

Appendix 3: Sustainability Appraisal of Policies and Reasonable Alternatives

WORKING DRAFT

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Policy SPD7 Settlement Boundary | 4 |
| Policy SPD8 Developer Contributions and Infrastructure | 18 |
| Policy SPD9 Protecting the South Pennine Moors | 25 |
| Policy ENV8 Open Countryside | 31 |
| Policy ENV9 Landscape | 43 |
| Policy ENV10 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) | 50 |
| Policy ENV11 Green Belt | 57 |
| Policy ENV12 Green Infrastructure | 65 |
| Policy ENV13 Natural Environment and Ecological Networks | 71 |
| Policy ENV 14: Local Green Space | 78 |
| Policy ENV 15: Open Space | 84 |
| Policy ENV 16: Trees and Hedgerows | 91 |
| Policy ENV 17: Environmental Protection | 99 |
| Policy ENV 18: Contaminated and Unstable Land | 105 |
| Policy ENV 19: Design and Placemaking | 111 |
| Policy ENV20: Advertisements and Commercial Signage | 117 |
| Policy ENV 21: Historic Environment | 122 |
| Policy ENV 22: Leeds and Liverpool Canal Corridor | 129 |
| Policy ENV 23: Equestrian Development | 135 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Policy ENV 24: Walking and Cycling | 142 |
| Policy ENV 25: Parking | 148 |
| Policy ENV 26: Taxis | 156 |
| Policy ENV 27: Zero Net Carbon..... | 161 |
| Policy LIV 6: Revised Housing Requirement..... | 169 |
| Policy LIV 7: Housing Site Allocations | 184 |
| Policy LIV 8: Reserved Sites for Housing | 198 |
| Policy LIV 9: Affordable Housing | 211 |
| Policy LIV 10: Quality Housing..... | 218 |
| Policy LIV 11: Self and Custom Build Housing..... | 224 |
| Policy LIV 12: Housing in the Countryside | 231 |
| Policy LIV 13: Communal Living | 238 |
| Policy LIV 14: Accommodation for Travelling Communities..... | 246 |
| Policy WRK 7: Employment Site Allocations | 253 |
| Policy WRK 8: Protected Employment Areas | 266 |
| Policy WRK 9: Mixed Use Development | 275 |
| Policy WRK 10: Vibrant Town Centres | 282 |
| Policy WRK 11: Retail and Commercial Uses outside of Town and Local Shopping Centres..... | 289 |
| Policy WRK 12: Tourist Facilities and Accommodation..... | 295 |
| Policy WRK 13: Digital and Electronic Communications | 301 |
| Policy SUP5: Supporting Healthy Places and Lifestyles..... | 306 |
| Policy SUP6: Support for Local Communities..... | 312 |

Policy SPD7 Settlement Boundary

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred approach seeks to direct development to within defined settlement boundaries, establishing a presumption in favour of sustainable development within these areas, beyond settlement boundaries Policy ENV8 applies. The policy seeks to safeguard the open countryside from loss to development, encouraging regeneration and the redevelopment of brownfield land. This is in line with policy objectives, and supports the implementation of the spatial strategy, focussing development at the most sustainable locations within the Borough. In doing so, the policy assists effects to minimise the effects of development on climate change, air quality, and to encourage a modal shift. The policy also helps to protect land which is in recreation use or of recreational value. The policy does not limit or prevent the delivery of new homes, with sufficient land to meet identified requirements identified as allocations through the Part 2 Local Plan.

Reasonable Alternative: The alternative would be to remove settlement boundaries altogether. Whilst the policy would aid the delivery of new housing and support the local economy, the adoption of this approach would remove certainty for communities and applicants and would undermine countryside policy (Policy ENV8). The policy could therefore result in harm to environmental objectives, including adverse effects for landscape, green infrastructure, and flood risk. The policy would also undermine objectives to regenerate and reuse existing buildings and vacant land within the Borough and contribute towards increased greenhouse gas emissions in the Borough by encouraging development further from existing services and facilities and transport infrastructure. For these reasons the policy option is rejected.

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy establishes in principle where development can and cannot take place providing greater certainty for applicants, landowners and the wider community. The presumption to build within the settlement boundary assists the delivery of housing whilst encouraging the reuse of brownfield land and protecting the open countryside supporting regeneration objectives and help address levels of deprivation within the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The policy will be effective from adoption of the Plan with positive effects for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation could be dealt with via planning obligations / conditions or s106 contributions through the development management process.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The extent to which development will occur on sites within settlement boundaries (beyond those with planning permission or allocate) is unknown. New housing development meets local needs will be dependent on the mix of housing delivered (in terms of size, type and tenure) which is currently unknown. Unexpected changes which may take place in the plan period such as market uncertainty, site specific constraints, availability of materials etc, may delay the delivery of allocated sites/opportunities for sites within settlement boundaries. (Low-Medium Risk)</p> | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would effectively remove the restriction and distinction for the delivery of new homes enabling provision outside of built-up areas. This would significantly increase the scope for development in the Borough and potentially increase the amount and variety of new homes provided.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The policy will be effective from adoption of the Plan with significant positive effects for this objective for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of policy approach on wider issues such as the environment, social wellbeing and health, and accessibility.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy establishes in principle where development can and cannot take place providing greater certainty for applicants, landowners and the wider community. The presumption to build within the settlement boundary assists the delivery of employment land whilst encouraging the reuse of brownfield land and protecting the open countryside. Land within settlement boundaries is likely to be more accessible to existing communities and sources of labour benefiting the local workforce and in turn supporting regeneration and helping to address deprivation levels.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The policy will be effective from adoption of the Plan with positive effects for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation could be dealt with via planning obligations / conditions or s106 contributions.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>There are opportunities for development within the settlement boundary that are suitable and responsive to employment needs. Development is viable within settlement boundaries.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale of and need for employment land within the borough is under review. The extent to which development will occur on sites within settlement boundaries (beyond those with planning permission or allocate) is unknown. Unexpected changes which may take place in the plan period such as market uncertainty, site specific constraints, availability of materials etc, may delay the delivery of allocated sites/opportunities for sites within settlement boundaries (low to medium risk).</p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will aid the economy both directly and indirectly with jobs in the construction sector, greater support to local businesses, and increased local workforce. The positive effects of the policy are tapered somewhat by the potentially adverse effects that enabling the spread of economic uses throughout the Borough may have on weakening existing employment sites, as employers may be attracted to new sites.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The policy will be effective from adoption of the Plan with likely positive effects for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None Made.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent of support provided by the development of new housing to the local economy (low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Settlement boundaries help to encourage the development of land within existing settlements including the redevelopment of vacant and previously developed land and reuse of existing buildings. This supports regeneration objectives and helps channel and revitalize some of the Borough's poorest areas, and main the vitality of the Borough's town centres and local shopping areas. Settlements with settlement generally benefit from access to existing services, facilities and infrastructure. Development locations within settlement boundaries are therefore likely to be amongst the most sustainable locations in the Borough promoting sustainable living. Settlement boundaries are drawn at the Borough's rural settlements within which new development may be permitted. This will help to encourage new development in rural areas of a suitable scale to maintain the vitality of rural communities, supporting the rural economy, opportunities to live locally, and to retain and develop existing services.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The policy will be effective from adoption of the Plan with significant positive and lasting effects for this objective through the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>There are opportunities for development within the settlement boundary. Development is viable within settlement boundaries.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Site viability within the M65 Corridor particularly is known to be particularly low. Availability of funding to support regeneration. Demand for development in the Borough, particularly in Town Centres and inner urban areas (medium risk)</p> | -- | <p><u>Like Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would promote the development of greenfield land. This would undermine urban regeneration objectives as land in the open countryside is often more desirable and profitable to build at. The result would be to direct investment away from those areas of the Borough which are most in need, most likely compounding existing problems, especially where monies and resources are diverted to these new sites. Whilst development in rural areas would assist in maintaining the level of existing services and facilities, the amount of development which could come forward may be significant overwhelming capacity and service quality with adverse effects for existing residents resulting in considerable harm to the sustainability and functionality of these areas, notwithstanding wider environmental effects.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely significant adverse effects from the adoption of the Local Plan, with effects likely throughout the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will promote access to housing, jobs and services for existing residents in towns and villages benefiting health and wellbeing. Development is likely to be accessible to existing services, facilities, sources of employment, and recreation. This will help encourage travel by walking and cycling modes, encouraging daily exercise. The policy will encourage new development in close proximity to a range of existing healthcare facilities minimising the need to travel long distances. The policy will encourage the reuse of brownfield land improving the environmental quality of existing urban areas and addressing pollution and contaminated land. This also means that existing open countryside will be retained and protected from inappropriate development safeguarding its recreational and cultural role in the Borough. The policy is therefore responsive and beneficial in addressing health issues currently experienced within the Borough.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation could be dealt with via planning obligations / conditions or s106.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The policy will be effective from adoption of the Plan with positive and lasting effects for this objective through the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Development is viable with contribution requirements. Capacity exists at existing services and facilities.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Development viability means that development is unable to come forward within the settlement boundary and/or support sustainable expansion of existing facilities where needed. There is an appetite to develop within settlement boundaries (low to medium risk)</p> | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Sites on the edge of existing settlement would be closely served and be accessible to recreational opportunities located within the open countryside. Sites may however be inaccessible by foot or bicycle broader existing facilities such as parks and leisure centres. The development of greenfield land could adversely affect the health and wellbeing of existing residents owing to impact on residential amenity or reducing/severing links to the open countryside. New developments could provide for enhanced links or recreational facilities for the benefit of all.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects caused by policy in the Short, Medium and long term. Effects would likely vary on a site by site basis depending on location, scale and use.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation could be dealt with via planning obligations / conditions or s106.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The enhanced viability of development outside of settlement boundaries could provide greater scope for developer contributions and benefits to the wider community.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Impact variable depending on site specifics (Medium risk)</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Development is directed to locations which benefit from existing public transport infrastructure helping to promote their use/investment and to parts of the Borough which are accessible to existing services, facilities, and sources of employment. This will help to minimise car dependency and car journeys, and encourage access via sustainable modes of transport and a modal shift. Development is also likely to take place at/in close proximity to locations identified for infrastructure investment as identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, aiding the delivery of these through planning contributions. In turn this means that development is unsustainable locations is minimised.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects likely in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation is dealt with via planning obligations / conditions or s106 contributions.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Development is viable with contributions.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The location, type, and timing of development which takes place within the settlement boundary on non-allocated sites is largely unknown Development viability means that development is unable to come forward within the settlement boundary (low-medium risk)</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would encourage/allow development to take place outside of settlements, which are less likely to be accessible by public transport and existing services and facilities then sites located within settlement boundaries. The policy would encourage development which contradicts the spatial strategy, and lead to pressure on existing services which may not have the capacity for development. Investment in places outside settlements may undermine service quality and infrastructure provision within settlements.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short-Medium significant negative. Longer term, this harm may reduce with changing attitudes and technology (uncertain at this stage).</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation is dealt with via planning obligations / conditions or s106 contributions.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale, type and location of development relative to existing services and infrastructure (medium risk)</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy directs development to within existing settlement boundaries. This will encourage development on brownfield land making efficient use of land, and conserving soils including the short supply of BMV land in the Borough. The policy also gives rise to the opportunity to address soil quality and contamination experienced at sites located within settlement boundaries.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent significant positive effects from adoption of the plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Wider funding may be sought to support the redevelopment of sites where available. This could include a public private partnership (such as PEARL) to secure the redevelopment of land.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>There is an appetite to redevelop land within the settlement boundary</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability uncertainty means the redevelopment of previously developed land may not be achievable in some parts of the Borough. Contaminated land may could increase costs associated with development and therefore further affect the viability of sites. Potential future supply problems may result in unplanned growth on greenfield land beyond settlement boundaries (medium risk)</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would allow development outside of settlements discouraging the reinvestment and redevelopment of existing buildings and land owing to the increased costs, uncertainty and difficulties associated with type of site. This would result in the loss of land in agricultural use, including soils of higher quality to permanent forms of development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent adverse effects from adoption of the plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Density increases would limit the loss of undeveloped land.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties.</u></p> <p>Soil quality varies within the district with large tracts of undeveloped land not considered to be BMV (medium risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Development is directed to existing settlements protecting existing water courses and resources located within the open countryside from contamination. The redevelopment of PDL may address contaminated sites within the urban areas and lead to improvements in water corridors and quality within urban areas.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent positive effects from the medium term with the implementation of the policy and its influence in directing development and investment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Remediation undertaken through the redevelopment of urban sites Contributions made through planning applications to water infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Opportunities for such remediation come forward and is viable. Capacity exists within water infrastructure to accommodate new development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Willing landowner and developer to carry out works. Availability of third party funding sources should this not prove viability. Programmed works to water infrastructure take place as planned. Low risk.</p> | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effect</u></p> <p>The policy may place a strain on water quality and resources by encouraging development on land close to existing watercourses. The nature of and potential for this impact would depend on the location, scale, and type of development proposed which would also have a bearing of water capacity which is evidenced as being strained by both United Utilities and Yorkshire Water</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The effects of the policy will vary depending on the scale, location and type of development proposed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Masterplanning measures. Planning Conditions.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale of impact dependent on amount of development which could come forward in accordance with policy. A low amount of development would have limited/negligible effects increasing with scale of development (low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Development is directed to urban areas helping to safeguard greenfield sites and the role these fulfil within the drainage basin. Reduced hard surfaces and the incorporation of SuDs drainage methods in new developments within urban areas may lead to a betterment in run-off rate and increased surface water storage capacity lessening flood risk effects within urban areas.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent positive effects from the medium term with the implementation of the policy and its influence in directing development and investment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Sequential Test and Flood Risk Vulnerability applied in accordance with National Planning Policy. Application of the SuDs hierarchy through the DM process. Design standards re: mitigating the effects of climate change. Wider investment into flood defences by the EA and drainage boards.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Development avoids F22 and F23 in accordance with national planning policy. Incorporation of SuDs and climate change design measures are feasible.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Pressure to develop greenfield land. Rate and effect of Climate Change on the environment and extreme weather events. (medium risk)</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy approach would encourage the development of greenfield land increasing the overall amount of developed land available in the Borough adversely affecting surface run-off increasing the risk of flooding with greater pressure on the flood plain especially during extreme weather events.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent adverse effects from the medium term with the implementation of the policy and its influence in directing development and investment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Policy requirement for SuDs to mimic greenfield run-off</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effectiveness of SuDs especially if not adequately maintained. Rate and effect of Climate Change on the environment and extreme weather events. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|----------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>New development operation has potential to have negative effects on air quality due to emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements during construction. Effects may be more pronounced in sensitive areas, such as the North Valley Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Directing development within settlement boundaries however helps to promote travel via non-polluting modes of travel due to increased accessibility of services, facilities and sources of employment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent positive effects from the medium term with the implementation of the policy and its influence in directing development and investment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Investment in walking and cycling infrastructure. Mixed use development/aligned employment and housing strategies. Development at quality public transport corridors. Incorporation of electric charging for vehicles. Travel Plan Targeting through the DM process. Travel vouchers. Bike Storage.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Both feasible and viable for mitigation measures to be provided as part of permitted developments. There is appetite within the community for a change in the mode of preferred travel and the adoption of less polluting means of travel.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Technology changes. Changes in air quality levels requiring the establishment of further AQMAs. Medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The removal of settlement boundaries could promote an unsustainable pattern of development, with development taking place further and more inaccessible to public transport connections, walking and cycling links, and existing services, facilities, shops, and sources of employment. The longer distances faced will likely force people into cars increasing air quality problems in the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely adverse effects in the medium term. Uncertain effects in the longer term depending on technology and behavioural changes.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Investment in walking and cycling infrastructure. Mixed use development/aligned employment and housing strategies. Development at quality public transport corridors. Incorporation of electric charging for vehicles. Travel Plan Targeting through the DM process. Travel vouchers. Bike Storage.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sites beyond the built up area are generally more inaccessible than sites within the built up area.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Technology changes such as the take up of electric cars may reduce the impact on air quality development outside of settlement boundaries would have. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Development is directed to within settlement boundaries, helping to minimise the need to travel by unsustainable modes of travel, and safeguarding undeveloped areas of the Borough which may assist in mitigating the effects of climate change such as existing wooded areas and the South Pennines SPA. A minor positive effect is assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short to medium effects are likely to be adverse-neutral given the effects of development on climate change. In the longer term as higher efficiency standards are adopted generally the policy will have greater positive effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Investment in walking and cycling infrastructure. Mixed use development/aligned employment and housing strategies. Development at quality public transport corridors. Incorporation of electric charging for vehicles. Travel Plan Targeting through the DM process. Travel vouchers. Bike Storage. Implementation of sustainable methods of construction and materials, and efficiency standards. Renewable energy generation.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Both feasible and viable for mitigation measures to be provided as part of permitted developments. There is appetite within the community for a change in the mode of preferred travel and the adoption of less polluting means of travel</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The use and take up of renewable energy. The capacity of infrastructure to accommodate low carbon/carbon neutral development. The effects of climate change on the environment, society and the economy. Medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The removal of settlement boundaries could promote an unsustainable pattern of development, with development taking place further and more inaccessible to public transport connections, walking and cycling links, and existing services, facilities, shops, and sources of employment. The longer distances faced will likely force people into cars increasing greenhouse gas emissions due to the need to travel. The development of greenfield land may increase flood risk elsewhere due to surface water run-off. Development could also result in the loss of natural features which are important in mitigating climate change.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short to medium term negative. Turning towards neutral in the longer term as enhanced build and construction standards come in and technology improves.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Investment in walking and cycling infrastructure. Mixed use development/aligned employment and housing strategies. Development at quality public transport corridors. Incorporation of electric charging for vehicles. Travel Plan Targeting through the DM process. Travel vouchers. Bike Storage.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sites beyond the built up area are generally more inaccessible than sites within the built up area.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Technology changes such as the take up of electric cars may reduce any adverse effects that development outside of settlement boundaries would have on climate change. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|--|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy directs development to within settlement boundaries thereby safeguarding natural resources from permanent loss.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would enable development outwith settlement boundaries placing pressure to develop land identified within mineral safeguarding areas.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential adverse effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale and location of development permitted in line with policy.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy directs development to built-up areas helping to minimise adverse effects of development on wildlife, habitats, and green infrastructure inclusive of the loss of designated sites, as well as pressures caused by new development on designated areas from recreational use etc. It is recognised that in some cases urban sites/brownfield land can have significant biodiversity value; however the effects of the redevelopment of a brownfield site however this would be assessed against policy through the development management process. The policy will indirectly assist with conservation of special scientific interest and local geodiversity sites. Overall, the policy supports a minor positive effect on the objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the medium to longer term as new development established.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Net Biodiversity Gain in line with policy</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>It is assumed that impacts on biodiversity have been duly considered as part of the planning application process.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scope for and implementation of design/mitigation measures in response to biodiversity and green infrastructure through development proposals. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The removal of settlement boundaries and encouragement this would provide to development beyond the built up area would add pressure to biodiversity threaten the loss or interference of habitats used for foraging, nesting etc through the loss of the natural environment. Similar pressures would exist for the effect of development on green infrastructure and geodiversity.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short-medium significant negative to negative effects. Reducing over time.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Policy requirements for the implementation of biodiversity net gain. These measures however will take time to establish. In the meantime local wildlife may have dispersed. It is not guaranteed how successful such means will be.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That greenfield land has an ecological, geology and/or green infrastructure value.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The value of the open countryside for this policy objective and how this will change over the course of the plan period owing to the effects of climate change. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy establishes the principle of development within settlement boundaries. Historic assets, environments and their wider settings are prevalent throughout the Borough in both rural and urban areas. The policy therefore has a neutral impact on this sustainability objective, with the effects of developments to be assessed on the merits of the proposal at the application stage.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Effects of policy will vary site by site depending on proximity to, significant of, and relationship with a historic asset, and the scale and type of development which is proposed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Development proposals may affect historic assets within or outwith the settlement boundary. The extent and nature of this affect will vary substantially. It is not clear whether the policy promotes interactions/conflict between new developments and historic environments owing to the dispersed nature of heritage assets around the Borough, and uncertainty of the location of unallocated development proposals within settlement boundaries. Low-medium risk.</p> | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy establishes the principle of development within settlement boundaries. Historic assets, environments and their wider settings are prevalent throughout the Borough in both rural and urban areas. The policy therefore has a neutral impact on this sustainability objective, with the effects of developments to be assessed on the merits of the proposal at the application stage.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Effects of policy will vary site by site depending on proximity to, significant of, and relationship with a historic asset, and the scale and type of development which is proposed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Development proposals may affect historic assets within or outwith the settlement boundary. The extent and nature of this affect will vary substantially. It is not clear whether the policy promotes interactions/conflict between new developments and historic environments owing to the dispersed nature of heritage assets around the Borough, and uncertainty of the location of unallocated development proposals within settlement boundaries. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy directs development to within settlement boundaries where there is the potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and to improve townscapes, particularly where brownfield sites are redeveloped. The policy helps to safeguard the open countryside, and its valued landscapes, including the AONB from inappropriate forms of development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short-medium-long term effects all likely to be positive.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Landscaping/boundary treatments, use of materials, scale and massing to reflect the local built environment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>It is assumed that landscape impacts have been duly considered through the planning application process.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Design quality may vary. Permitted Development within urban boundaries may undermine design and environmental quality objectives. Low risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would enable development beyond built up boundaries. This may have an adverse effect on the setting and character of a settlement, and result in adverse effects for visual qualities of the local landscape if built form interrupts a previously undeveloped vista.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent harm from adoption of the plan. The extent of this harm may reduce with the implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Landscaping/boundary treatments, use of materials, scale and massing to reflect the local built environment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Undeveloped land adjacent to settlements plays a role in defining their setting and unique character.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Certain forms, types and scales of development may enhance the built character and result in a neutral effect on local landscapes. Medium risk.</p> |

