conditions. Minimum noise insulation specifications were also proposed for the windows and trickle	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.

Site ref/ name: HLA3982 Land adjacent to Huddersfield Road, Diggle	Potential use: Residential	Area: 2.67ha	Indicative capacity: 77 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		No: --  Yes but could be mitigated: ?  Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X		ventilators, and this was considered suitable.  Therefore, it is considered that environmental health concerns could be overcome in any future application.	
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++  Major development with high accessibility = +  Major development with medium accessibility = X  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX	X	Site has access to a bus stop without frequent service.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3, CO9 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	--	PROW run along the boundaries of the site	Policies in the Local Plan such as policy T2 'Creating Sustainable Streets'; Policy D1 – 'A Design-Led Approach for Residential & Mixed-Use Development'; and Policy D2 – 'A Design Led Approach to Non-Residential, Commercial and Employment Developments' will ensure account is taken of footpaths.
14, 15 and 16	Highways	No Highway concerns (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?  Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X	+	No specific concerns. Acceptable in principle subject to detailed design, site layout, access arrangements and subject to addressing requirements of a transport assessment where necessary.  The Planning application considered access and highways issues.	The Planning application considered access and highways issues.
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	Potential positive impact on highway network = +  No impact on highway network = --  Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown at this stage = ?	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A

Site ref/ name: HLA3982 Land adjacent to Huddersfield Road, Diggle	Potential use: Residential	Area: 2.67ha	Indicative capacity: 77 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
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 secondary school and a post office 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 = ? For employment: N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.

Site ref/ name: HLA3982 Land adjacent to Huddersfield Road, Diggle	Potential use: Residential	Area: 2.67ha	Indicative capacity: 77 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	For employment sites only - Is the site:  Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +  Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X  For housing sites: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	For employment / mixed use / housing sites in active or recent employment use:  1ha + = ++  0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = +  0 ha = --  -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X  -1ha + = XX	N/A	N/A. The site has been allocated for employment but the site has never been developed.	N/A
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	Red (scores 1-3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	--	IMD = 8  The site is not within a deprived area so will not make a significant contribution to reducing deprivation and disparity.	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m of centre = +  Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --	--	Not within or close to centre	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ?	--	Not within an MSA.	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.



Site ref/ name: HLA3982 Land adjacent to Huddersfield Road, Diggle	Potential use: Residential	Area: 2.67ha	Indicative capacity: 77 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 35dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
	Safeguarding Area (MSA) (Mapping GM)	(prior extraction would need to be considered)			
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Not within / close to a waste site / area.	N/A

The site has some ecological concerns, which the planning application addressed. 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.

Furthermore, proximity to South Pennine Moors necessitates assessment of site as potential functionally linked land. However, the HRA states that this site has been surveyed and assessed as part of a recent planning application. It was concluded from these surveys that the site is not functionally linked because of a lack of records of qualifying bird species and because the habitat was considered unsuitable for supporting significant numbers of qualifying bird species. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site has an extant Planning permission as a residential development (FUL/349826/22). 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 either scores positive where the site is not within a constraint / not likely to impact or neutral because no adverse impacts are expected.

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

A negative / uncertain was given as a planning application has shown that the site provides habitats for nesting bird habitat and compensation to offset this was required. Another negative was that the site only has access to two key services.

The site also scored negative for consisting of greenfield land and for having medium public transport accessibility which reflects its more rural setting. NPPF does allow for a mix of sites so although the Local Plan aims to maximise the proportion of previously developed land that is used to meet development needs it is recognised that some greenfield sites can make up the housing land supply.

Based on the IA and HRA assessment the site does appear to be acceptable on balance and taking into account the extant planning permission the site is generally acceptable with mitigation.



Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site name / ref: SHA0899 London Road, Derker	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.78ha	Indicative capacity: 54 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No / little concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	No overriding ecological constraints.  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	Site does not fall within an LCT.	N/A
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	+	The site is within 250m of a listed building which will need to be considered, however overall there are limited heritage concerns.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A	+	Site is 100% within Flood Zone 1 and therefore passes the sequential test. See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.	See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk. In addition, policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Site is not within SPZ.	N/A
1 , 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++  Previously developed land in Green Belt = +	++	Site is previously developed land in the urban area.	N/A

Site name / ref: SHA0899 London Road, Derker	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.78ha	Indicative capacity: 54 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<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>			
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies.	--	No known opportunities at this stage from available mapping.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	<p>Housing:</p> <p>Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?</p> <p>Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --</p>	--	Site is not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 emissions.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	<p>Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>	--	Site does not appear to be in close proximity to any uses that would cause amenity harm.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	<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 as it has access to a bus stop/route with frequent service and is within 800m of Derker Metrolink stop.	N/A

Site name / ref: SHA0899 London Road, Derker	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.78ha	Indicative capacity: 54 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70	
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 site that would be impacted.	N/A
14, 15 and 16	Highways	<p>Site acceptable in principle (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +</p> <p>Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?</p> <p>Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X</p>	+	No specific concerns. Site has a pending Planning application which will consider highway impact and measures required to ensure safe access.	<p>Detailed design will be considered as part of the Planning application.</p> <p>Should the proposed development be approved and not commence, any future scheme on this site would need a detailed design.</p>
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>	+++	<p>Site has access to health facilities, a primary school, a secondary school, post office and community facilities, within 800m.</p> <p>In addition, Oldham Town Centre is 1km from the site where there are a range of services and facilities.</p>	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	Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +	?	At this stage, the site would be expected to contribute to	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations

Site name / ref: SHA0899 London Road, Derker	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.78ha	Indicative capacity: 54 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
	health facilities or open space	<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>		health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.	which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss of education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ?</p> <p>For employment sites = N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +</p> <p>Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X</p> <p>For housing sites: N/A</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	<p>For employment / mixed use / housing site 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

Site name / ref: SHA0899 London Road, Derker	Potential use: Residential	Area: 1.78ha	Indicative capacity: 54 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 70	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
18	Proximity to deprived areas (Index of multiple deprivation score)	Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	++	IMD score = 1  The site is in a significantly deprived area. Development of the site, in addition to other nearby cleared sites, could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre / within 400m of centre = +  Housing site outside of centre / not within 400m of centre: --	--	Site outside of centre and not within 400m of centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A	+	Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.  The site has a pending Planning application which will consider housing mix.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan for ensuring the right mix, size and type of housing.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment.	N/A. See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Site not within MSA.	N/A. GM Minerals Plan contains policies on Minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Site not within a waste area / site.	N/A

The site has a pending Planning application for residential development (FUL/350118/22).

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 significantly positive for being in an accessible location with access to several transport options. The site scored positively in terms of access to key services. In addition, the site is within 1km of Oldham Town Centre where there are a range of services and facilities. Also being located within a very deprived area 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 significantly positive against using brownfield land efficiently as it is a previously developed site in the urban area.

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: SHA1162 Saddleworth School, High Street, Uppermill	Potential use: Residential	Area: 4.45 ha	Indicative capacity: 97 homes (major)		
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	No overriding ecological constraints.  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. Furthermore, proximity to South Pennine Moors necessitates assessment of site as potential functionally linked land.	See previous column  The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	However, site adjacent to LCT 'Open Moorlands and Enclosed Upland Fringes (Dark Peak)' and should consider landscape guidance.	PfE Policy JP-G1 'Landscape Character' provides the policy framework for considering landscape.
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	--	Site just outside the boundary of Uppermill conservation area which is high density industrial heritage.	Any development should take into account views and vistas in and out of the conservation area and respect the character of the conservation area, in terms of scale, layout, materials, and appearance.  Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so Exception Test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception Test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A (this applied to change of use – eg a mill – we are assuming we will retain)	+	Site passes sequential test. FRA required as site over 1ha and to assess surface water and other sources of 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) = +	+	Outside of SPZ.	N/A