Policy SPD8 Developer Contributions and Infrastructure

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred approach seeks to ensure that new development is sustainable in terms of its effects and requirements for infrastructure. The policy reflects the national planning policy position as set out in Paragraphs 54-57 of the 2019 NPPF. The policy has significant benefits for securing the sustainable delivery of required housing and employment. Will secure sustainable communities, assist in the promotion of health and wellbeing, and will allow benefits of development such as the delivery of key infrastructure, affordable housing, open space, addressing climate change, and biodiversity areas to be secured.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy reflects the NPPF position and is necessary to secure sustainable development. As a result it is not considered that there are any reasonable alternatives to this policy approach. No reasonable alternative is therefore assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will secure the affordable housing requirements of the Local Plan in line with LIV4. This helps ensure that the housing provided within the plan period is responsive to the housing needs of all sections of the community as identified through the Pendle Housing Needs Assessment. The policy also seeks to ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided to support developments, sought fairly and proportionately to the size, scale and location of the development, thereby promoting housing delivery in the wider Borough, as development is not burdened by increased undue cost.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Permanent positive effect from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Contributions secured through s.106 agreements</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Affordable housing is delivered in accordance with policy. Infrastructure requirements meets CIL tests.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Needs alter through the plan period. The market alters through the plan period changing the feasibility to meet obligation requirements. Medium risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Affordable housing provided through this policy aids the local economy by providing a local skilled workforce within easy access. Infrastructure works supports jobs in the local economy, and promotes economic growth with enhanced infrastructure links.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Permanent positive effect from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Infrastructure gained through new development benefits wider areas than just the development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Scale, timescales, and nature of development. Market/Demand shifts affecting viability/need for infrastructure. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Policy seeks to ensure that the accessibility and quality of key services, facilities and infrastructure required for sustainable communities is safeguarded and enhanced through new development. Such infrastructure works can form part of and be a catalyst for urban regeneration aiding helping to reduce levels of deprivate areas and support rural communities. This may be planned where gain from allocated development and provided in accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and/or Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent significant positive effect from adoption of the plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Monies/direct infrastructure gained through new development</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Development comes forward in accordance with the development plan. Large scale infrastructure may be also reliant on third party funding/implementation. Requirement for multi-agency working/collaboration.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Finance – Viability/Funding. Timescales. Subject to negotiation. Reliance on third parties. Unplanned development resulting in increased/redirected infrastructure needs. Medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy has potential to promote healthy lifestyles and improve well-being through promoting access to affordable housing, delivery of new infrastructure such as footpath, cycling links, recreational facilities, and improved access to health care facilities. The implementation of the policy forms a key response to addressing the identified health inequalities within the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent significant positive effect from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Third party delivery and funding – i.e. Central Govt investment/incentives</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That the requirement for contributions is adequately managed through the development management process.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The level of investment in community facilities and services that may be stimulated by new development is uncertain and will in part be dependent on individual development through the planning application process and viability of developments. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would provide the opportunity to increase financial contributions towards sustainable transport projects enabling the delivery of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and aligned to the site specific requirements of LIV6/LIV7. Whilst generally speaking development may increase the amount of traffic in the vicinity, this policy could provide a good opportunity to investment in the transport infrastructure network to mitigate congestion.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effect from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Allocation of Sites to meet identified needs in sustainable locations with the infrastructure necessary to promote the use of non-car modes to travel.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Promoted sites have readily available means of reducing the reliance on cars, and viable with measures to do so.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale, type and location of development at non-allocated sites is at this time unclear. Technology changes. The severity of climate change and impact this has on planning and infrastructure requirements. Medium risk.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy may challenge the deliverability of this strategy policy objective. It is however unclear to what degree or effect this would be and is likely to be a site by site, development by development issue.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short to medium uncertainty. Policy enables renegotiation where site specific evidence illustrates that policy requirements would make a scheme unviable. Viability position may change. Third party funding may encourage and enable investment. This will vary site by site depending on the scale, location and type of development proposed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Development management process negotiation may provide alternative means to provide the required infrastructure should viability be challenged by contribution requirements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Viability is low in the M65 corridor</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Market conditions change. There is a change in national policy in regard to the use of land. Funding sources change. Pressure to develop Greenfield sites. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will secure enhancements to water infrastructure where this is required. Consultation undertaken with statutory providers of water infrastructure in the plan preparation process thus far shows that the Plan can be accommodated by existing/planned infrastructure, however longer term capacity pressures are identified within UU and Yorkshire Water publications. Further feedback will be sought as part of the remaining stages of plan preparation, with policy requirements altered accordingly. The effect and availability of water infrastructure will again be determined at the planning application stage.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effect from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Engagement to date has been accurate and illustrates no further needs not already programmed.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Infrastructure requirements alter. Further evidence shows an increased level of need. Planned programme timescale slip and not delivered to meet the needs of committed development. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Where relevant the policy will be used to secure enhancements to flood defences affecting the site and/or affected by the development. This will vary on a site by site basis in accordance with site specific policy and through the DM process.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effect from adoption – though variable depending on success of implemented scheme.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Monies raised from the development or onsite provision (depending where relevant).</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Subject to site specific modelling. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>New/improved facilities provided through the policy may enhance accessibility via non-polluting modes of travel. Improvements to cycling and pedestrian and public transport infrastructure will also promote modal shift providing a continued reduction in emissions from the Borough. Replacement facilities will be built to a more efficiency and sustainable design than predecessors. Travel Plan monitoring and contributions will implement sustainability measures proposed at major developments.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short-medium term benefit during travel plan monitoring years and during years where public transport travel may be supported by development. Longer term effects likely where new infrastructure is provided such as shops, community services etc.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel vouchers. Bike Storage. Electric charging points, car sharing.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>It is assumed that air quality and sustainable travel have been duly considered through the development management process.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Securing daily and regular use. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Infrastructure contributions orientated to reducing the need to travel, promoting sustainable modes of transport, and to encourage environmentally practices within the development and operation of a site. For example construction and build standards, development/enhancement of daily essential infrastructure, development at/investment in public transport, promotion of walking and cycling. Infrastructure renewable energy and transport. The policy will help secure ambitions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions continuing trends, and secure developments which use less energy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits. The scale and extent of this will vary depending on site specific circumstance including scale, type and location of development.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures are proposed in the Local Plan policies</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>It is assumed that low carbon design measures have been duly considered through the planning application process.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Technology changes. Changes in national planning policy. Viability. Maintenance and delivery. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Contributions may be required to facilitate or enhance waste recycling collection and/or process if deemed relevant and necessary through new development which will assist in achieving ambitions to increase the amount of recycled material collected in the Borough. There is limited connection to mineral resources.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent positive effects from the medium to long term as the policy takes effect on new developments.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Suitable means of storage and collection provided for through the development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None. Low risk.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will be used to secure biodiversity net gains where this is required and justified. This will help to expand the green infrastructure assets of the Borough in response to the green infrastructure strategy, and help protect and enhance wildlife and habitats. The extent of the benefit provided will depend on the type, scale and location of the proposal and the considered impact on biodiversity, and means available (or practical) to secure this on site (in lieu of this an off-site contribution will be required).</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Benefits of the policy are only likely to arising in the medium to long term as measures mature and integrate into the wider environment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>New habitat areas, landscaped areas, open space, SuDs, Habitat features and safeguarding areas in new buildings. Effective management regime needed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Success of new habitats. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy has been assessed that it would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy has been assessed that it would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Permanent.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Low risk.</p> |

Policy SPD9 Protecting the South Pennine Moors

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred approach seeks to ensure that new development does not adversely affect the integrity, value, and condition of the South Pennine Moors SPA. The adoption of avoidance measures to limit the effects of new development, and delivery of offsetting measures is considered to achieve benefits for the natural environment, recreational opportunities, and character of Pendle and its surrounding area, but is not considered to have negative effects for objectives to promote housing and economic development, owing to the availability of suitable and sustainable sites for development in parts of the Borough which are unaffected by its requirements.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy is responsive to the international designation of the South Pennine Moors and seeks to secure its long term protection and enhancement for wildlife, its role in mitigating the effects of climate change and for the benefit of the local community for generations to come. The approach of the policy is consistent with requirements outlined in law and has been successfully implemented in neighbouring authorities, and local planning authorities across the country. For these reasons it is considered that the policy does not have a reasonable alternative. No reasonable alternative is therefore assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy has potential to constrain the delivery of housing in areas in close proximity to the South Pennine Moors. The spatial strategy of the Core Strategy directs development away from the South Pennines. The housing requirement can be accommodated without adversely affecting the SPA. The overall effect is assessed to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sites identified for allocation come forward as anticipated.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Land within the influence of the South Pennine Moors comes under pressure for development. Low risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy has potential to constrain the delivery of employment in areas in close proximity to the South Pennine Moors. The spatial strategy of the Core Strategy directs development away from the South Pennines. The employment land requirement can be accommodated without adversely affecting the SPA. The overall effect is assessed to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sites identified for allocation in the plan come forward as anticipated.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Land within the influence of the South Pennine Moors comes under pressure for development. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy does not affect areas within the Borough which are disadvantaged or are in need of urban regeneration. The policy has a constraining effect on development in the eastern parts of the Borough. These rural areas are sparsely populated and benefit from close links to the M65 conurbation. The South Pennines have a role in contributing to the standard of life of residents and providing a source of tranquility and recreation which the policy seeks to protect from loss. The policy therefore has a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None identified</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None. Low risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to protect the South Pennine Moors as an important upland habitat for future generations beneficial for local health and wellbeing. To reduce recreational pressure the policy requires the provision of SANG through new development. This will enhance the green infrastructure of the Borough and increase accessibility of the community to areas of open and accessible greenspace. This is term will enhance health and wellbeing and could also improve standards of living.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>On-delivery/off-site delivery via developer contributions</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Suitable and available land is identified for SANG.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Development pressure in areas close to the South Pennine Moors requiring SANG. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The provision of assessable SANG required by policy could reduce the need to travel to access recreational opportunities in parts of the Borough. The amount and availability of this will depend on the scale and nature of proposals. Overall the policy is considered to have a beneficial effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>On-site delivery/off-site delivery via developer contributions</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Suitable and available land is identified for SANG.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The extent to which the policy is successful in reducing pressure on the South Pennines Moors and limiting trips for recreation. Low risk.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy safeguards natural greenfield land from inappropriate forms of development. The SPA does not however include BMV land. The policy has a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None,</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>There is minimal development pressure in this part of the Borough. Low risk.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Policy prevents inappropriate forms of development in most environmentally sensitive upland locations which also form the source of many watercourses in Eastern Pendle. The policy will, by proxy, help to maintain water quality and resource in these areas, protecting these from any potential adverse effects from development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy restricts the form, scale and type of development permitted in designated undeveloped upland areas of the Borough. Such areas provide a vital storage of rainwater limited runoff into watercourses below. This will benefit flood risk objectives and help limit flood risk is watercourses downstream.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change will cause more extreme weather events and may affect the surface water storage capacity of the South Pennine Moors. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The restriction of development in this rural part of the Borough means that existing air quality in these parts will remain largely unchanged. The provision of SANG as sought for affected developments may result in some reduced trips into this area for recreational uses helping to reduce pollution in the area by reduced visits by car.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>On-site delivery/off-site delivery via developer contributions</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sufficient SANG is identified/made available.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Usage of SANG as an alternative to the South Pennine Moors. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy protects the South Pennine Moors from inappropriate development and in particular its peat bogs which function to capture carbon emissions. This is beneficial in addressing climate change, protecting natural assets which play a key role in absorbing harmful greenhouse gases.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None identified</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None identified</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Climate change means that the ability of the peat bogs to capture carbon emissions is reduced and in the end acts as a contributor to climate change (through the emission of methane gas). Unclear risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy safeguards a large part of the Borough from inappropriate development, in turn protecting the loss of minerals and natural resources which feature within the ground and landscape in this area. The policy is considered to have a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Not assessed</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to conserve the important habitat of the South Pennine Moors. This will help safeguard this upland natural resource for wildlife in recognition this area has an important location for migratory birds, as well as types of bog/heather. Measures put in place for alternative natural greenspace provided as part of new development in the zone of influence of the South Pennine Moors is aimed at reducing pressure as a result of recreational use.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Significant positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Policy contains mitigation measures to reduce pressure on South Pennine Moors as a source of recreation.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Sufficient SANG is identified/made available.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Climate Change may put at risk the South Pennine Moors as an important habitat for local wildlife due to drought, extreme rainfall, moorland fires etc. Usage of SANG as an alternative to the South Pennine Moors. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy restricts development opportunities in rural areas close to the South Pennine Moors, which in turn may safeguard historic assets located in this area from development which may adversely affect significance and setting. The SPA is not considered a sustainable location for development and so the constraint placed development in this part of the Borough does not act to increase the pressure on heritage assets located elsewhere within the Borough. A neutral effect is found.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent of impact of policy on objective is variable depending on scale, type and location of development in relation to heritage assets. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy safeguards the open wilderness which is characteristic of the South Pennine Moors and contributes significantly to the setting, identity and quality of Pendle and its landscapes. This has significant positive effects in safeguarding, maintaining and enhancing a key natural resource and landscape of the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects from adoption at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None. Low risk.</p> |

Policy ENV8 Open Countryside

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred approach which seeks to protect the open countryside from inappropriate forms of development, enabling only development required in a countryside location, rural exception development, assists in the diversification of the rural economy, or secures a historical asset. The policy is considered to have environmental, landscape and historical benefits. It will help safeguard the sustainability, role and functionality of rural areas. It is considered to have a neutral effect housing delivery given that there is sufficient scope to meet needs outside the open countryside. The policy will support the implementation of the spatial strategy defined through the Core Strategy.

Reasonable Alternative: The defined reasonable alternative would establish a more liberal scope for development within the open countryside, enabling broader forms of development, outside but adjacent to the settlement boundary, subject to adherence to policy criteria to minimise and mitigate as far as possible a development's effect on landscape, the historic environment, infrastructure, flood risk etc. Whilst the policy would benefit the supply of housing and employment land, the policy would adversely affect policies which promote the regeneration of urban land and efficient use of existing land/protection of soil, climate change, and the environment owing to the increase loss of Greenfield land which would be promoted through the policy. Such a policy is also likely to result in over development in contrast to defined requirements, undermining the spatial strategy, and would put existing infrastructure under increased strain. Overall the alternative approach to the policy is not considered sustainable and as such has been rejected by the Council.

A third approach to the open countryside policy could be to adopt a more restrictive approach to development in the open countryside. Such an approach would be akin to a Green Belt policy and as such, given that the open countryside has been assessed as not to justify green belt policy could not be implemented. This third approach is not therefore considered reasonable and as such has not been assessed.

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy constrains the development of housing at inappropriate locations within the Borough with limited scope for development allowed through the policy and rural exceptions policy (LIV9) and secures the spatial pattern of development and achievement of regeneration objectives. The effects of this policy on housing land supply as a whole is mitigated by the wider supply contained within the Local Plan contains policies and allocations and opportunities for windfall development within settlement boundaries which are considered to provide sufficient opportunity for the housing needs of the Borough to be met in full.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period owing to availability of supply elsewhere and potential for limited housing development within the open countryside.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Allocated sites. Windfall development, Reserve Sites.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy would provide a means to enable additional housing land supply to come forward over the plan period. The scale and extent is unclear given that proposals allowed through the policy would be classed as windfall development, and would depend on the potential for land to respond to outlined criteria.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Positive effect during the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The timing, scope and scale of development which might come forward in accordance with policy. The policy may result in investment being taken away from allocated sites meaning they are not developed as envisaged over the plan period. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy constrains the development of employment at inappropriate locations within the Borough with limited scope for development allowed through the policy and rural exceptions policy (LIV9) and secures the spatial pattern of development and achievement of regeneration objectives. The effects of this policy on employment land supply as a whole is mitigated by the wider supply contained within the Local Plan contains policies and allocations and opportunities for windfall development within settlement boundaries which are considered to provide sufficient opportunity for the employment needs of the Borough to be met in full.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period owing to availability of supply elsewhere and potential for limited economic development within the open countryside.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Allocated sites. Windfall development, Reserve Sites.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would provide a means to enable additional employment land supply to come forward over the plan period. The scale and extent is unclear given that proposals allowed through the policy would be classed as windfall development, and would depend on the potential for land to respond to outlined criteria.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect within the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The timing, scope and scale of development which might come forward in accordance with policy. The policy may result in investment being taken away from allocated sites meaning they are not developed as envisaged over the plan period, especially where such sites may be more attractive to the market and responsive to demand than existing supply. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy assists regeneration by resisting most types of development in the open countryside, in turn directing this investment towards the existing urban area helping to support regeneration objectives and help reduce levels of deprivation. The policy prevents any large scale growth which would undermine or prejudice this spatial focus towards the redevelopment of the urban area. The policy supports rural diversification and sustainability of the countryside in Pendle where proposals are considered suitable, and works with LIV11 in permitting small scale affordable housing as an exception where consistent with policy and justified.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short-Medium-Long term significant positives at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Allocated sites and sites within development boundaries come forward as necessary through the plan period. Proposals for development within the open countryside are consistent with the policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Allocated sites stall or fail to come forward resulting in pressure to develop land within the open countryside. Medium risk.</p> | -- | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would direct investment to greenfield sites located on the edge of the built up area which are likely to be more attractive and less costly to develop in comparison to brownfield sites. This could adversely affect regeneration objectives and plans to tackle social deprivation by channelling this investment elsewhere. Sites on the edge of built up areas tend to be less accessible by public transport, cycling, and foot to existing services and facilities, sources of employment and shops, with sites being less sustainable as a result. Such sites may however support rural vitality and vibrancy by introducing new population to an area to support existing service provision and rural businesses however equally, development may be harmful to service quality due to increased pressure on capacity.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short to medium significant negative effects, reducing to negative effects in the longer term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Developer contributions and site proposals may delivery improvements in local infrastructure and accessibility which would also benefit existing residents.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>Sites on the edge of built-up areas are generally less accessible and further away from key services, facilities, shops and sources of employment.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale, extent and type of development which might come forward under such a policy and the timing of its delivery. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to protect the open countryside from inappropriate development safeguarding it as an open and tranquil natural resource for the health and wellbeing residents of the Borough. The policy permits limited forms of development where consistent with its location in the open countryside which supports the rural economy and assists regeneration objectives by limiting the forms of development allowed in the countryside directing this investment to within settlement boundaries. This may include proposals beneficial to local health and wellbeing.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium, and long term benefits at least for the duration of the plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Planned development fails to come forward resulting in pressure to develop land within the open countryside. Low-medium risk.</p> | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Sites on the edge of existing settlement would be closely served and be accessible to recreational opportunities located within the open countryside. Sites may however be inaccessible by foot or bicycle broader existing facilities such as parks and leisure centres. The development of greenfield land could adversely affect the health and wellbeing of existing residents owing to impact on residential amenity or reducing/severing links to the open countryside. New developments could provide for enhanced links or recreational facilities for the benefit of all.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Effects of development likely to be harmful in the short to medium term. Longer term effects will vary depending on the natural, scale and type of development proposed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation could be dealt with via planning obligations / conditions or s106 contributions in policy SUP 8.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The enhanced viability of development outside of settlement boundaries could provide greater scope for developer contributions and benefits to the wider community.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects will vary from site to site.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Areas of the open countryside are typically not as well served in terms of infrastructure, services, and access to employment as urban areas. The policy assists sustainable development by prevent inappropriate forms of development in the open countryside, helping to direct this to the urban area in accordance with the spatial strategy and provide for a coordinated approach between the location and amount of development and the provision of infrastructure. Limited forms of development are however permitted in the open countryside where this will support the sustainability of rural areas where justified and consistent with policy requirements.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short-medium-long term benefits across the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Developer contributions sought as necessary in accordance with Policy SDP8 through the development management process.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>There are suitable and accessible sites located within in Urban Areas which are available and deliverable for development. There is capacity in services and infrastructure to support further development in urban areas. Proposals for development within the open countryside are consistent with the policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Planned development fails to come forward resulting in pressure to develop land within the open countryside. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would encourage/allow development to take place outside of settlements, which are likely to be less accessible by public transport and existing services and facilities then sites located within settlement boundaries. The policy would encourage development which contradicts the spatial strategy, and lead to pressure on existing services which may not have the capacity for development. Investment in places outside settlements may undermine service quality and infrastructure provision within settlements, and undermine/prejudice the development of allocated sites with spare capacity in existing infrastructure taken by unplanned development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short to medium negative effects. Longer term effects may reduce to neutral depending on technology changes, future growth and changing patterns of behaviour.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation is dealt with via planning obligations / conditions or s106 contributions in policy SUP 8.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale, type and location of development relative to existing services and infrastructure. Technology changes and likelihood of a modal shift. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy resists most forms of development in the open countryside, in turn directing this investment to existing urban areas supporting the sustainable redevelopment of previously development sites encouraging their renewal and turn protecting undeveloped soils from loss. The primary purpose of this policy is to maintain and enhance the open countryside which would have associated conservation and enhancement of soils.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant benefits from adoption for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Soil quality is highest in rural areas.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Planned development fails to come forward resulting in pressure to develop land within the open countryside. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would allow development outside of settlements discouraging the reinvestment and redevelopment of existing buildings and land. This would result in the loss of land in agricultural use, including soils of higher quality to permanent forms of development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent negative effects from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Density increases would limit the loss of undeveloped land.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties.</u></p> <p>Soil quality varies within the district with large tracts of undeveloped land not considered to be BMV. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Existing watercourses within the open countryside would be protected from inappropriate/polluting forms of development. Equally, the concentration of development in urban areas may adversely affect water quality and resources in these areas if not sufficiently controlled. No objection has thus far been received regarding capacity levels of water infrastructure from statutory providers though longer term projections show a shortage of water capacity, though longer term sensitivity in overall capacity is identified. Engagement will continue through the plan preparation process and post adoption through the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects in the short to medium term, becoming uncertain in the longer term depending on effects of climate change and the capacity of infrastructure available.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of water efficiency standards through development which recycle and minimise the amount of water used.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>There is adequate water infrastructure to support planned growth.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Further engagement with the Environment Agency, United Utilities and Yorkshire Water will be necessary regarding proposed allocated sites and the potential impact these would have on supply, infrastructure and water quality. Changing development needs result in pressure for further development beyond those planned through the Local Plan. Climate change puts water resources under pressure. Medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would enable the development of greenfield land outside of settlement boundaries which may be important for water quality and resources. Policy requirements ensuring that development does not adversely affect such resources would ensure a neutral affect for this objective. The policy would however would afford the opportunity for additional development above and beyond that planned for and envisaged through the local plan placing water resources under pressure. A minor adverse effect is therefore assessed.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent negative effect from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Water resource infrastructure may be secured through a development to limit and minimise this impact.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate Change and the effect this has on the supply of water. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy resists inappropriate forms of development in the open countryside and in turn protected undeveloped greenfield land from development helping to safeguard existing drainage basins. Such land is important in minimising flood risk in the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely positive effects from adoption across the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Third party initiatives to enhance flood risk storage within river basins/catchment areas to slow surface water drainage and enhance river capacity.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change increases severity and frequency of extreme weather events. Climate Change, rural economic activity reduces soil integrity, and alters the capacity of greenfield land to absorb the flow of water. Medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would enable the development of greenfield land outside of settlement boundaries. This would result in an increase in the amount of developed land within the Borough reducing the amount of greenfield land available to store and reduce runoff.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent adverse effects, though the extent and nature of this adverse effect could be reduced with effective mitigation.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>SuDs. Amount, layout and form of development.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The effects of climate change on extreme weather events and effectiveness and practicality of SuDs measures. Medium risk.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy supports rural diversification and sustainability of the countryside in Pendle. The policy prevents inappropriate development in the open countryside maintaining air quality in this part of the Borough. Development is focussed towards areas which are accessible to services, employment and shops reducing the need to travel.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Sustainability standards in new development such as electric charging points. Measures to encourage access via non-polluting forms of transport.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The means and frequency of access to the open countryside. Changing technology. Changing needs. Changing patterns in behaviour and attitudes to climate change and air quality. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would enable development outside of settlement boundaries where access to sufficient and practical forms of sustainable infrastructure is more limited, and services, facilities, shops and sources of employment are typically further away. Such development would encourage access via car, with adverse effects for air quality across the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short to medium negative effects, potentially reducing in the longer term with changing technology and behaviour patterns.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements. Car sharing. Electric charging facilities. Cycle storage.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Undeveloped sites on the edge of settlements are typically less sustainable than locations within settlement boundaries.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Changes in technology, demand and patterns in behaviour. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy supports rural diversification and sustainability of the countryside in Pendle, this policy supports sustainability issues and has been assessed as having a minor positive effect on this objective. Development is focussed towards areas which are accessible to services, employment and shops reducing the need to travel.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and longer term positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would enable development outside of settlement boundaries where access to sufficient and practical forms of sustainable infrastructure is more limited, and services, facilities, shops and sources of employment are typically further away. Such development would encourage access via car, with adverse effects for greenhouse gas emissions across the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative effects in the short to medium term, reducing towards neutral in the longer term as technology and behaviours adapt.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements. Car sharing. Electric charging facilities. Cycle storage. Greenfield sites may have greater means to adopt renewable technology for energy generation owing to enhanced viability.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Undeveloped sites on the edge of settlements are typically less sustainable than locations within settlement boundaries.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Changes in technology, demand and patterns in behaviour. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy benefits this objective by directing development away from undeveloped mineral safeguarding areas which exist quite extensively outside of established settlements.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy adversely affects this objective by enabling development in the open countryside potentially putting at risk mineral safeguarding areas.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor permanent adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to protect the open countryside from inappropriate forms of development in turn protecting existing habitats, geological features, and green infrastructure from harm which existing within this area. This includes some of the Borough's most extensive and important designated areas and sources of green infrastructure. The assists in directing growth to existing built areas which generally have a lower value/use by wildlife.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely positive effects from adoption of the plan, at least until the end of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Net gain for biodiversity and geodiversity sought through planning applications.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Pressure to develop Greenfield sites should identified allocated sites not come forward as envisaged. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The scope to develop on the edge of built up areas may result in harmful effects for biodiversity, geodiversity and green infrastructure through the loss of greenfield land which may have a role in one or all three. Policy requirements would have require this to be adequately addressed with biodiversity net gains sought and open space contributing to and even enhancing green infrastructure links for the benefit of wildlife and residents alike. The overall effect is assessed as a minor negative owing to the pressure that the loss of greenfield land would have for wildlife due to the loss of an irreplaceable resource.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initially significant adverse effects reducing over time where mitigation measures are implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Provision of habitat areas within open space, landscaping or buildings to deliver net gain for biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Relevance and success of measures provided within developments to mitigate effects of development on wildlife. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy limits the scale and type of development which is permitted in the open countryside. In turn this protects heritage assets located in the open countryside and/or where the open countryside forms part of the heritage asset's significance or setting from harm which could occur from inappropriate forms of development. Heritage assets are found across all parts of the Borough and so the policies restriction to development in the open countryside could place pressure to development sites which are historically sensitive or affect a heritage asset to meet development needs. The policy has uncertain effects on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects depending on the location, scale and form of development proposed and its relationship with the historical environment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design measures, landscaping or use may be used to mitigate any harm on heritage assets. This is to be assessed through the development management process.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The effect of allocated developments on heritage assets has been assessed, accounted for and mitigated for through the site selection process with adequate policy measures put in place.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Permitted Development results in harm to heritage assets. Low-medium risk.</p> | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy broadens the potential for new development to impact on heritage assets in the Borough. Heritage assets exist throughout the Borough, and their significance and relationship to the wider natural and built environment varies. The resulting effects of the policy on this objective is therefore unclear and is dependent on site specific issues.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects depending on the location, scale and form of development proposed and its relationship with the historical environment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design measures, landscaping or use may be used to mitigate any harm on heritage assets. This is to be assessed through the development management process.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale, location, type of development and nature of affected heritage asset. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy affords protection to the open countryside from inappropriate forms of development, in turn conserving the local landscape and sites located on the edge of settlements which are considered important to townscape character which may include conservation areas. Limited development is permitted through the policy, however such development is required to safeguard or enhance the character of the area.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from adoption across the short, medium and into the long term for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design, scale, and location of development. Landscaping, Use of high quality materials.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Pressure to develop Greenfield sites should identified supply not come forward or development targets not be achieved. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would enable development beyond built up boundaries. This may have an adverse effect on the setting and character of a settlement, and result in adverse effects for visual qualities of the local landscape if built form interrupts a previously undeveloped vista.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial significant adverse effects, reducing to between negative and neutral in the longer term with adoption of successful mitigation measures</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Landscaping/boundary treatments, use of materials, scale and massing to reflect the local built environment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Undeveloped land adjacent to settlements plays a role in defining their setting and unique character.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Certain forms, types and scales of development may enhance the built character and result in a neutral effect on local landscapes. Low-medium risk.</p> |

Policy ENV9 Landscape

Summary

Preferred Option: The seeks to ensure that development does not adversely affect landscape quality and important views, and ensure that landscape is adequately taken into account through the design process. The policy will be beneficial to environmental objectives given the protective measures provided for the policy to natural features. For social objectives the impact is mixed, with potential positive effects for health and wellbeing, balanced against potential reduced capacity of sites owing to landscape constraints. Similar uncertainties exist for economic objectives, though it should be noted that for both housing and economic sites, the Council has identified a supply of sites which is in excess of targets and capacity exists within settlement boundaries for further growth.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy reflects the NPPF position regarding landscapes, and ensures that landscape quality is safeguarded for the enjoyment of future residents. It is considered that there is no reasonable alternative to the policy which would be consistent with national planning policy. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The impact of a proposed development is required to be considered, addressed and planned for through this policy ensuring that proposed respond to the local landscape character assessments and integrate into their surroundings. The layout, form, scale, capacity, and type of development which may be permissible on a site may be affected by this policy and as such the amount and diversity of housing supply may be affected. Landscape as a constraint to development has been considered through the site selection process at a high level with suitable mitigation measures set out in site specific policy the impact of the policy will vary depending on site specific circumstances.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral/uncertain effect for the plan period depending on the scale, location and type of development proposed. Possible neutral effects in the longer term with adoption mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting, layout, form, mass of development, materials used, Landscaping. Topographical changes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures outlined in policy to address a development's effect on the landscape can be mitigated in line with policy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Identified sites fail to come forward as envisaged resulting in a pressure to develop land in higher quality landscapes. Development needs change resulting in increased pressure for new development. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The impact of a proposed development is required to be considered, addressed and planned for through this policy ensuring that proposed respond to the local landscape character assessments and integrate into their surroundings. The layout, form, scale, capacity, and type of development which may be permissible on a site may be affected by this policy and as such the amount and diversity of employment supply may be affected. Landscape as a constraint to development has been considered through the site selection process at a high level with suitable mitigation measures set out in site specific policy. The impact of the policy will vary depending on site specific circumstances.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral/uncertain effect for the plan period depending on the scale, location and type of development proposed. Possible neutral effects in the longer term with adoption mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting, layout, form, mass of development, materials used, Landscaping. Topographical changes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures outlined in policy to address a development's effect on the landscape can be mitigated in line with policy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Identified sites fail to come forward as envisaged resulting in a pressure to develop land in higher quality landscapes. Development needs change resulting in increased pressure for new development. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | +/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The impact of a proposed development is required to be considered, addressed and planned for through this policy ensuring that proposed respond to the local landscape character assessments, townscape and integrate into their surroundings. The layout, form, scale, capacity, and type of development which may be permissible on a site may be affected by this policy and as such the amount, location and diversity of development may be affected. Landscape as a constraint is unlikely to affect urban areas, and where significant may direct investment to urban areas. The impact of the policy will vary depending on site specific circumstances.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive/uncertain effect for the plan period. At least neutral effects in the longer term with adoption mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting, layout, form, mass of development, materials used, Landscaping. Topographical changes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures outlined in policy to address a development's effect on the landscape can be mitigated in line with policy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Identified sites fail to come forward as envisaged resulting in a pressure to develop land in higher quality landscapes. Development needs change resulting in increased pressure for new development. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The overriding aim of the policy is to conserve and enhance the existing landscape. Such landscapes may be important to the health and wellbeing for local residents, be it as a resource of recreation, tranquillity, or amenity. The policy aims to secure and where possible enhance these landscapes for the enjoyment of existing and future residents and is therefore beneficial in delivering this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None. Low risk.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no link between the policy regarding landscape quality and this objective. The overall effect is therefore considered to be negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Measures required of the policy to address a proposal's effect on the landscape may impact the developable area/form of development potentially enhancing or adversely affecting the efficient use of land. The implication of this policy on this objective will alter depending on the nature of the proposal and site specific and local circumstances and as such cannot be determined on a district wide basis.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects over the plan period depending on the scale, location and type of development proposed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation measures are set out in policy to set out how a proposal can avoid adverse effects and respond to the qualities of the local landscape.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The location, scale and type of development which may come forward over the plan period. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>In protecting landscape character the policy requires conservation, and where possible, the enhancement of watercourses and water bodies. This is beneficial for protecting water resources and quality where these contribute to landscape quality. The policy is therefore supportive on this objective and as such scores a minor positive effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely positive effects from the medium term, at least for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Areas left free of development. Functioning as open space/net biodiversity areas.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The application of the policy's requirements are feasible and viable.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The degree to which the safeguarding and enhancement of watercourses and waterbodies can be secured through new development. Low risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>In protecting landscape character the policy requires conservation, and where possible, the enhancement of watercourses and water bodies. The policy's position as a starting point should mean no direct adverse consequences to a watercourse and its associated flood risk as a result of a development, however a proposal's impact on wider flood risk will depend on its location, scale, and form, and the potential to incorporate measures to alleviate flood risk. Nevertheless a positive effect is identified.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely positive effects from the medium term, at least for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Areas left free of development. Functioning as open space/net biodiversity areas.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The application of the policy's requirements are feasible and viable</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The degree to which the safeguarding and enhancement of watercourses and waterbodies can be secured through new development. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Measures put in place within developments to address landscape issues, requiring a greening of the site and redistribution of development may have localised effects on air quality however is unlikely to affect overall development proposals and associated air quality affects. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects from the medium term, at least for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Areas left free of development. Functioning as open space/net biodiversity areas. Changes in density and layout.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The application of the policy's requirements are feasible and viable</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The extent of design measures undertaken to address landscape and the impact these have on air quality. Low risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The protection and enhancement sought by the policy to environmental features such as trees, hedgerows, and woodland will aid efforts to adapt, slow and reverse the effects of climate change, with trees known absorbers of carbon. The policy is therefore measured to result in a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely positive effects from the medium term, at least for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Areas left free of development. Functioning as open space/net biodiversity areas. New planting</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The application of the policy's requirements are feasible and viable</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The rate of change and effects of Climate Change. Medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The protection afforded by the policy to landscape quality and character is also by proxy likely to protect areas of mineral deposits and natural resources from loss to development which feature quite extensively beyond settlement limits. The overall effect is considered to be a minor positive one.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely positive effects from the short term, at least for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The aim of the policy is to conserve and enhance the existing landscape which would have benefits for biodiversity and geodiversity. This may include restoring habitats and/or the maintenance and management of existing habitats to the benefit of wildlife and safeguarding those features most important to biodiversity, geodiversity and Green Infrastructure, consistent with the Green Infrastructure strategy. The policy requires developers to consciously consider and plan for environmental features in their developments. The overall effect of the policy is considered to result in considerable benefits for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely significant positive effects from the medium term, at least for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Features providing for net gain for biodiversity. Appropriate use of land. Open space and natural green space.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Natural features within a site also fulfil an important function for wildlife.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Natural features provided through developments are well maintained, are appropriate for local wildlife and used by wildlife consistent with its intended use. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The aim of the policy is to conserve and enhance the existing landscape including landscape features of cultural, historic and heritage value. The application of this to development proposals will safeguard and where possible enhance the Borough's heritage assets, leading to improvements in the quality of the environment in landscapes where historic assets are sited. The policy is assessed as having a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely positive effects from the medium term, at least for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Scale and location of development, layout, materials, landscaping, open space, and proximity of and relationship to constraints</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Assumed that measures to address landscape effects also benefit the historic environment.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The aim of the policy is to conserve and enhance the existing landscape, inclusive of townscapes. The policy achieves this beyond ensuring that the design and layout of a development is responsive to the local landscape and that negative effects are suitably mitigated. The policy requires a broad range of issues to be taken into account and conserve through the development process, this includes natural features, settlement identity, rural-urban transitions, skylines and topography, historic landscapes, views, and tranquillity. The policy is considered to have a significant positive effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely significant positive effects from the medium term, at least for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Scale and location of development, layout, materials, landscaping, open space</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures implemented through new developments to address the impact on landscapes are maintained and deliver the intended effect.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Pressure for greenfield development as a result of changing in need and/or under supply. Low-medium risk.</p> |