Site ref / name: SHA1162 Saddleworth School, High Street, Uppermill	Potential use: Residential	Area: 4.45 ha	Indicative capacity: 97 homes (major)		
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	Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++  Previously developed land in Green Belt = +  Mixed: More than 50% brownfield within site boundary = +  Mixed: Less than 50% brownfield within site boundary = x  Greenfield in urban area / edge of settlement = X	++	Previously developed site.	N/A
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies. However, any known low carbon opportunities will be stated i.e. if a site is within a heat network.	N/A	N/A	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	Housing:  Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?  Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --	--	Not within proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the 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	Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).  (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)  No: --  Yes but could be mitigated: ?  Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X	--	No specific issues at this stage.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	Major development (above 10 or more dwellings or 0.4 ha and above) with very high accessibility = ++	+	Site has access to bus stop with a frequent service.	PfE 'Connected Places' chapter includes policies alongside policies T1-3 and design policies in the Local Plan that provide the

Site ref / name: SHA1162 Saddleworth School, High Street, Uppermill	Potential use: Residential	Area: 4.45 ha	Indicative capacity: 97 homes (major)		
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Major development with high accessibility = +  Major development with medium accessibility = X  Major development with low (or not achieving low accessibility) accessibility: = XX			policy context for promoting sustainable transport choices.
1 and 16	Footpaths	Are there any public footpaths, cycleways or bridleways running through or along the boundaries of the site?  Yes. Development would need to consider how proposals link up to / enhance footpaths, cycleways or bridleways within the site = ?  No. Development unlikely to impact on public footpaths, cycleways or bridleway = --	?	PROW runs along the edge of the site and through the site to the south.	Design of the site would need to take this into account.  Policies in the Local Plan such as policy T2 'Creating Sustainable Streets' ; policy D1 – 'A Design-Led Approach for Residential & Mixed-Use Development'; and policy D2 – 'A Design Led Approach to Non-Residential, Commercial and Employment Developments' will ensure account is taken of footpaths.
14, 15 and 16	Highways	No Highway concerns (subject to transport assessment / site layout etc) = +  Some highways concerns which can be mitigated = ?  Highways concerns and unlikely to be mitigated = X	?	Access would need to be improved with footway on either side.	Access would need to be improved with footway on either side.
14, 15 and 16	Impact on strategic highway network (not available yet)	Potential positive impact on highway network = +  No impact on highway network = --  Potential adverse impact on highway network = X  Unknown at this stage= ?	?	This assessment will be completed at a later stage	N/A
7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 26	Accessibility	Is the site accessible to other key services  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where two services include an education and health facility = +++  Major housing site with access to at least three key services and where one service is an education or health facility = ++  Major housing site with access to at least three key services = +	+++	Site is within 800m of a GP, primary school, community facilities and is within 800m of Uppermill Town Centre.	Local Plan policies H1 'Delivering a Diverse Housing Offer', C2 'Local Services and Facilities' and CO9 'Creating Sustainable and Accessible Communities' can help influence ensuring sites are accessible to key services.

Site ref / name: SHA1162 Saddleworth School, High Street, Uppermill	Potential use: Residential	Area: 4.45 ha	Indicative capacity: 97 homes (major)		
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		Major housing site with access to one or two key services = X  Major housing site with no access to key services = XX			
2, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26	Health and well being: Provision of health facilities or open space	Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +  Development would not place additional pressure on open space or health facilities = --  Development would place additional pressure / loss of open space and / or health facilities and would not contribute towards additional facilities = X  Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.  Sites includes some areas of open space (outdoor sports facilities). Development of the site will be required to take this into consideration in line with Local Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +  Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --  Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss or education facilities = X  Unknown at current stage = ? For employment: N/A	?	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 or mixed use sites	For employment sites only - Is the site:  Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +  Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X  For housing sites: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	For employment / mixed use / housing sites where employment in active or recent employment use:	N/A	N/A. School will have provided some employment, which has been	N/A