Policy ENV10 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

Summary

Preferred Option: The seeks to protect the intrinsic beauty, landscape quality, cultural and wildlife importance of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty permitting only limited forms of high calibre and quality development. The policy has significant benefits for environmental objectives especially those relating to landscape, green infrastructure, biodiversity, and the historic environment and benefits for air quality and climate change. The policy is also beneficial for social objectives relating to health and wellbeing. It will support the local economy by preserving the distinctiveness and quality of a key local natural asset of the Borough important for tourism. It is supportive of infrastructure objectives by ensuring that development does not result in over development in areas where infrastructure has less capacity. The policy performs neutrally for objectives to promote housing delivery with sufficient sites and opportunity identified outside the AONB to meet identified needs. Whilst the policy has positive effects for this objective by safeguarding the AONB from inappropriate forms of development, the benefits of the policy for tourism could attract increased visitor numbers to the AONB resulting in greater pressure for the environment from increased visits.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy reflects the NPPF position regarding the AONB and development within the AONB. As a result it is not considered that there is any reasonable policy alternative to the preferred option. No reasonable alternative is therefore assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Forest of Bowland AONB occupies the largely rural area surrounding Pendle Hill in the west of the Borough. The Spatial Strategy expects little to no development in this area, with any development small in scale and justified by robust evidence illustrating needs. The AONB and restrictive approach to development within this area does not undermine broader objectives to meet the diverse housing needs of the population, with sufficient allocated sites identified in the Local Plan in locations which do not effect this designation. Large scale growth in this area is not appropriate and nor would it be effective in responding to the housing needs of the population. Rural exceptions within the AONB will be permitted where consistent with policy ensuring that local housing needs can be accommodated should they come forward.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>New homes in the AONB will be expected to be of highest quality and respond to and safeguard the local character, quality of the landscape, and cultural heritage of the local area.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale of housing need within the AONB may be greater than permitted in policy. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Forest of Bowland AONB occupies the largely rural area surrounding Pendle Hill in the west of the Borough. The Spatial Strategy expects little to no development in this area, with any development small in scale and justified by robust evidence illustrating needs. The AONB and restrictive approach to development within this area does not undermine broader objectives to meet the employment land needs of the population, with sufficient allocated sites identified in the Local Plan in locations which do not effect this designation. Large scale growth in this area is not appropriate and nor would it be effective in responding to the housing needs of the population. The policy confirms the types of small scale growth which may be permissible in the AONB to support the rural economy. The policy also safeguards the AONB which provides for a distinctive landscape important to the image and attractiveness of the Borough as a place to visit and invest in.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>New premises and/or conversion of existing buildings will be expected to be of the highest quality and respond to and safeguard the local character, quality of the landscape, and cultural heritage of the local area</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Activities take place which place the AONB under pressure. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Whilst the policy aims to safeguard the special qualities of the AONB, where suitable and where criteria have been met, development which promotes vibrant communities may be permitted. This includes development for agriculture and horticulture, residential conversions/exception sites, and sustainable tourism encouraging redevelopment and reuse of existing buildings.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>will be expected to be of the highest quality and respond to and safeguard the local character, quality of the landscape, and cultural heritage of the local area.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Forest of Bowland AONB is used regularly by residents and tourists as a valuable source of recreation and tranquillity, and makes a positive contribution to the identity of the Borough. The associated benefits to maintaining the overriding qualities of the AONB as sought through this policy will have consequential benefits for the health and wellbeing of residents in Pendle and further afield by encouraging sustainable recreation.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>New developments will be expected to be of the highest quality and respond to and safeguard the local character, quality of the landscape, and cultural heritage of the local area</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes small scale sustainable development within the AONB which will help sustain rural communities and businesses. The investment brought by such development will be important in ensuring that residents local to the AONB do not have to travel or leave to access daily essential services, sources of employment and suitable housing. This is important not only to the social and economic success of this area, but to also promote sustainable travel in rural areas.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Measures to encourage the use of non-car modes for developments may be sought through Planning Contributions.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Developments provide benefits to the local community and businesses.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>A modal shift cannot be forced. Jobs provided in the AONB may not be taken up by residents of the AONB. Existing housing stock in the AONB may be bought by people with no connection to the area/used as holiday homes/second homes. Existing services and facilities may reduce in quality/capacity/completely close due to the lack of funding. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the most suitable and sensitive use of land within the AONB including the promotion of re-use/conversion of existing buildings. This safeguards the loss of land within the AONB to inappropriate forms of development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy by its implementation will help safeguard water quality and resources which are to be found within the AONB from inappropriate forms of development. The AONB in Pendle forms an important catchment for watercourses draining into the Calder Valley to the South, and Ribble Valley to the North contributing to the quality and supply of these catchments.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Limited forms and types of developments are permissible in the AONB. Design requirements and sustainable build standards to be implemented.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of climate change on supply of water. Medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The restrictive nature of this policy to a wide range of forms of development acts to safeguard important and undeveloped areas which perform an important function in reducing flood risk providing significant areas of water storage.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Proposals to be design and developed in accordance with ENV7</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change effects functionality and capacity of drainage basins. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy supports rural diversification and sustainability of the countryside in Pendle, this could result in minor benefits to air quality as local residents become less reliant on polluting modes of transport to access local services and sources of employment. Benefits to air quality are likely to be daily use. The impact on development on this objective will depend on the scale, form, type, and location of development. A minor positive effect is assessed overall.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Measures to promote sustainable travel through new development secured by planning condition/obligation</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>N/a.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Changes in technology/behaviours/attitudes may influence significantly air quality over the plan period. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy supports rural diversification and opportunities for sustainable growth within the AONB important to secure the longevity of the area as a place to live, work and play sustainably in. It also seeks to protect the AONB which is an important natural environment. Benefits to reducing greenhouse gases are likely to be daily use. Overall a positive effect is assessed owing to the protection afforded to a large natural resource.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Sustainable build standards, efficiency in the use of resources, measures to promote sustainable travel.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>N/a.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Changes in technology/behaviours/attitudes may influence significantly efforts to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and our adaptiveness to climate change. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy protects the AONB for inappropriate forms of development and as such also protects mineral safeguarding and natural resources found within. The policy is assessed as having a minor positive impact.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The aim of the policy is to protect the landscape and cultural qualities of the AONB from inappropriate forms of development. The AONB is not just an asset for tourism and recreation but also acts as an important habitat for wildlife and is integral to the Borough's Green Infrastructure network. The protection of the AONB against inappropriate development which is afforded by this policy will therefore result in benefits to biodiversity, geodiversity and the Borough's Green Infrastructure Network and will contribute to the implementation of the AONB Management Plan.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term significant benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Net gain for biodiversity secured through new development</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Development is of an appropriate type and scale to deliver improvements for biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate Change and use of the AONB for recreation undermines efforts to conserve the local landscape and reduces the benefits this has for wildlife. Low to medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy aims to secure the cultural qualities of the AONB which is exhibited by its built and natural environment. This includes the AONB's historic environment. Proposals within the AONB will be expected to respond to and avoid harm to the historic environment especially where this harm would threaten the cultural heritage of the AONB. This will help support the delivery and implementation of the AONB Management Plan.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term significant benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>High quality design, landscaping, use of local materials, small scale development</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Policy aims to safeguard and enhance the special landscape qualities of the AONB. Within the AONB are the defined rural villages of Barley, Newchurch in Pendle, Roughlee and Spen brook. The special character, cultural and historic character of these settlements will be protected and enhanced through the application of this policy contributing the achievement of the objectives of the AONB Management Plan.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term significant benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>High quality design, landscaping, use of local materials, small scale development</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy ENV11 Green Belt

Summary

Preferred Option: The seeks to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate forms of development, deferring to the national planning policy position for proposals for development within designated Green Belt areas. This benefits environmental and social objectives by safeguarding open land and preventing urban sprawl within the Borough. The policy has a minor adverse impact for the delivery of housing and employment however there is sufficient land outside of Green Belt areas to meet identified needs. The policy is supportive of regeneration objectives for the Borough, ensuring an efficient use of land, and to support the implementation of the adopted Core Strategy.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy reflects the NPPF position regarding the protection afforded to the Green Belt from inappropriate forms of development. To inform the preparation of the Part 2 Local Plan, and in response to the scope set for the Part 2 Local Plan by the Core Strategy, a Green Belt review has been prepared. This Green Belt review confirms that areas within the Borough designated as Green Belt continue to reflect the essential characteristics of green belt and fulfil one or more of the five purposes of the Green Belt. No amendments are proposed to the Green Belt in response to this evidence and/or because of the presence of exceptional circumstance. The Council therefore regard the Green Belt as defined to remain relevant, up-to-date, and consistent with national planning policy and as such there is no reasonable alternative to the proposed policy approach of the preferred option. No reasonable alternative is therefore tested.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Green Belt in Pendle is drawn tightly around the settlement boundaries of several of the Borough's sustainable settlements including Barrowford, Colne, and Fence. This serves to constrain the expansion of these settlements reducing the scale and type of development which might come forward at these locations. As a result a minor negative effect is assessed for this policy. This is moderated and mitigated by the assessment of housing land supply which has confirmed that housing needs of the Borough (inclusive of settlements within the Green Belt) can be accommodated without releasing land from the Green Belt. In line with National Planning Policy in relation to Green Belt some limited forms of development may take place within this designation where the type of development is considered to meet the exemptions list of Paragraph 145. This scope could enable limited housing in response to localised housing needs of locations within the Green Belt.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative effect for the plan period and beyond, moderating with opportunity to meet housing need outside of this area within the Borough.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Type of development, scale, layout, form and massing. Use of materials, open space and landscaping. Availability of suitable land for housing outside of the designated Green Belt.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Allocated sites come forward for development as envisaged over the plan period. There is sufficient scope for development in non-green belt parts of the Borough.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The need for housing alters during the plan period. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Green Belt in Pendle is drawn tightly around the settlement boundaries of several of the Borough's sustainable settlements including Barrowford, Colne, and Fence. This serves to constrain the expansion of these settlements reducing the scale and type of development which might come forward at these locations. As a result a minor negative effect is assessed for this policy. This is moderated and mitigated by the assessment of employment land supply which has confirmed that employment land needs of the Borough (inclusive of settlements within the Green Belt) can be accommodated without releasing land from the Green Belt. In line with National Planning Policy in relation to Green Belt some limited forms of development may take place within this designation where the type of development is considered to meet the exemptions list of Paragraph 145. This scope could enable limited provision in response to localised employment needs of locations within the Green Belt.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative effect for the plan period and beyond, moderating with opportunity to meet employment land needs outside of this area within the Borough.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Type of development, scale, layout, form and massing. Use of materials, open space and landscaping. Availability of suitable land for employment beyond the designated Green Belt.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Allocated sites come forward for development as envisaged over the plan period. There is sufficient scope for development in non-green belt parts of the Borough.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The need for employment alters during the plan period. Low risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Green Belt in Pendle strongly fulfils this function (purpose 5) to encourage the regeneration of previously developed land. This is achieved by redirecting investment to the urban area particularly the urbanised areas of the M65 corridor, promoting the sustainability of existing settlements, and helping to tackle deprivation. The Green Belt promotes the vitality of rural communities. Safeguarding the character, value, and lifestyle of these communities. Settlements which do not display the purposes of the Green Belt have been taken out of the Green Belt, with new development generally supported in principle. Settlements "washed over" by Green Belt may experience limited growth where consistent with Paragraph 145 of the NPPF.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects in the medium and longer term and beyond as investment is channelled to urban areas.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Opportunities for regeneration come forward with available funding where needed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability of development is a significant uncertainty in urban parts of the Borough. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The green belt provides residents and visitors opportunity for exercise and activity space linked with the outdoor environment. A key aim of national green belt policy, as supported by ENV11, is to make suitable use of the Green Belt for recreational activity, for the benefit of residents. The designation of Green Belt and implementation of ENV11 will therefore have significant benefits for health and wellbeing objectives.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects for the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The Green Belt is accessible as a recreational resource, and includes facilities within which are available and/or made available during the plan period</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages development within existing urban areas which generally are better served by existing services, facilities, sources of employment, and public transport. This will reduce the need to travel, and the emphasis on car travel. This aligns to the spatial strategy of the Core Strategy which requires around 70% of growth to take place at the M65 corridor with investment in infrastructure (as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) directed accordingly.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Benefits for the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions/contributions, Travel Plan measures, investment in local cycling, footpath and public transport infrastructure. Mixed use development.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sufficient capacity exists/can be made to exist within urban areas to accommodate additional growth sustainably.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Funding for infrastructure/service enhancement. Low viability of development within urban areas. Reality of a modal shift and changing attitudes and patterns of behaviour. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the reuse and redevelopment of land and existing buildings within urban areas. The policy serves to protect land within the Green Belt from development which may include higher quality soils.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects for the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>There is an appetite to develop land within the urban area.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Market demand and need means urban sites are unsuitable. Viability changes. Allocated sites fail to deliver. Medium risk.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The protection afforded to green belt land from development will also help to safeguard existing water quality and resources within these areas from potentially polluting/compromising developments. However, directing growth towards urban areas may put additional strain on water quality and resources in urban areas. The EA, and water companies made no objection to the spatial strategy which forms of the basis of this plan although longer term resources constraints are identified. All parties will be consulted on site specific proposals which will consider the effects on water quality and resources through DTC. Ultimately the effect on water quality and resources will be development specific and will need to be assessed at the planning application stage. The overall affect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Balanced neutral effect over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Existing water quality and resources in Green Belt areas are good.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change may affect water quality and resources in areas within the Green Belt. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The protection of openness applied by the policy to areas within the Green Belt will also ensure that areas important to mitigating and reducing flood risk remain free from development maintaining greenfield run-off rates. The policy works with ENV7 which requires the adoption of SuDs measures within urban areas achieving a reduced runoff rate. Collectively the policies work to reduce flood risk and enhancing flood water storage within river catchments.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and longer term strengthened with the adoption of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Application of SuDs in new developments. Third party enhancements to flood storage and slowing the flow of water to watercourses.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>SuDs measures are feasible and viable through new development</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The effects on climate change on extreme weather events and eroding effects on the landscape affecting storage capacity. Medium risk.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The limited forms of development permitted within the Green Belt will help safeguard the high levels of air quality experienced in these parts of the Borough. The policy also aids to direct development towards the urban areas reducing the need/length of trips by car, with urban areas generally more sustainable owing to the mix of uses, availability of employment, and accessibility of essential and every day services and facilities. The concentration of development to these areas may also result in adverse effects on localised corridors (i.e. at identified AQMAs) due to increased levels of activities.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Measures to encourage a modal shift. Sites being accessible to existing shops, services, and sources of employment. Enhancements to walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure. Cycle storage, travel vouchers. Electric charging points.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Assumed that mitigation measures are feasible, viable, and are implemented through new developments.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Behaviour and attitude of residents. Societal shifts, and changes in working practices. Technological shifts. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy helps to direct development towards the urban area which are generally more sustainable owing to the mix of uses, availability of employment, and accessibility of essential and every day services and facilities helping to reduce the reliance on pollution modes of transport to travel. The concentration of development to these areas may also result in adverse effects on localised areas due to increased levels of activities.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Benefits for the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Measures to encourage a modal shift. Sites being accessible to existing shops, services, and sources of employment. Enhancements to walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure. Cycle storage, travel vouchers. Electric charging points. Sustainable build and material standards. Implementation of renewable energy in new developments.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Assumed that mitigation measures are feasible, viable, and are implemented through new developments. It is also assumed that development comes forward in sustainable locations within non-green belt areas.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Behaviour and attitude of residents. Societal shifts, and changes in working practices. Technological shifts. Pressure to develop the Green Belt should needs not be met. Low-medium risks.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy protects minerals and natural resources from development which are located in the Green Belt. At the same time however, this designation redirects and adds pressure to develop in areas outside the Green Belt which may also have minerals and natural resources located within them. The overall effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The green belt within the borough contains within it various designated biological and geological sites including Local Nature Reserves (LNR), Biological Heritage Sites (BHS) and Local Natural Importance (LNI). The Green Belt functions as an important part of the Borough's Green Infrastructure, enabling easy access to open space and sources of recreation for large parts of the Borough's main urban area and provides an important policy tool in maintaining the separation of urban areas and protecting the open countryside from urban sprawl. The application of Green Belt policy will serve to safeguard these areas from inappropriate forms of development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits extending through and beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Pressure for development within the Green Belt. Effects of climate change on ecological and geological designations. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will assist in protecting the Borough's historic assets which are located within the Green Belt by reducing significantly the form of development which may be permitted which could affect the significance of the asset. The heritage assets of the Borough however exist outside of green belt areas where development is to be focussed. The result may be an increased pressure for development in these parts of the Borough with potential effects for heritage assets located in these areas.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the Plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Site specific mitigation measures relating to design, type and scale.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Small scaled development may have more limited effects on heritage assets than larger scaled development</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy helps to safeguard landscape character and townscapes by maintaining the openness of the Green Belt, preventing the coalescence of settlements, assist in safeguarding the open countryside from encroachment and to prevent the urban sprawl of large built up areas. The Green Belt in Pendle has been assessed for its functionality against the five purposes of the Green Belt as defined in Paragraph 134 of the NPPF. This evidence (the Pendle Green Belt Study 2017) illustrates that the Green Belt maintains this functionality and no major changes to Green Belt boundaries are proposed as a result.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Long term significant benefits extending throughout the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Building design, detailing, materials, landscaping, form, scale</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy ENV12 Green Infrastructure

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy seeks to protect, enhance and where possible extend the green infrastructure assets of the Borough and is responsive to Green infrastructure evidence. This is secured by requiring development proposals to have special regard to and consideration of existing green infrastructure assets in the Borough to secure their protection and longevity, and how linkages could be created through development proposals to enhance this network. The policy has significant positive effects for environmental objectives including landscape, biodiversity, and climate change and flood risk. There are also positive effects for social objectives relating to recreation, health and wellbeing. The policy has a neutral effect for economic and objectives to increase the supply of housing to meet housing needs owing to the fact that there is a sufficient supply of housing land identified to meet identified requirements.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy enables the green infrastructure assets of the Borough to be protected and enhanced in response to evidence produced by locally and on a county wide basis. The Council does not consider that there is a practical alternative means of securing this response. No reasonable alternative is assessed for this policy.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is not intended to constrain the supply of housing. Seeking to identify, protect and enhance green infrastructure in the Borough. The site selection process has identified a sufficient supply of housing land to meet housing needs without requiring areas identified as part of the Green Infrastructure network for development. The policy therefore has a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Allocated sites and sites within settlement boundaries come forward in sufficient numbers to meet identified needs.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Identified sites stall or deliver at a slower rate. The need for housing increases during the plan period. Low risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is not intended to constrain the supply of employment land. Seeking to identify, protect and enhance green infrastructure in the Borough. The site selection process has identified a sufficient supply of employment land to meet needs without requiring areas identified as part of the Green Infrastructure network for development. The policy therefore has a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Allocated sites and sites within settlement boundaries come forward in sufficient numbers to meet identified needs</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Identified sites stall or deliver at a slower rate. The need for employment land increases/changes during the plan period requiring additional/alternative sites. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The maintenance and enhancement of Green Infrastructure within the Borough will assist in promoting urban regeneration by providing for enhanced quality of the environment, helping to tackle deprivation by providing access to recreation and green environments, and promote sustainable living, by enhancing access to local sources of leisure and green environments.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The policy will deliver permanent positive effects for this objective at least for the medium term which will be tangible at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Green Infrastructure enhancements are feasible, and deliverable in access of local communities</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability. Medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Pendle Green Infrastructure Strategy sets out how green infrastructure investment could, going forwards, improve the borough's green infrastructure (GI). This policy seeks to secure the implementation of this strategy, In turn providing a more extensive GI network with greater quality and accessibility. This is important to develop and enhance the health and wellbeing of the residents of Pendle which is evidenced in some communities to be poor.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Long term benefits in securing maintenance, protection and extension of green infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Green Infrastructure enhancements are feasible and accessible to the wider community</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy may have positive effects for the objective by improving access to green infrastructure for residents in Pendle reducing the need to travel for recreation.</p> <p><u>Trend</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would help safeguard areas of existing Green Infrastructure (including soils) from inappropriate and destructive forms of development. The policy may provide for greener developments, with the layout and form of development arranged to provide more enhance links through and connecting to a development site ensuring that land more effectively responds to the needs of the nature and recreation needs of residents. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be minor positive.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The need for and implication of green infrastructure within developments will vary depending on their scale, type and location. Low risk.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Network can include water corridors which will be protected and enhanced through the implementation of this policy (specifically through part c). The policy therefore aids the conservation and enhancement of water quality and resources within the Borough and at new developments. The policy is assessed as having a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the short, medium and long term, though open to external influences.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Determined on a site by site basis</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Enhancements are achievable within the scope of a development. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The safeguards provided to the Borough's Green Infrastructure Network will have additional benefits in reducing the risk of flooding and mitigating the effects of climate change. The Green Infrastructure Network holds dual functionality in also serving to assist in reducing flood risk with natural flood water storage and features to reduce run-off rates. The policy aims to safeguard these and enhance these through new developments, creating links between existing green infrastructure where feasible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely positive effects over the short, medium and long term for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Implementation of SuDs measures to address flood risk and surface water flooding which may form part of the Green Infrastructure network</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Green Infrastructure enhancements are feasible through a new development</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Lack of maintenance to SuDs may reduce flood risk mitigation. Climate Change will increase the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Climate change may also adversely affect the quality of the Green Infrastructure network. Medium risk.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The safeguarding and enhancement of the Borough's Green Infrastructure network is important to maintaining corridors of cleaner air which are especially beneficial where they traverse urban areas enhancing the wellbeing and health of existing communities.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term benefits as Green Infrastructure becomes established.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Opportunities exist to connect green infrastructure networks within and nearby urban areas</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change, changing technology, changing behaviour patterns. Medium risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Green Infrastructure policy acts to safeguard and enhance natural features within the Borough will help to reverse the effects of climate change and minimise the impact of extreme weather events associated with climate change on communities and businesses within Pendle.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term benefits as Green Infrastructure becomes established.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Existing Green Infrastructure is in a good condition and there is scope and it is feasible for this to be maintained and enhanced.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of climate change on Green Infrastructure and the role this has in moderating its affects. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Green infrastructure may to a limited extent include mineral safeguarding areas. The maintained and enhancement of these corridors could serve to protect natural resources located in these corridors. At the same time their protection could lead to pressure to develop elsewhere which may equally hold value for natural resources. The overall effect of the policy on this objective is considered to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects balancing over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>An important role and outcome of the Pendle Green Infrastructure Strategy and this policy is the enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity. The implementation of this policy which aims to safeguard, enhance and develop the Green Infrastructure network of Pendle will also result in significant benefits for local wildlife which also use these networks.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term significant positive effects. Immediate benefits from directing development, and longer term benefits through securing the maintenance and expansion of green infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Role of green infrastructure for local wildlife and effectiveness of management schemes or schemes for expansion. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Green Infrastructure may form part of the significance or setting of heritage assets within the Borough. The policy requirements for these to be safeguarded and where possible enhanced would also be of benefit to local heritage designations.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>N/a.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures for enhancement would be sensitive to the historical landscape/assets. Enhancement would represent a suitable and desirable response to the nature of the heritage asset.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The relationship of the heritage asset to existing and/or proposed green infrastructure. Low risk.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The maintenance, enhancement, and extension of Pendle's green infrastructure will be beneficial to the conservation and enhancement of landscape character as well as townscape helping to safeguard the natural influences in this environment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term significant effects. Immediate benefits arising from directing development, and long term benefits secured through the maintenance and expansion of green infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Green Infrastructure is managed and maintained in a way that is beneficial to landscape character and townscapes. Low risk.</p> |

Policy ENV13 Natural Environment and Ecological Networks

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy seeks to protect, maintain, and enhance natural habitats and ecological networks, securing a net gain for biodiversity through development proposals (preferably and where possible on site). The policy has significant benefits for environmental objectives particularly in supporting and protecting assets important for wildlife. This also has positive effects for landscape, climate change, limiting pollution, flood risk, and health and wellbeing. There is uncertain effects of the policy for objectives to meet housing and economic needs owing to the impact the implementation of the policy could have on viability depending on location. The impact of the policy requirement on new development will however vary according to the scale, location and condition of the proposals site and form of proposed development, and as such its effect on the deliverability of development is not necessarily geographical in its nature and will vary site to site.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy seeks to secure net gains for biodiversity applying the biodiversity metric. The policy is responsive to the Environment Bill progressing through Parliament and expected to form part of legislation before the Part 2 Local Plan is adopted. The policy therefore future proofs the plan to respond to this expect future legislative requirement of developments and there is no reasonable alternative to the policy proposed. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy aims to secure net biodiversity benefits from new development responsive to the principles of sustainable development. The requirements of the policy may, in some instances, affect the developable area and/or viability of proposals, depending on the extent of biodiversity measures required. This will vary on a site by site basis and be subject to discussions and negotiation between the Council, the applicant, and statutory consultees.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The implication of the policy on the supply of housing land in response to need is uncertain and will depend on site specific condition. This uncertainty is shared in the short, medium and longer term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Where on-site delivery is not possible/not desirable, funding for off-site provision may be sought.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Provision for biodiversity is required and feasible</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent on the effect on the overall supply of housing. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy aims to secure net biodiversity benefits from new development responsive to the principles of sustainable development. The requirements of the policy may, in some instances, affect the developable area and/or viability of proposals, depending on the extent of biodiversity measures required. This will vary on a site by site basis and be subject to discussions and negotiation between the Council, the applicant, and statutory consultees.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The implication of the policy on the supply of employment land in response to need is uncertain and will depend on site specific condition. This uncertainty is shared in the short, medium and longer term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Where on-site delivery is not possible/not desirable, funding for off-site provision may be sought</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Provision for biodiversity is required and feasible</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent on the effect on the overall supply of employment land. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to safeguard and enhance features of biodiversity, with additions sought to the ecological network of the Borough by way of provision or funding from new development. This supports the achievement of net environmental gain which is one of the pillars of sustainable development and could help tackle levels of deprivation by increasing the amount of green environments within urban areas.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the medium and longer term as ecological enhancement measures take effect.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>N/a.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures implemented are relevant to local species and wildlife providing for the most successful results.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Longevity and success of ecological network following establishment. Successful maintenance and integration key to the success of measures taken to address and enhance biodiversity. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Areas provided/enhanced for biodiversity through this policy will also be beneficial to health and wellbeing, providing green, open, and tranquil areas for residents to enjoy helping to address observed health issues in the Borough. These features will also enable residents to be closer to nature which is beneficial to the enjoyment and understanding of natural and the pursuit of hobbies such as bird watching.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium, and longer term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures implemented to enhance biodiversity are also accessible/in close proximity to publically accessible areas</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The value of these areas will vary depending on quality, use by nature, and personal preferences. Low risk.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no link to this objective. The policy is therefore assessed as having a negligible effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to safeguard and enhance biodiversity at development sites. This may include land to be set to meet biodiversity needs, reducing the developable area. Such a requirement does not necessarily mean that the efficient use of land is compromised, rather that land is more appropriately used to meet the needs of wildlife. The policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect measured for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Measures undertaken to enhance biodiversity and ecological networks may assist in conserving and enhancing water quality and resources for example where improvements are provided to water courses for the benefit of wildlife or where habitat features contribute to water quality and water environments. De-culverting watercourses etc. This will however depend on the specific requirements for new habitats and their scale. The policy should not adversely affect this objective. Overall the policy is assessed as having a minor positive effect</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects assessed from the medium term, likely to remain permanent.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Improvement of water courses etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Areas provided to enhance biodiversity and ecological network also often hold dual functionality in enabling enhanced water storage and in providing for a more sustainable development. For example SuDs infrastructure, if maintained, may also provide a suitable habitat for wildlife. The provision of areas for wildlife will also reduce the amount of impermeable surfaces benefiting flood risk, defence and drainage objectives.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects in the short term. Positive effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>A solution to surface water drainage is also suitable for wildlife. Provision is onsite.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will assist air quality by greening developments and creating/contributing to green infrastructure in the Borough, providing areas which break up the urban area and associated pollution. The policy will have a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects in the short term. Positive effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Areas of biodiversity link to green infrastructure creating green or clean air corridors</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will assist efforts to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and counter the effects of climate change by providing habitats and natural areas which are beneficial to the environment, are capable of absorbing CO2 and other emissions and enhance the capacity of the landscape to respond to and withstand the effects of climate change on wider areas</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects in the short term. Positive effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ecological areas could work with landscaped areas and areas set aside to alleviate flood risk to provide a strategic approach to addressing climate change.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The effects of climate change itself and whether warming will continue at predicted rates. Medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requirement is unlikely to require the use of minerals or natural resources and as such is assessed as having a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy significantly contributes towards the encouragement of biodiversity and geodiversity. The policy seeks to safeguard sites and features of ecological value which are important for biodiversity responding to findings of the biodiversity audit, with enhancements provided through biodiversity net gain, ensuring that wildlife activity and opportunities for wildlife are considered and protected through new development. The policy contributes significantly to maintaining and enhancing the baseline ecological position of the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects in the short term, turning positive in the medium term and significantly positive in the longer term as policy measures become established.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>New habitat outside of developable areas, integration with landscaping and green infrastructure, linkages to other existing habitats. Improvement of existing habitats</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Deliverable enhancements are responsive to the needs/requirements of local wildlife.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Management in the longer term and effects of climate change. Medium risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The conservation of irreplaceable habitats, enhancement and greening of others could give rise to benefits for local heritage assets where such habitats form part of the significance and/or setting of that asset. The policy is assessed as having a minor beneficial effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>N/a.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The proposed development itself does not lead to adverse effects for the heritage asset.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>N/a.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The conservation of irreplaceable habitats, enhancement and greening of others could give rise to benefits for local landscapes where such habitats form an integral part of that landscape (for example an ancient woodland or priority habitat) as identified in the Landscape Character Appraisals relevant to the Borough. Biodiversity enhancements provided on or off-site through a new development could also enhance the local landscape and/or townscape where they form a feature which is important or contribute to this character. Overall the policy is assessed as having a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects in the short term. Positive effects in the medium and long term as measures become established.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The proposed development itself does not lead to adverse effects for the landscape and local townscape</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy ENV 14: Local Green Space

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy seeks to protect, maintain, and enhance areas of defined local green space which have been identified as having special value to local communities. The policy has significant positive effects for social and environmental objectives, particularly in promoting health and wellbeing, tackling social deprivation, biodiversity and landscape given the value that maintaining the undeveloped nature of Local Green Spaces has for these policy objectives. A minor negative effect is assessed for objectives to respond to housing and economic needs however it is clear that these needs can be accommodated without requiring land which is defined and designated as local green space.