Site ref / name: SHA1162 Saddleworth School, High Street, Uppermill	Potential use: Residential	Area: 4.45 ha	Indicative capacity: 97 homes (major)		
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		1ha + = ++ 0.1ha to 0.99ha of land = + 0 ha = -- -0.1 ha to 0.99 + = X -1ha + = XX		relocated, but site is not an employment site.	
18	Proximity to deprived areas  (Index of Multiple Deprivation Score)	Red (scores 1 to 3 high deprivation): ++ Amber (scores 4 to 6 medium deprivation): + Green (scores 7 to 10 low deprivation): --	--	IMD score = 8  The site will make a limited contribution to tackling deprivation.	N/A
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre or within 400m of centre = +  Housing/ mixed use outside of centre or 400m of centre: --	+	Within 400m of Uppermill centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A	N/A	At this stage it is not known what the housing mix will be for housing sites. Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PFE and Local Plan.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment	See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Outside MSA	GM Minerals Plan contains policies on minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Not close to waste site / areas.	N/A

The site has limited ecological concerns. However, 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. Furthermore, proximity to South Pennine Moors necessitated assessment of site as potential functionally linked land. However it was concluded that this site does not support habitats suitable for use as functionally linked land by qualifying bird species. The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.

The site scores significantly positive for having good access to key services and being on previously developed site within the urban area. It is close to Uppermill centre so may contribute towards increased vitality of the centre.

The site also either scores positive where the site is not within a constraint / not likely to impact or neutral because no adverse impacts are expected.

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

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.

Oldham Site Allocations IA

Site ref/ name: SHA1630 Former Cromford Mill	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.58ha	Indicative capacity: 28 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?  No / little concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	No overriding ecological constraints  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = -- / ?	--	Site does not fall within an LCT.	N/A
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: - -  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	--	There are some heritage concerns owing to previous mill legacy, which can be mitigated.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so exception test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A	+	Site is 100% within Flood Zone 1 and therefore passes the sequential test. See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.	See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk. In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Site is not within SPZ.	N/A
1 , 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++	++	Site is previously developed land in the urban area.	N/A

		<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>			
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies.	--	No known opportunities at this stage from available mapping.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	<p>Housing:</p> <p>Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?</p> <p>Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --</p>	--	Site is not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 emissions.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	<p>Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).</p> <p>Local environmental quality noise: housing site next to a motorway or major road or B2/B8 use odour: site next to a waste management facility (a distance of 20 metres will be applied where possible)</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>	--	Site does not appear to be in close proximity to any uses that would cause amenity harm. Although proximity to Deker Metrolink stop should be considered.	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> <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 as it has access to a bus stop/route with frequent service and is within 800m of Derker Metrolink 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>	?	<p>Some highways concerns related to integration with existing street layout. It is considered, however, that mitigation is possible.</p> <p>Site has a pending Planning application which will consider highway impact and measures required to ensure safe access.</p>	<p>Detailed design will be considered as part of the Planning application.</p> <p>Should the proposed development be approved and not commence, any future scheme on this site would need a detailed design.</p>
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>	++	<p>Site has access to a primary school, secondary school and community facilities within 800m</p> <p>In addition, Oldham Town Centre is just over 1km from the site where there are a range of services and facilities.</p>	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	Development would contribute to the provision of additional open space and/or health facilities = +	?	At this stage, the site would be expected to contribute to	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations

	of health facilities or open space	<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>		health facilities / open space in line with Planning policy.	which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
7, 17 and 22	Provision of education facilities	<p>Development would provide additional education facilities on site or contribute to the provision of education facilities = +</p> <p>Development is not expected to increase pressure on educational facilities = --</p> <p>Development would not contribute to the provision of additional educational facilities and would increase pressure on existing educational facilities or result in loss of education facilities = X</p> <p>Unknown at current stage = ?</p> <p>For employment sites = N/A</p>	?	At this stage sites would be expected to contribute to education facilities in line with Planning policy.	Consider site specific policy criteria for any site allocations which progress to publication Plan, where there is an identified need.
18, 19, 20 and 26	Is the site in close proximity to areas of employment	<p>For employment sites only - Is the site:</p> <p>Within Business Employment Area / Saddleworth Employment Area / mixed use site or centre = +</p> <p>Outside of BEA / SEA / mixed use site or centre = X</p> <p>For housing sites: N/A</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A
18 and 19	Net employment land gain / loss	<p>For employment / mixed use / housing site 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 = 1</p> <p>The site is in a significantly deprived area.</p> <p>Development of the site, in addition to other nearby</p>	N/A

				cleared sites, could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.	
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre / within 400m of centre = +  Housing site outside of centre/ not within 400m of centre: --	--	Site outside of centre/ not within 400m of centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A	+	Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.  The site has a pending Planning application which will consider housing mix.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan for ensuring the right mix, size and type of housing.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment.	N/A. See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Site not within MSA.	N/A. GM Minerals Plan contains policies on Minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Site not within a waste area / site.	N/A

The site has a pending Planning application for residential development (FUL/350118/22).

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 significantly positive for being in an accessible location with access to several transport options. The site scored positively in terms of access to key services. In addition, the site is within 1km of Oldham Town Centre where there are a range of services and facilities. Also being located within a very deprived area 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 in terms of highway access, however it is considered that concerns related to integration with existing street layout can be mitigated against. An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage.

The site scores significantly positive against using brownfield land efficiently as it is a previously developed site in the urban area.

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 name / ref: SHA2017 Land at Flint Street	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.27ha	Indicative capacity: 10 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
1	Ecology	Does the site have ecological concerns?  No / little concern = --  Site will require ecological assessment = ?  Site has ecological interest and will require a greater degree of ecological investigation = ?/x	--	No overriding ecological constraints.  However, the site has been screened in by HRA as increases in population could result in increased road traffic resulting in increased air pollution effects and increased recreational disturbance on European sites.	The HRA addresses mitigation for any likely significant effects.  In addition, policy N1 to N3 on nature of the Local Plan and PfE Greener chapter provides details on the policy approaches, including any necessary mitigation. Policy N4 of the Local Plan will consider tree replacement/ mitigation.
3 and 5	Landscape Character	Development does not fall within a landscape character type (LCT): --  Development falls within a LCT and will need to consider guidance / take into account sensitivity = - - / ?	--	Site does not fall within an LCT.	N/A
3, 4 and 5	Historic environment	Does the site have heritage concerns:  No heritage concerns: +  Some heritage concerns which can be mitigated: --  Major heritage concerns – mitigation may be possible: ?  Heritage concerns which cannot be mitigated: X	+	There are no heritage concerns.	Policies HE1 to HE5 of the Local Plan and PfE Policies JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' and JP-P2 'Heritage' provide the policy framework for considering the historic environment.
9 and 13	Flood Risk	Site passes the Sequential Test: +  Site does not pass the Sequential Test and so exception test is required - ?  Site does not pass Sequential test and Exception Test is likely to be passed: --  Site has not passed Sequential Test and is unlikely to pass Exception test: X  Sequential Test not applicable: N/A	+	Site is 100% within Flood Zone 1 and therefore passes the sequential test. See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk.	See Flood Risk Sequential Report for further details on flood risk. In addition, Policy JP—S5 'Flood Risk and the Water Environment' and Policy CC3 of the Local Plan provides the policy framework for managing flood risk.
10	Water Quality	The site falls outside of a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) = +  The site falls within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone = ?	+	Site is not within SPZ.	N/A
1 , 2, 6, 11 and 18	Land and soils	Previously developed land (including vacant / or under used buildings) in urban area = ++	++	Site is previously developed land in the urban area.	N/A