Reasonable Alternative: A possible alternative to not identify areas of Local Green Space and rely on wording would not be effective given the Green Belt like restrictions which apply for development proposals within designated areas of Local Green Space. The failure to identify such areas would make the policy impossible to implement as intended through the NPPF, and as a result does not form a reasonable alternative. A relaxed version of the policy to protect valued areas of land of use by open space or landscape would be covered by Policy ENV9, ENV12, or ENV15. Such a policy would not therefore be required and does not form a reasonable alternative. No reasonable alternatives have therefore been assessed for this policy.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets significant restrictions akin to Green Belt policy to the amount of development which can take place within any designated area and as such would constrain the development of new housing. Sufficient land and scope for development is however identified/provided elsewhere through other policies of the Local Plan which will minimise this effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse effect softening with allocations and scope for development elsewhere.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Allocated sites. Windfall provision</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>All sites identified for housing come forward as envisaged.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The need for housing alters over the plan period, and/or sites fail to come forward. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets significant restrictions to the amount of development which can take place within any designated area and as such would constrain the development of new employment land. Sufficient land and scope for development is however identified/provided elsewhere through other policies of the Local Plan which will minimise this effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse effect softening with allocations and scope for development elsewhere.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Allocated sites. Windfall provision</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>All sites identified for employment come forward as envisaged and no employment land is lost to other types of development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The need for employment land alters over the plan period, and/or sites fail to come forward. Existing sites lost to other uses. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to safeguard existing areas of Local Green Space which are deemed important to the local community. This ensures that open space key for sustainable living, for recreation use, amenity etc is kept free from inappropriate form of development protecting these areas for use by existing and new residents ensuring no harm caused to communities and deprivation levels as a result of loss of valued open space.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to safeguard existing areas of Local Green Space which are deemed important to the local community. This ensures that open space key for local amenity, recreation, health and wellbeing is kept free from inappropriate form of development protecting these areas for use by existing and new residents securing their accessibility.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to safeguard existing Local Green Space ensuring that the accessibility of the community to amenity areas and places for recreation is maintained and improved over the plan period. The policy is assessed as having a minor positive effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would conserve existing sites designated as Local Green Space safeguarding them from development. Development needs are to be met in full through the Local Plan at identified allocations. The policy would not therefore effect the efficient use of land and is considered to have a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is unlikely to result in any positive or detrimental effects on water quality and resources. The policy retains areas of Local Green Space which may or may not contain water resources and keep these free from inappropriate forms of development. The overall effect of this policy is considered to have a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy Ensures that areas identified as Local Green Space will be kept free from inappropriate forms of development, maintaining their open character and undeveloped nature. The implication of this is to retain areas which are likely to contribute to reducing flood risk and mitigating the effects of climate change. This benefits flood risk capacity in river catchments and reduces the risk of flooding downstream.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The retention of Local Green Space will assist air quality levels by maintaining areas within the Borough and close to the built up area which remain free from development. Local Green Spaces may be accessible to communities and hold a dual use for recreation need. The availability of such spaces close to existing communities reduces the need to travel.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Uses on site are low impact and infrequent.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy maintains uses on site which are low carbon and/or carbon neutral such as access by foot and bicycle. Identified areas of Local Green Space may also be important local areas in serving to mitigate/reduce the effects of climate change where they reduce/absorb greenhouse gas emissions, providing shading or providing storage areas for flood water.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Over usage, mismanagement and climate change may reduce the environmental quality of Local Green Spaces. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy keeps certain areas of land free from development safeguarding any minerals also located within them. The overall effect is assessed as neutral as the policy could direct development to other locations which are also important for minerals.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy contributes to the conservation of biodiversity and geodiversity by retaining areas identified as Local Green Space which may fulfil a dual purpose beneficial for local wildlife. Local Green Spaces also fulfil an important function to the Green Infrastructure of the Borough providing access to greenspaces and natural areas for communities and breaking up the urban areas.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Local Green Space in whole or in part has naturalistic features beneficial to wildlife</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Overuse through uncontrolled recreation activity has adverse effects for wildlife – i.e. trampling, disturbance, noise etc Low risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is likely to assist in the objective of conserving and enhancing the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, where designated Local Green Space is located surrounding, adjacent or in close proximity to a heritage asset and the Local Green Space contributes to this asset. The policy permits very limited forms of development ensuring that heritage assets within or closely related to Local Green Spaces are safeguarded.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The Local Green Space may form part of the significance and/or setting of the heritage asset.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> Local Green Spaces may form part or contribute to local landscape and/or townscape character. The policy seeks to conserve areas of Local Green Space from inappropriate forms of development and as such the policy assists in maintaining landscapes and townscapes in accordance with this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Positive effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Local Green Space contributes positively to local landscape character and townscapes</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Lack of management or maintenance may result in a Local Green Space detracting from the local landscape character or townscape. Low-medium risk.</p> |

Policy ENV 15: Open Space

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy seeks to increase, protect, maintain, and enhance areas of public open space in the Borough to secure sufficient access to quality open space typologies for the Borough's residents and visitors. The policy is responsive to the Pendle Open Space Audit completed in 2018 which assessed the quantity and quality of open space typologies within the Borough updating existing evidence. The policy has considerable benefits for health, wellbeing, and tackling social deprivation, and wider benefits for social and environmental objectives. Neutral effects are assessed for objectives which respond to employment and housing needs given that open space requirements are set out in allocated site policy and have been taken into account at a high level through the site selection process.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy is responsive to evidence prepared in support of the Part 2 Local Plan and seeks to promote and seeks to ensure sufficient and enhanced open space within the Borough over the plan period. Alternatives to adopt only a policy framework for open space would not be effective in protecting existing open space from loss to development. A weaker policy framework would be ineffective in securing open space within new development and fail to respond to findings in evidence of shortfalls in provision. There are no reasonable alternatives to preferred option. No other policy approach has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to secure the necessary open space to support the population in light of local quantitative and qualitative supply. Open Space may add to the attractiveness and value of a development. The extent to which this policy effects the supply of housing will vary site to site and subject to discussion. The requirement for open space on site may reduce the capacity of the Site for development and/or its financial capacity to meet the entire housing needs of the population. A high level consideration of open space needs for sites has been taken into account at the site selection stage. The policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent neutral effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Off-site provision/financial contribution may be sought.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Open Space requirements take up developable land.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Open Space requirements vary by area and by site and the proposals for that site. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Open Space at employment sites can provide for high quality environments which are attractive places to invest and work in. Similarly open space requirements may reduce the developable area reducing the amount of employment space which might be accommodated on a particular site. A high level consideration of open space needs for sites has been taken into account at the site selection stage. The policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent neutral effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Financial contributions may be sought in lieu</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Open space is of high quality and takes up developable land</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Open space requirements vary by area and by site and the proposals for that site. Low risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The provision of open space within developments assists in making a more attractive place to live, invest in, work, and visit. Open space can provide significant enhancements to the quality of an environment, improve safety and reduce social deprivation with better access to recreation important to maintain healthy lifestyles and wellbeing. Developments may make an important contribution in addressing deprivation and support sustainable communities where open space is provided is responsive to identified deficiency in quantity or quality as set out in the Open Space Audit.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term permanent benefit.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Open Space does not undermine development viability. Open Space is well designed, delivered in accordance with policy (and any planning consent) and maintained</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Funding. Usage. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Open space can provide significant enhancements to the quality of an environment, improve safety and reduce social deprivation with better access to recreation important to maintain healthy lifestyles and wellbeing. The Open Space Audit has assessed the level and quality of open space provision across the Borough for all open space typologies. This evidence will be used to determine what open space is provided through new development over the plan period, together with the need for strategic level enhancements (i.e. Sports and Leisure facilities).</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term permanent benefit.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Upgrades to existing open space. Financial contributions</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Open space contributes towards health and wellbeing of residents</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>New open space provision and/or enhanced quality of open space may reduce the need to travel by residents to access recreational facilities (for example if a new playground open, sports pitches etc). This would provide a minor benefit for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term permanent benefit.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>N/a.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>New open space is accessible and available to existing communities</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>How open space facilities are to be maintained and retained for targeted users. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The requirement for open space within a site may affect the developable area and require a larger site. Open Space is however necessary to provide for an attractive and healthy environment, and as such is considered to be an effective use of land. In addition, areas identified for open space (depending on the typology of provision) will help conserve existing soils and keep them free from development. The policy is considered to have a neutral effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The maintenance of open space may use to increased water usage. This however could be countered by the storage and recycling of rainwater on site through the use of water butts and/or ponds/SuDs features.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Droughts may be increasingly common in the future due to the effects of climate change. Medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Providing there are no health and safety implications, areas of open space could function as part of the drainage infrastructure of a development providing surface water basins which store rainwater and help to reduce the runoff rate from the development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term permanent benefits as open space establishes.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Open space provided within a development is also designed specifically to respond to rain events and is adequately maintained</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>There is a blockage undermining the functionality of the drainage system. Climate change events worsen than envisaged. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Open spaces would contribute positively to local air quality, providing areas of clean air that are free from development. Open spaces could also act as buffers between a major road and a development worsening the effects of pollution arising from the major road on new residents/users. New/enhanced open space within an area will help reduce car journeys that would have been made to access alternative provision further afield.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term permanent benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Open Space is sufficiently large to reduce the effects of air pollution at a particular development</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Technology changes over the plan period. Changes to patterns of behaviour. Societal shifts. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Open Space provided may include a variety of vegetation which may assist in alleviating the effects of climate change, provide areas for food production to promote self-sustainability (i.e. allotments), or provide additional drainage capacity to effectively deal with extreme weather events.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term permanent benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The quality and functionality of open space may change over time depending on maintenance, usage and climate change. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Areas within open spaces would no longer be suitable for mineral extraction though not lost to development. A neutral effect is found for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requires contribution towards biodiversity and geodiversity through Policy ENV12</p> <p>Overall, the policy/proposal would create new habitat and link it with existing habitats or significantly improve existing habitats to support local biodiversity and the policy has been assessed as having a minor positive effect on this objective. This is especially the case where open space or contributes to the established green infrastructure network.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term permanent benefits as areas of new open space matures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Areas of informal open space, planting and habitat areas</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sufficient scope is provided within the scale and finance of a development to deliver open space with sufficient benefits for wildlife.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The quality and functionality of open space may change over time depending on maintenance, usage and climate change. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Where heritage assets are affected by a proposed development, quality open space, landscaping, buffer planting etc could be used to mitigate the effects on the significance and setting of the heritage asset. The scope for this and extent of any success with vary on a case by case basis and its successful implementation.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely minor permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The nature of the heritage asset and its significance and the potential for any adverse effect a new development might have through the provision of open space</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Where areas of distinct landscape quality or special townscapes are affected by a proposed development, quality open space, landscaping, buffer planting etc could be used to mitigate these effects. The scope for this and extent of any success with vary on a case by case basis and its successful implementation. This is especially the case where open space or contributes to the established green infrastructure network.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely minor permanent positive effects from the medium term</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The nature of the landscape and townscape which is affected and the potential for any adverse effect a new development might have through the provision of open space</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy ENV 16: Trees and Hedgerows

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy seeks to protect, maintain and increase tree coverage in the Borough over the plan period. This includes the need for applicants to take into account and integrate existing trees into the layout and form of development and secure their protection and maintenance during construction and through operation/continued use. A key part of the policy is the requirement to replace any lost tree twofold to ensure that tree coverage is increased in the Borough. The policy is considered to have benefits for social and environmental objectives, particularly in promoting health, safeguarding landscapes and visual character, protecting and enhancing biodiversity, and mitigating the effects of climate change. The policy is considered to have a likely minor adverse effect on meeting economic and housing needs.

Reasonable Alternative: The tested reasonable alternative is a similar policy where lost trees are replaced one for one instead of securing a net increase in tree coverage. The assessed outcome is reduced benefits for environment and health and wellbeing objectives but the same outcomes for other objectives. Overall the policy approach is considered to have more limited benefits and as a result is not preferred.

| | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | -1? | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect existing trees and hedgerows seeking replacement provision with net provision where loss is unavoidable. The retention of existing trees and greening of sites can contribute significantly to the design quality of a development making it an attractive and healthy place to live. Net tree provision will need to be taken into account through the design process and the extent to which the policy affects developable area will vary from site to site. The requirement for net provision of trees where lost is however assumed to reduce developable areas as a whole. It is however expected that housing needs can be accommodated notwithstanding the requirements of this policy.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Minor adverse effects in the short to medium term as adjustments are made to site capacity and layouts to accommodate the plan requirement.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Avoidance of existing trees as far as possible.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Site specific issues regarding trees can be addressed at the planning application stage</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Extent to which trees affect the development area and type of development which could take place.</p> | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect existing trees and hedgerows seeking replacement provision where loss is unavoidable at a rate of one to one. This will help secure existing tree provision at sites though lost trees will take time to recover. The Site selection process has taken into account constraints to development represented by existing trees/hedgerows. The policy is unlikely to affect the capacity and deliverability of sites allocated for development.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Likely permanent neutral effects.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Avoidance of existing trees as far as possible.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Site specific issues regarding trees can be addressed at the planning application stage</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Extent to which trees affect the development area and type of development which could take place.</p> |

| | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | -1/? | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect existing trees and hedgerows seeking replacement provision with net provision where loss is unavoidable. The retention of existing trees and greening of sites can contribute significantly to the design quality of a development making it an attractive and healthy place to live. Net tree provision will need to be taken into account through the design process and the extent to which the policy affects developable area will vary from site to site. The requirement for net provision of trees where lost is however assumed to reduce developable areas as a whole. It is however expected that housing needs can be accommodated notwithstanding the requirements of this policy.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Minor adverse effects in the short to medium term as adjustments are made to site capacity and layouts to accommodate the plan requirement.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Avoidance of existing trees as far as possible.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Site specific issues regarding trees can be addressed at the planning application stage</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Extent to which trees affect the development area and type of development which could take place.</p> | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect existing trees and hedgerows seeking replacement 1 for 1 where loss is unavoidable. The retention of existing trees and greening of sites can contribute significantly to the design quality of a development making it an attractive and healthy place to work and invest. The Site selection process has taken into account constraints to development represented by existing trees/hedgerows. It is largely expected that employment land needs can be accommodated notwithstanding the requirements of this policy.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Long term neutral effects.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Avoidance of existing trees as far as possible.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Site specific issues regarding trees can be addressed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Extent to which trees affect the development area and type of development which could take place.</p> |

| | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | ++ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The retention, enhancement, replacement of trees as sought through this policy will promote a greening of development important for wildlife, residential amenity, and health and wellbeing. The implementation of the policy supports the achievement of environmental net gain on developments, an important pillar of sustainable development.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Long term significant positive effects.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The retention, enhancement, replacement of trees as sought through this policy will help safeguard trees within development sites which are important for wildlife, residential amenity, and health and wellbeing. The policy is supportive of this policy objective and considered to have a minor positive effect.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Long term positive effects.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Trees and hedgerows provide benefits for health and wellbeing, providing a source of privacy, shade, residential amenity, and introducing wildlife and green environments into development. The Policy therefore fulfils an important role in promote the health and wellbeing of the community in Pendle, seeking to protect, enhance and if necessary replace existing trees and hedgerows with net provision.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Significant positive effects in the long term.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Trees are adequately considered through the design process. Trees are maintained and in a safe condition.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Effects of climate change. Damage from unsociable behaviour. Medium risk.</p> | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Trees and hedgerows provide benefits for health and wellbeing, providing a source of privacy, shade, residential amenity, and introducing wildlife and green environments into development. The Policy therefore helps to assist the health and wellbeing of the community in Pendle, seeking to protect, enhance and replace existing trees and hedgerows where loss is unavoidable.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Positive effects in the long term.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Trees are adequately considered through the design process. Trees are maintained and in a safe condition.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Effects of climate change. Damage from unsociable behaviour. Medium risk.</p> |

| | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ~ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> | ~ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Where trees are lost to development, the requirement for replacement provision net to the amount of trees lost will use up development space potentially requiring a larger site/constraining the development potential of the site.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Minor adverse effect for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The implication of this policy on the efficient use of land will vary depending on site specific circumstances. Medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy requires that trees are considered through the design and layout of the site with any lost trees replaced one for one. The policy should therefore have a neutral effect on this policy objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The implication of this policy on the efficient use of land will vary depending on site specific circumstances. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The increase in tree coverage in the area is likely to be of benefit to water quality and resources.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Minor positive effect in the longer term.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The maintenance of tree coverage in the area supports this objective. A neutral effect is concluded.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Neutral effects in the longer term.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to retain, enhance, and replace existing trees which help contribute to the absorbing and reducing the drainage of surface water, this ensures that run-off rates are maintained preventing worsening flood risk elsewhere as a result of development. Replacement net tree provision may aid a reduction in runoff rates.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Medium to long term benefits.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Climate Change resulting in more frequent and worse extreme weather events. Medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to retain, enhance, and replace existing trees which help contribute to the absorbing and reducing the drainage of surface water, this ensures that run-off rates are maintained preventing worsening flood risk elsewhere as a result of development.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Climate Change resulting in more frequent and worse extreme weather events. Medium risk.</p> |

| | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to secure green environments within developments and urban areas helping to promote better air quality beneficial for the health and wellbeing of existing residents. Positive effects are provided by securing tree provision in new developments and retaining and providing net tree provision in response to those lost.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Medium and long term benefits.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to maintain green environments within developments and urban areas helping to secure air quality beneficial for the health and wellbeing of existing residents. The policy results in a neutral effect for this objective as the status quo for tree provision is maintained.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Seeks to secure green environments within developments and urban areas helping to promote better air quality beneficial and helping to counter/reduce at a local level the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Long term benefits.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Effects of Climate Change on the natural environment, including new and existing trees/hedgerow. Medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Seeks to maintain green environments within developments and urban areas helping to secure air quality beneficial and safeguard the role provided by vegetation within the site to counter/reduce at a local level the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Neutral effects.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Effects of Climate Change on the natural environment, including new and existing trees/hedgerow. Medium risk.</p> |

| | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will assist in conserving and enhancing biodiversity protecting habitats important to local wildlife and resulting in the creation of new habitat to provide net gains for local biodiversity. The policy will also contribute to the maintenance, replenishment, and extension of the Borough's Green Infrastructure network, supporting the implementation of the Pendle Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term significant benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of Climate Change on the natural environment, including new and existing trees/hedgerow. Medium risk.</p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will assist in conserving biodiversity protecting habitats important to local wildlife and resulting in the creation of new habitat to provide net gains for local biodiversity. The policy will also contribute to the maintenance, and replenishment, of the Borough's Green Infrastructure network, supporting the implementation of the Pendle Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of Climate Change on the natural environment, including new and existing trees/hedgerow. Medium risk.</p> |

| | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will help to maintain the historic environment where existing trees and hedgerows contribute to the significant/setting on these assets.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of Climate Change on the natural environment, including new and existing trees/hedgerow. Medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will help to maintain the historic environment where existing trees and hedgerows contribute to the significant/setting on these assets.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of Climate Change on the natural environment, including new and existing trees/hedgerow. Medium risk.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will help to maintain and enhance landscapes and townscapes where existing trees and hedgerows contribute this and new tree coverage would be beneficial to this position. Once mature, and subject to design, new trees and hedgerows will further contribute to this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of Climate Change on the natural environment, including new and existing trees/hedgerow. Medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will help to maintain landscapes and townscapes where existing trees and hedgerows contribute this protecting existing provision or requiring one for one replacement where lost. The policy approach is assessed as having a neutral effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>New trees provided through a development are maintained and achieve maturity</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of Climate Change on the natural environment, including new and existing trees/hedgerow. Medium risk.</p> |

Policy ENV 17: Environmental Protection

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy seeks to amenity, health and wellbeing of occupants, future users and neighbours of development and seek to ensure that development does not adversely affect the environment. The policy scores positively in response to environmental and some social objectives particularly objectives relating to health, wellbeing and deprivation. The policy has a minor negative effect on housing and economic objectives given the limited constraint provided by the policy for the development of some sites. It must however be acknowledged that there is a sufficient allocated supply and scope beyond these to more than meet growth needs for the plan period and beyond.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy seeks to amenity, health and wellbeing of occupants, future users and neighbours of development and seek to ensure that development does not adversely affect the environment, and in this regard is consistent with the requirements of Paragraphs 180 of the 2019 NPPF. As such it is considered that there is no reasonable alternative to the preferred option. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to protect the environments/residents and users from inappropriate forms of development which might result in pollution and/or harm to health and wellbeing. The policy has a potentially constraining effect on development in areas which would be unsuitable in accordance with this policy such as site close to incompatible uses and heavily contaminated sites. The effect of this is limited owing to the availability of land located elsewhere (and allocated through this plan) which more than meets identified targets. The degree and extent to which the policy affects a particular site and its development potential will vary based on site specific circumstances.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects are assessed over the plan period. The implication however for meeting development targets is reduced by scope and availability of land elsewhere to meet needs.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Allocated sites and windfall. Site layout, uses, design features, landscaping etc</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sites are deliverable as envisaged through the plan making process.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Detailed technical evidence reveals constraints issues which are not known or worse than anticipated. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to protect the environments/residents and users from inappropriate forms of development which might result in pollution and/or harm to health and wellbeing. The policy has a potentially constraining effect on development in areas which would be unsuitable in accordance with this policy such as site close to incompatible uses and heavily contaminated sites. The effect of this is limited owing to the availability of land located elsewhere (and allocated through this plan) which more than meets identified targets. The degree and extent to which the policy affects a particular site and its development potential will vary based on site specific circumstances.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects are assessed over the plan period. The implication however for meeting development targets is reduced by scope and availability of land elsewhere to meet needs.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Allocated sites and windfall. Site layout, uses, design features, landscaping etc</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sites are deliverable as envisaged through the plan making process.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Detailed technical evidence reveals constraints issues which are not known or worse than anticipated. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that the development of sites does not result in adverse effects for the environment or health and wellbeing impacts for residents and users. The effects for regeneration are mixed. The implementation of this policy could give rise to increased costs/complexity for applicants proposing to redevelop sites (which is evidenced to be likely in the M65 Corridor). However if implementable will make sites more attractive to end users/buyers/renters. The policy will also help tackle sources of pollution and adverse effects to health and wellbeing which may be prominent in areas suffering from deprivation, attracting wider investment. The policy helps to support sustainable living. Overall it is considered that the policy scores neutrally in relation to this policy objective noting some positive and negative effects.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive and negative effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation. Site design and use.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent of environmental issues on site and the cost/feasibility of addressing these without undermining viability. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The implementation of this policy will protect and enhance the health and wellbeing of residents and businesses of Pendle, addressing sources of pollution and helping to ensure that issues such as noise, odour, and air quality do not worsen and improve.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation. Site design and use.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures implemented through the development are viable and effective.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent of environmental issues on site often unknown until ground works commence. Medium risk.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Measures outlined within the policy aimed at reducing pollution and addressing air quality by requiring development to be sustainably located, accessible and enhancements made to encourage walking and cycling help support the delivery of this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Infrastructure improvements, Travel Plan measures</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sites are readily sustainable and accessible or can be made so.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability. Use of non-car modes by residents/users. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will help secure the safe and sustainable development of contaminated and vacant land helping to recycle and restore previously developed land and conserving higher quality soils located elsewhere in the Borough from loss to development. It is considered that the policy will therefore have a positive effect on this objective. The effect of the policy is reduced owing to the potential constraint caused on redeveloping certain sites owing to effects on the environment, residents and neighbouring uses.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation. Site design and use.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures implemented through the development are viable and effective.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent of environmental issues on site often unknown until ground works commence. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The implementation of the policy which seeks to ensure that adverse environmental effects are avoided during construction including the effects on water. This policy therefore supports the implementation of this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant permanent positive effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation. Site design and use</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures implemented through the development are viable and effective.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent of environmental issues on site often unknown until ground works commence. Medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>It is considered that there is no direct link between this policy and this objective. The effects are therefore considered to be negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to prevent an escalation of air quality issues during construction, and aims to ensure that development is sustainably accessed or can be made sustainably accessed. This includes potential requirements to enhance public transport infrastructure and to promote walking and cycling, and other travel plan measures, softening the effect of development on air quality.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Infrastructure improvements, Travel Plan measures</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sites are readily sustainable and accessible or can be made so</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability. Use of non-car modes by residents/users. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to limit adverse effects on the environment and promotes the improvement of and use of sustainable forms of transport to reduce climate emissions from new development, enabling existing developed sites to be developed sustainably. Overall minor positive effects are assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium - Long term positive effects</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Infrastructure improvements, Travel Plan measures</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sites are readily sustainable and accessible or can be made so</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability. Use of non-car modes by residents/users. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Measures implemented through the construction of a site in response to policy requirements to avoid and minimise the effects of development a site on the environment is also likely by its very nature to promote the waste hierarchy and include the use of sustainable materials. The policy therefore results in positive effects for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short to medium positive effects for development stage. Effects felt throughout plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Measures to reduce, reuse, recycle and recover materials used in construction.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sustainable construction methods are feasible and viable</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Measures implemented through this policy through reducing environmental effects of construction, and addressing air quality, noise, and light issues, will also benefit ecology and local wildlife as adverse effects caused by development and the urban environment are softened.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term positive effects. Positive effects should be permanent in nature.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation. Site design and use</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Measures implemented through the development are viable and effective.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent of environmental issues on site often unknown until ground works commence. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Policy requirements relating to lighting provided in new developments seek to avoid adverse effects on the open countryside/neighbouring buildings/uses which may feature as part of a valued landscape or townscape. I.e. lighting causing an urbanisation of the open countryside, or changing the character of townscapes at night.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term positive effects. Positive effects should be permanent in nature.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Measures to avoid spillage/glare</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

Policy ENV 18: Contaminated and Unstable Land

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy seeks to amenity, health and wellbeing of occupants, future users and neighbours of development and seek to ensure that development does not adversely affect the environment as a result of contaminated land. The policy scores positively in response to environmental and some social objectives particularly objectives relating to health, wellbeing and deprivation. The policy scores a minor adverse effect to economic objectives and supply objectives owing to the potential constraint caused by the policy to develop sites. It must be noted that there is sufficient opportunity provided within the plan to meet identified development needs.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy seeks to amenity, health and wellbeing of occupants, future users and neighbours of development and seek to ensure that development does not adversely affect the environment, and in this regard is consistent with the requirements of Paragraphs 180 of the 2019 NPPF. As such it is considered that there is no reasonable alternative to the preferred option. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy Seeks to ensure that development appropriately addresses and mitigates the effects of contaminated and unstable land. The policy potentially restricts development by adding costs in order to make sites suitable however also enables the development of other sites by providing guidance which will enable their safe and sustainable redevelopment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Overall the minor positive and negative effects caused by this policy on this sustainability objective are assessed to balance out over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation works. Development platforms etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>High level information regarding ground conditions is sufficiently reliable to justify the allocation of land for housing through the Part 2 Plan</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability, true extent of contamination/stability issues. Medium risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy Seeks to ensure that development appropriately addresses and mitigates the effects of contaminated and unstable land. The policy potentially restricts development by adding costs in order to make sites suitable however also enables the development of other sites by providing guidance which will enable their safe and sustainable redevelopment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Overall the minor positive and negative effects caused by this policy on this sustainability objective are assessed to balance out over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation works. Development platforms etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>High level information regarding ground conditions is sufficiently reliable to justify the allocation of land for housing through the Part 2 Plan</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability, true extent of contamination/stability issues. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Policy aims to ensure that regenerated sites do not result adverse impacts for the environment and local communities. The proposal will have mixed effects for this objective by protecting existing communities from potential harm but also preventing some sites from coming forward owing to ground conditions and health risks. A neutral effect is assessed.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation works. Development platforms etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Suitable mitigation measures in place to ensure that the site is suitable.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Increase cost in developing sites with implications for viability. Medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy aims to protect the health and wellbeing of existing residents, existing and future users from potentially harmful effects of contaminated and unstable land. This will significantly enhance the health and wellbeing of those living and working in Pendle with enhancements to existing problem sites provided through the development process.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive permanent effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation works. Development platforms etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extend of issues related to ground contamination and stability will vary from site to site. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Contaminated sites may or may not be in sustainable and accessible locations. The policy guides development of these sites. A neutral effect is assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy Seeks to conserve and enhance soils at previously developed and contaminated sites with benefits for the environment. The effects are reduce due to the increased pressure for greenfield development which might result if development proves unsuitable or viable applying this policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Variable effects erring on the side of positive for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation works. Development platforms etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Increase cost in developing sites with implications for viability. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The requirement to suitably address contaminated land will ensure that any nearby watercourses are not polluted by leeching/runoff. This is beneficial to securing water quality and resources, particularly polluted water course through industrial/urban areas. Remediation works may in some cases address existing problems delivering a net benefit including the de-culverting of existing watercourses where this is justified.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation works. Site layout. Protecting and restoring water courses.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent and nature of contamination and the ability for this to be addressed and managed through the construction process. Low-Medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy has a limited relationship with this objective and as a result will result in negligible effects.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy could have positive effects for air quality where contamination includes trapped gases which would harm air quality if not suitably addressed through the construction process.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>There are feasible means to deal with any trapped gases that may be released through ground works.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will assist the safe and suitable redevelopment of land which is known to be contaminated or unstable helping to limit the use of greenfield land for development. Protective measures taken in addressing ground conditions will benefit the environment, addressing local sources or pollution and managing local sources of emissions.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground works. Safe removal and storage of contaminated materials.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Contaminated land is also a source of harmful materials/gases to the environment. PDL sites subjected to contamination are sustainably located and accessible.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy Requirement to address contaminated and unstable land in the development of sites presents a challenge in securing the safe disposal of extracted and removed materials. At the same time the redevelopment of contaminated land could limit and safeguard sites which have more importance for minerals and natural resources. A neutral effect is assessed.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>The Council will need to work with developers and appropriate consultees to find a safe and sustainable solution to the disposal of such material once removed from a development site.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale of contaminated land extracted and capacity elsewhere for its suitable disposal/storage. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The safe restoration and development of contaminated land should give rise to benefits to local wildlife and habitats which may be adversely effected by existing sources of pollution. Wildlife which is currently unable to use a site which is contaminated by return to the site should appropriate habitat be provided. The policy may assist implement the expansion of the Green Infrastructure Network.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Source of pollution addressed through redevelopment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Contaminated land holds lesser ecological value than remediated land.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy guides the safe and high quality restoration of previously used contaminated land which will enhance landscapes and townscapes which are currently adversely affected by derelict land. The Policy is likely to have a mixed effect on this objective enabling some development but preventing others due to effects on suitability and viability.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Mixed effects over the plan period from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Remediation works. Redevelopment of vacant and derelict sites which detract from existing heritage assets.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Land in a derelict form holds lesser role and detracts more significantly for a heritage asset than in a redeveloped condition.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The nature of a heritage asset and its relationship to the wider environment changes from site to site. Contaminated/derelict sites may contain heritage assets within them. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy guides the safe and high quality restoration of previously used contaminated land which will enhance landscapes and townscapes which are currently adversely affected by derelict land. The Policy is likely to have a mixed effect on this objective enabling some development but preventing others due to effects on suitability and viability.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Mixed effects over the plan period from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Remediation works. Redevelopment of vacant and derelict sites which detract from existing heritage assets.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Land in a derelict form holds lesser role and detracts more significantly for a heritage asset than in a redeveloped condition.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The nature of a heritage asset and its relationship to the wider environment changes from site to site. Contaminated/derelict sites may contain heritage assets within them. Low-medium risk.</p> |

Policy ENV 19: Design and Placemaking

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to ensure that key design principles as set out in the NPPF and PPG are captured through the development process, ensuring that new development is of high quality, is appropriate in its scale, form, type and design to its location, does not adversely affect the amenity, security, health and wellbeing of occupants, future users and neighbours. The policy scores positively for most assessed policy objectives owing to the assessed benefits for economic, social and environmental issues and confirms good design as the linchpin in securing these benefits through new development.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy is responsive to the requirements of Section 12 of the NPPF and provides guidance as to how development will be considered to represent good design taking into account its impacts of future users, wider uses and the environment. A more detailed approach would not be suitable within the current system of plan making given the scope and form of the Part 2 Local Plan, and instead should be set out through a Design SPD or Design Brief where it is applicable to a specific area. A less detailed approach would risk being found inconsistent with the NPPF, and fail to deliver good design within the Borough. Neither option therefore forms a reasonable alternative and as such has not been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to secure high quality development through good design and placemaking to the benefit of local environment, amenity, health and wellbeing. The policy will deliver places which are desirable to live in for a wide range of community groups, provide quality new homes, and ensure a variety of new homes are provided in response to needs.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term effects at least for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Measures affecting the layout, density and form of development. Landscaping and appearance. Sustainable construction. Renewable energy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Applicants engage positively in the design process and deliver high quality schemes in line with policy</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. On a site level, design considerations may affect the overall capacity of site for development. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to secure high quality development through good design and placemaking to the benefit of local environment, amenity, health and wellbeing. The policy will deliver places which are desirable to live and work in, attracting investment in Pendle and a broader workforce.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium, and long term effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Measures affecting the layout, density and form of development. Landscaping and appearance Sustainable construction. Renewable energy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Applicants engage positively in the design process and deliver high quality schemes in line with policy</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. On a site level, design considerations may affect the overall capacity of site for development. Low-medium risks.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The delivery of the policy securing high quality developments and enhancement to the environment will increase the attractiveness of Pendle as a place to invest, live, work and visit supporting urban regeneration. The policy will lead to improvements in social and environmental conditions within deprived areas helping to reduce inequalities and lower levels of social deprivation. Its application will help support sustainable living through the use of sustainable materials and promotion of renewable energy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability; however the policy supports the intention to ensure land developed in of good quality. Medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that new development follows the principles of good design achieving high quality environments designed to protect local amenity, minimise crime, maintain natural light, avoid overlooking/shadowing and provide local sources of recreation and tranquillity, helping to ensure that new development improves on baseline data for health and wellbeing.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant permanent positive effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Responses to key design issues through changes to form, layout, scale, appearance etc</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> There is scope within the proposed development to make a meaningful and positive response to the policy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Securing development which aid and promotes access via non-car modes of travel will help promote a modal shift away from the car</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial positive effects. Potentially declining depending upon take up, use, and sustainability.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Legible and high quality routes through a site. Strong connectivity and enhancements to wider infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Opportunity exists for pedestrian and cycling connections.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Take up by users. Low-Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the efficient use of land through design responses i.e. massing, scale, location, aspect, uses etc.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term positive effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Open space requirements. Biodiversity offsetting.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scope within a development to respond to design policy requirements positively. Low risk.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to secure reduced water uses and safeguard water by applying water resource efficiency standards and recycling rainwater thus is responsive to the water sustainability programmes of United Utilities and Yorkshire Water. Measures to address pollution of water such as controlling water runoff and managing pollution will help improve the quality of water resources in Pendle in line with objectives of the Environment Agency.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The policy will have medium to long term significant benefits for water usage and resources.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Efficient building standards. Suitable treatment of run-off and potentially contaminated/polluted water.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The means exists in the scope of development proposed to address water supply/quality issues.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change results in further pressures in water supply. Medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Application of design principles which will help address flooding issues within a site minimising the rate of runoff and potential to increase the risk of flooding on or off-site.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent minor positive effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Landscaping, location of development. Use of materials. Etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The implementation of the policy to provide for green spaces, promoting walking and cycling, and implement renewable energy and reducing energy consumption will assist in improving local air quality.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term benefits</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation measures to reduce emissions and to promote travel by non-car methods.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Technology changes. Behaviour changes. Low-Medium risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that new buildings and developments conform to sustainable construction standards, implement energy efficiency technologies such as minimise use of water and electricity, make use of opportunities for renewable energy for energy generation on site (such as for internal heating), promote recycling of waste in construction and ongoing use, and encourage accessibility via non-polluting modes of transport. This will contribute to objectives to reduce reliance and use of fossil fuels, increase the use and role of renewables, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions over the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent medium to long term benefits</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Measures to be implemented through planning conditions and obligations</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Mitigation measures are feasible and deliverable.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Technology changes during the plan period, and the adaptiveness of policy to respond to these. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the use of sustainable and recycled materials in construction. The policy seeks to promote sustainable waste recycling and storage post development by ensuring waste requirements are sufficiently designed within new developments.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short-medium and long term significant benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Use of materials and practices conditioned and confirmed through the construction management plan.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy aims to conserve and enhance local habitats including safeguarding features of natural importance, incorporating trees and hedgerows into the design of schemes, and providing new landscaping that integrates with the local environment and existing features. The policy is responsive to the Pendle Habitats Audit and helps to implement the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term significant benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>The submitted landscaping plan, tree survey and ecological management plan will likely be conditioned with suitable means of implementation agreed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>A site contained existing natural features, or can contribute positively to local biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Impacts of climate change. Use. Maintenance. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would likely protect and enhance the sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, architectural interest with local designations (including their setting).. Given the requirement for new development to respect the form of existing buildings, respond to the context of the site, and maintain positive aspects of a local environment and improve poorer ones.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design responses to the wider built context, such as design responses to scale, height, density, layout, appearance, and landscaping.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The significance of the listed building/heritage asset may mean that building in its setting is inappropriate even with mitigation put in place. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks high quality development which promotes local character and distinctiveness, responding to site context, wider urban form, and seeks to retain and enhance the local environment. High quality building design and landscaping can contribute significantly to landscape and townscape character.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design responses to the wider built context, such as design responses to scale, height, density, layout, appearance, and landscaping.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The nature of the landscape or townscape may mean that certain forms of development in these areas are inappropriate even with mitigation put in place. Low risk.</p> |

Policy ENV20: Advertisements and Commercial Signage.