Site name / ref: SHA2017 Land at Flint Street	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.27ha	Indicative capacity: 10 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
		<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>			
12	Low carbon energy	No score if given for this objective as all sites will be required to meet PfE policies.	--	No known opportunities at this stage from available mapping.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policies JP-S2 'Carbon and Energy', JP-S3 'Heat and Energy Networks' and JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' also addresses energy in addition to Local Plan policy CC1.
14	Air Quality	<p>Housing:</p> <p>Within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 = ?</p> <p>Not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding legal limit for NO2 = --</p>	--	Site is not within close proximity to a road which exceeds or is close to exceeding the legal limit for NO2 emissions.	Development will need to come forward in line with PfE policy JP-S6 'Clean Air' and policy LE3 'Air Quality' of the Local Plan.
15	Local environmental quality	<p>Is the site likely to be affected by or cause Local environmental quality or amenity issues (e.g. noise pollution, amenity issues and bad neighbour uses).</p> <p>No: --</p> <p>Yes but could be mitigated: ?</p> <p>Yes and unlikely to be mitigated to an acceptable level: X</p>	--	Site does not appear to be in close proximity to any uses that would cause amenity harm.	Any mitigation required would be flagged up through the development management process at Planning application stage.
14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26	Public Transport Accessibility	<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 as it has access to a bus stop/route with frequent service and is within 800m of Derker Metrolink stop.	N/A

Site name / ref: SHA2017 Land at Flint Street	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.27ha	Indicative capacity: 10 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph	
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 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>	?	Some highways concerns related to integration with existing street layout. It is considered, however, that mitigation is possible with detailed design.	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 several key services and facilities (including education and health provision) 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 name / ref: SHA2017 Land at Flint Street	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.27ha	Indicative capacity: 10 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph	
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>			
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 site 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.</p> <p>Development of the site</p>	N/A



Site name / ref: SHA2017 Land at Flint Street	Potential use: Residential	Area: 0.27ha	Indicative capacity: 10 homes (major)	Density (as proposed in policy H3): 50dph	
IA Objective	Theme	Criteria	Score	Comments	Mitigation
				could promote regeneration and improve deprivation.	
20	Centres	Housing / mixed use within centre / within 400m of centre = +  Housing site outside of centre / not within 400m of centre: --	+	Site is within 400m of Oldham Town Centre.	N/A
23 and 26	Housing: provide an appropriate mix of type, size, tenure and density?	Development would have a positive effect on the contribution towards an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = +  Development is unlikely to provide an appropriate mix of housing type, size, tenure and density = X  Other uses = N/A	+	Development will be required to provide an appropriate housing mix in line with Planning policy.	N/A. See housing policies in PfE and Local Plan for ensuring the right mix, size and type of housing.
23 and 26	Gypsy and Travellers: Number of transit pitches provided	providing for pitches = +  0 pitches = --	--	Need will be based on outcome of any updated Gypsy and Travellers Assessment.	N/A. See Policy H12 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
24	Is the development in a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	Outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area = --  Within a Minerals Safeguarding Area = ? (prior extraction would need to be considered)	--	Site not within MSA.	N/A. GM Minerals Plan contains policies on Minerals.
25	Waste	Is the development within / close to waste management site / area  Yes (for any use other than employment) = x No for any use = + Yes for employment: ?	+	Site not within a waste area / site.	N/A

The site has 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 significantly positive for being in an accessible location with access to several transport options and key services and facilities. Also being located within a very deprived area 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 in terms of highway access, however it is considered that concerns related to integration with existing street layout can be mitigated against. An assessment on the strategic highway network is not yet complete and so this is uncertain at this stage.

The site scores significantly positive against using brownfield land efficiently as it is a previously developed site in the urban area.

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.