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to ensure that advertisements do not detract or threaten the local environment, protect amenity interests and contributes to design quality. The policy scores positively for social and environmental objectives, particularly objectives relating to townscape, heritage, and residential amenity. The policy is negligible for climate change, resource use, flood risk orientated objectives, and scores neutrally for economic objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy is responsive to the requirements of Paragraph 132 of the NPPF with regard to advertisements and prevent advertisements which can detract from the streetscene and the quality of the urban environment, lead to clutter, and act as a danger or nuisance to residents, occupiers, or users. A more detailed approach would not be suitable within the current system of plan making given the scope and form of the Part 2 Local Plan, and instead should be set out through the Design SPD or Design Brief where it is applicable to a specific area. A less detailed approach would risk being found inconsistent with the NPPF, and fail to deliver good design within the Borough. Neither option therefore forms a reasonable alternative and as such has not been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is of limited relevance to this objective and as such will have a negligible impact on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy provides guidance as for the key issues to be considered by applicants and businesses in bringing forward proposals for advertisements and commercial signage. The policy does not intend to prevent advertisements and commercial signage provided that policy requirements are satisfied and gives certainty to businesses as to how such proposals will be considered by the Council through the DM process. The overall affect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions. Design SPD guidance.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will assist in enhancing the quality and appearance of the built environment. This will occur by controlling and preventing advertisements which detract from the streetscene, add clutter, and/or has an adverse effects for other users, businesses or residents. The overall effect of the policy is assessed as positive for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects across the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions, Design SPD guidance.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Detrimental development takes place without planning. Low-Medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the health and wellbeing of residents, business operators and users in relation to advertisements and commercial signage by ensuring that such development does not have an adverse effect on amenity and safety. The overall effect of the policy is assessed as being positive for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects across the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions. Design SPD guidance.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Detrimental development takes place without planning. Low-Medium risk.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is of limited relevance to this objective and as such will have a negligible impact on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy has a limited relationship with this objective. The overall affect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy is of limited relevance to this objective and as such will have a negligible impact on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy is of limited relevance to this objective and as such will have a negligible impact on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to safeguard the historic environment, ensuring that advertisements do not detract from the built environment leading to adverse effects on historic assets. A minor positive effect has been assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive permanent effects throughout the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions. Design SPD guidance.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Detrimental development takes place without planning. Low-Medium risk.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to safeguard the historic environment, ensuring that advertisements do not detract from the built environment leading to adverse effects on townscape. A minor positive effect has been assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive permanent effects throughout the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions. Design SPD guidance.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Detrimental development takes place without planning. Low-Medium risk.</p> |

Policy ENV 21: Historic Environment

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks that development complies with national planning policy with regards to heritage assets and that heritage assets in the Borough remain protected, maintained and enhanced. Harm caused to a heritage asset is to be assessed and considered across to the status of the asset and degree of harm caused. The policy has positive effects for environmental objectives, and social objectives by enabling the Borough's heritage to be revealed and appreciated. Economic objectives, and objectives for the supply and delivery of development have uncertain effects as the extent to which heritage assets and designations act as a constraint on development will vary across the Borough.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy is responsive to the requirements of Section 16 of the NPPF, and as such is required to ensure adequate protection of heritage assets through development proposals as well as consistency with national planning policy. Linkages are made to Conservation Area appraisals which contain further guidance for development within these areas. More detailed guidance is also set out in the Design SPD. Against this wider context it is considered that there is no reasonable alternative to the proposed policy approach. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Historical assets and designations are distributed throughout the Borough and their significance, type and setting and effects for development proposals varies quite substantially. The policy requires attention to be paid to the historic environment when considering a site for development, the type of development to take place, its design, layout and form, and the way in which it interrelates to the wider area. The policy does not necessarily constrain development near all heritage assets but could do depending on the nature of the existing heritage asset and its relationship to the proposal site.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation measures will vary site by site depending on the nature of the proposals, relationship of with the historic environment and assessed degree of harm.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Opportunity exists to accommodate new development to an acceptable position with regard to its impacts on the historic environment.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>It is unknown to the authority where in the Borough applications for windfall development may come forward. A shortfall or delay in housing land supply may result in added need for this type of development. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Historical assets and designations are distributed throughout the Borough and their significance, type and setting and effects for development proposals varies quite substantially. The policy requires attention to be paid to the historic environment when considering a site for development, the type of development to take place, its design, layout and form, and the way in which it interrelates to the wider area. The policy does not necessarily constrain development near all heritage assets but could do depending on the nature of the existing heritage asset and its relationship to the proposal site.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation measures will vary site by site depending on the nature of the proposals, relationship of with the historic environment and assessed degree of harm.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Opportunity exists to accommodate new development to an acceptable position with regard to its impacts on the historic environment.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>It is unknown to the authority where in the Borough applications for windfall development may come forward. A shortfall or delay in housing land supply may result in added need for this type of development. Low risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Pendle has many historic building and places of historical significance. The policy/proposal would significantly enhance the attractiveness of the borough as a place to invest, live, work and visit. Restoring historic assets may assist towards regeneration in the area. One example would be the restoration and reuse of Brierfield mills, an old cotton mill in the area which is currently, at the time of writing, undergoing refurbishment to assist with economic development in the area housing a new call centre. The protection and enhancement of the historic environment may encourage investment in tourism as the industrial heritage of the Borough is released.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and longer term. The extent of this effect is likely to increase over the plan period, as schemes are determined in accordance with policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Environmental enhancement. Restoration of features. Stonework etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Opportunities for investment in historical assets limited by access to funding. The nature and condition of the historical asset itself may also prevent/limit opportunity for investment/rejuvenation. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The implementation of the policy may have positive and negative effects for this objective. The retention and enhancement of heritage assets will help maintain the quality of the local built environment and may be key to the identity and character of the local area with a value and importance attached to it by the local community. At the same time the policy may prevent or constrain the proposals of individuals/groups which are necessary or will improve wellbeing and health owing to the effect on a heritage asset.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive and negative effects are assessed over the entirety of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design measures to mitigate impact and respond to the qualities of the local historic environment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effect of development on historical environment will alter by scheme. Medium risk.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The effect of the policy on this objective will depend on the nature of the proposal and its relationship to the existing historic environment. These may be one in the same where works are proposed to a heritage asset. The overall effects of this policy on this objective can only therefore be assessed on a case by case basis applying the policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Unclear effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Nature of proposal and relationship with historic environment. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>It is unclear what impact the policy would have on the achievement of this objective especially where the thrust of the policy is to conserve and enhance the historic environment. There may be instances where technologies and responses to climate change may be incorporated into a development's design without adverse effects on the historic environment. Equally however there may be instances where the opposite applies and it is not appropriate for such measures owing to the adverse effects caused on the historic environment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Mitigation measures may be available to reduce this concern. Where harm is identified it will be up to the decision maker to consider what weight is given to the green benefits of a proposal.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Nature of proposal and impact on historic environment. Medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Measures to safeguard the historic environment are likely to (depending on the nature of the heritage asset and its location) also protect features important to local biodiversity where natural features contribute to its setting and/or significance. Similarly, measures to enhance the historic environment may also be beneficial for local wildlife, for example through new planting to provide a landscape buffer. The nature and extent of this benefit will vary from site to site by proposal to proposal.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Nature of proposal and relationship with the historic environment and biodiversity assets. Low risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal would protect and enhance the sites, areas and features of historic, cultural, archaeological and architectural interest with national designations (including their setting).</p> <p>The policy/proposal will make use of historic buildings, spaces and places through sensitive adaption and re-use allowing these distinctive assets to be accessed.</p> <p>The policy/proposal would result in an assets(s) being removed from the At Risk Register.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Historic environments often contribute significantly to townscapes providing the defining feature of skylines, such as church spires, public buildings, estates etc. Historic environments may, to a lesser degree, fulfil a similar role in valued landscapes where the historic asset is within a more rural/semi-rural setting, and indeed settlement character. The protection and enhancement sought by the policy to historic environments will therefore benefit this policy, given the link between the policy and this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy ENV 22: Leeds and Liverpool Canal Corridor

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to protect and enhance the historical, cultural, recreational, and environmental interest of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal corridor which runs through the Borough between Brierfield in the South and Barnoldswick in the North. The policy is assessed as having positive effects for environmental objectives, and social objectives by enabling a key asset to the Borough's heritage and recreational resource to be revealed and appreciated. The policy also supports Economic objectives by enhancing a key attraction and source of identity for the Borough attracting investment and promoting tourism. Objectives for the supply and delivery of development score neutrally given that the impact of development on this corridor has been considered to a high level through the site assessment process and is not considered to constrain significantly the achievement of planned targets.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy has been drawn up to recognise, protect and enhance a key historical asset in the Borough which has wider environmental and recreational benefits. The Leeds Liverpool Canal is unique in the Borough given its scale, identity, and linkage of planning objectives. This is considered by the Council to warrant its own policy which seeks to safeguard the asset and secure its sustainable continued use over the plan period and beyond to ensure that the cultural heritage of the Borough can be enjoyed by future generations, and its role as a source of recreation and habitat for wildlife is safeguarded. This could not be provided if the policy was removed given the unique character, features and role of this corridor within the Borough. As such it is not considered that there is a reasonable alternative to this policy and no alternative has been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy affects a relatively small corridor through the Borough. In a small number of instances, proposals for housing within this policy area, may be required to respond to its requirements. The policy does not necessarily prevent new homes and its requirements and setting is likely to make them desirable for future occupiers. Elsewhere there are sufficient allocations to meet the development need of the plan. Overall a neutral impact is assessed for this policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Schemes should be sensitively designed to respect the character and heritage of the canal corridor as well as its recreational importance</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Employment land supply planned for through the Part Local Plan in response to needs is not affected by this policy. Within the urban area, protected employment sites are closely related to this corridor and as such proposals for their redevelopment may be subject to the requirements of this policy. It is unlikely given the nature of this policy that such proposals would be prevented from coming forward subject to design and relationship to the canal corridor being safeguarded.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Schemes should be sensitively designed to respect the character and heritage of the canal corridor as well as its recreational importance.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to maintain and enhance the canal corridor through Pendle, which has a significant role in the cultural, heritage, recreational and environment of the Borough. The policy therefore helps to promote reinvestment and rejuvenation of the Borough. The implementation of the policy would enhance the canal corridor enhancing the attractiveness of Pendle as a place to invest, live, work and visit, important in securing regeneration and reducing observed levels of deprivation.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent Medium to long term positive effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Schemes should be sensitively designed to respect the character and heritage of the canal corridor as well as its recreational importance.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>There are no allocations in the vicinity of the corridor and so the policy directs windfall development reducing its overall effectiveness. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The canal corridor through Pendle is a popular source of maintain outdoor exercise for the population, canals are used for walking and cycling. The policy/proposal would have strong and sustained impacts on healthy lifestyles and improve well-being through physical activity, recreational activity, improved environmental quality, etc.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent Medium and long term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Schemes should be sensitively designed to respect the character and heritage of the canal corridor as well as its recreational importance.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy Seeks to promote access to the canal corridor for recreational use. The canal corridor offers an attractive and sustainable walking and cycling route from Burnley to the south through Brierfield and Nelson, connecting into the open countryside, and linking Foulridge to Salterforth and Barnoldswick. The enhancement of this route as a safe and attractive route for all may reduce the need to travel for some by car for some sections of the community.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent Medium and long term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Enhancement to the tow path. Security enhancements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Space, heritage issues. Funding. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The effect of the policy on this objective will depend on the nature of the proposal and its relationship to the existing historic environment. These may be one in the same where works are proposed to a heritage asset. The overall effects of this policy on this objective can only therefore be assessed on a case by case basis applying the policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Unclear effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Nature of proposal and relationship with historic environment. Medium risk.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy may lead to environmental enhancements to the canal corridor which in turn benefits water quality.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent Medium to long term benefits</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Habitat enhancement. The removal and remediation of pollutants from the canal corridor</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of works especially within the southern part of the M65 Corridor. Medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective. It is anticipated that the policy will neither cause nor exacerbate flooding in the catchment. Canals are controlled waterways and as such are not typically considered to be a cause of flood risk. The policy may however assist in maintaining the canal corridor to prevent any major failures in the canal that may result in flooding. The canal is however maintained by the Canals and Rivers Trust.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent neutral effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy should maintain and enhance air quality along the canal corridor through the promotion of the environment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is unlikely to result in any adverse effects for this objective. Developments will be required to be of high design and maintain the character, heritage and the canalised environment which will help promote the quality of the environment and assist in climate change along the canal corridor. Developments may however promote increased visits to the canal corridor as a result of the improvements in the attractiveness of the corridor as a place to visit. The overall effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects in the short to medium to, uncertain effects in the longer term owing to uncertainties regarding use and technology changes.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Impacts of policy on visitor numbers. Changes in technology and behaviour.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The canal corridor forms an important green and blue corridor through the Borough for wildlife forms a key wildlife corridor. The implementation of this policy will help safeguard and enhance the role the Leeds Liverpool Canal has for local wildlife as an important habitat.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Medium to long term permanent benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>High design standards. Response to the canal environment. Mitigation measures and biodiversity gain.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change may alter the habits of wildlife in the area. Medium risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The canal corridor represents an important part of Pendle's industrial heritage and legacy and integral to the Borough's original urbanisation. The policy seeks to safeguard this heritage both broadly but also its historical features such as bridges, locks, and associated buildings. Also the wider industrial landscape important to the setting and the context of the canal is also sought for protection as necessary.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent significant positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>High design standards. Response to the canal environment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The canal corridor is an important landscape and townscape feature in Pendle, reflecting the Borough's industrial heritage. The policy seeks to safeguard the canal in this landscape and townscape, protecting historical features such as bridges, locks and associated buildings, and broader features important to its setting.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent significant positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>High design standards. Response to the canal environment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |

Policy ENV 23: Equestrian Development

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to support the sustainable growth in the equestrian sector to support the rural economy and rural communities. The policy seeks to ensure that such development does not have adverse effects for the environment, highways, and amenity, and is located to minimise impacts on landscape, the open countryside and the historic environment. The policy is assessed as having neutral effects for environmental factors, with positive social and economic effects for supporting the rural economy, providing enhanced access to sources of recreation beneficial to health and wellbeing. Minor adverse effects are predicted for objectives promoting sustainable modes of transport, air quality, and climate change given that facilities are typically found in rural parts of the Borough which are much less well served and accessible via public transport. It must be stressed that these minor effects are limited.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy has been put together to support and guide development proposals for equestrian development within the open countryside. It is considered that there are not alternative forms of the policy which would provide adequate guidance for applicants and decision makers for this type of development. The open countryside policy is silent on the approach to determine such uses. The policy aims to support the sustainable development of the rural economy. No reasonable alternatives have therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy fulfils a minor role in supporting and creating rural jobs through farm diversification as a result of equestrian development. The policy is therefore assessed to have a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>The policy is assessed as having minor positive effects for this objectives for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will support the rural economy by providing support to the equestrian industry, approving schemes where consistent with policy requirements. The policy is therefore assessed to have a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will support opportunities for access to equestrian activities in the Borough supporting sustainable recreational opportunities beneficial to health and wellbeing. The scale of this opportunity is likely to be limited and small in scale and as such is likely to result in a limited positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the operation of the development.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Facilities for equestrian development are likely to be inaccessible to many by public transport, walking and cycling owing to the typically rural location in which such facilities are located. Existing infrastructure within the vicinity of proposals is likely to be of lower capacity. Use of infrastructure and access to a site for equestrian use is likely to be relatively low. This ensures that the effect on this objective is a minor negative.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative effects for this objective in the short and medium term. This may reduce should technology, attitudes or availability of non-populating transport modes change.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Sites on the edge of existing settlements are however encouraged in the policy subject to accessibility to existing bridleways and impact on the amenity of existing residents.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>In the majority of cases, proposals for equestrian type development will occur at existing farms which are largely located in isolated parts of the Borough.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Changes in technology, attitudes and behaviour, investment in public transport. Low to medium risk.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages farm diversification promoting equestrian uses with a preference to the redevelopment of existing buildings/development within existing farmsteads where appropriate. This safeguards the countryside from inappropriate development And secures the efficient use of land in the open countryside in support of sustainable rural economic growth.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the short term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal seeks to direct development to existing farmstead/built areas. Equestrian development is typically not of the form that would contribute to flood risk and as such would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective. It is anticipated that the policy will neither cause nor exacerbate flooding in the catchment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>SuDs measures will be required where proposals would give rise to the need for drainage measures to be put in place. The Council will apply its flood risk policy to all proposals in the Borough.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is unlikely to result in significant increases in activity with developments largely taking place at existing farms significantly away from AQMAs. Developments likely to be relatively inaccessible via sustainable forms of transport and lead to increase activity at farmsteads however this activity is likely to be minor with negligible effects for air quality.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negligible worsening for this objective in the short and medium term. Likely to reduce to neutral overtime as technology, attitudes or availability of non-populating transport modes change.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning obligations may be implemented to reduce car trips to and from a site if deemed reasonable.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Changes in technology, attitudes and behaviour, investment in public transport. Low to medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Developments likely to be relatively inaccessible via sustainable forms of transport and lead to increase activity at farmsteads. Scope to offset this would exist at farms through the construction of buildings built to high energy efficient standards and the incorporation of renewable technology to generate electricity for farm operations. The level of increase in activity likely as a result of equestrian development is likely to be relatively minor. On a Borough wide basis the impact of equestrian development, individually and cumulatively on this objective would be negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negligible worsening for this objective in the short and medium term. Likely to reduce to neutral overtime as technology, attitudes or availability of non-populating transport modes change.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning obligations may be implemented to reduce car trips to and from a site if deemed reasonable.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Changes in technology, attitudes and behaviour, investment in public transport. Low to medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal would reduce the amount of waste going to landfill through recycling and energy recovery through the implementation of agricultural management plans.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to conserve ecology interests as part of the consideration of proposals relating to equestrian development. The policy will ensure therefore that such proposals do not result in an adverse effect for biodiversity. Equestrian development is typically small scale in nature with a low impact on the wider countryside. Proposals within the green infrastructure network would therefore have a negligible impact on such corridors.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Biodiversity net gain opportunities will be sought from developments</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to conserve heritage interests as part of the consideration of proposals relating to equestrian development. The policy will ensure therefore that such proposals do not result in an adverse effect for heritage. Equestrian development is a rural land use and as such is a use that is associated with the open countryside. Equestrian development, depending on its form, scale, and detailed design is therefore unlikely to adversely affect the setting of a heritage asset in this way. Site specific circumstances will however need to be taken into account at the planning application stage.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Landscape/design measures may be applied to soften the effect of a development on a heritage asset. This may also reduce/enhance any visual/physical link.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to conserve the existing character of the area, and includes requirements to ensure that equestrian development has minimal effects on the open countryside and its surroundings. This includes requirements to be well-related to existing buildings permanent in nature, scaled proportionately, design measures to minimise visual effects, and to be supported by a pasture management plan. The safeguards within the policy will ensure therefore that such proposals do not result in an adverse effect for landscape character and townscape.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Landscape/design measures to soften/minimise any effects on local landscape/townscape.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy ENV 24: Walking and Cycling

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to promote and secure walking and cycling in new development to encourage its adoption by future users/operators as a means to access and travel within the site, and ensure that existing walking and cycling links are not compromised and where possible improved by new development. The policy scores positively for environmental and social objectives, particularly objectives relating to climate change, sustainable modes of transport, and health and recreation. Negligible effects are outlined in relation to economic and housing supply objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy supports walking and cycling within new development and enhancements for wider areas seeking to minimise the reliance on travel by non-sustainable forms of transport. In this way the policy reflects and responds to the requirements of Paragraphs 91 and 102 of the 2019 NPPF. As such it is not considered that there is a reasonable alternative to this policy. No alternative has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to encourage walking and cycling within Pendle by requiring developments to consider and where appropriate invest in the walking and cycling infrastructure of the Borough, within and connecting sites and other developments, and through the location of developments itself. Such an approach will assist in promoting sustainable living by given opportunity for access via non-polluting modes of transport, and benefit the wider community with enhanced infrastructure and improved air quality. Responding to long established efforts of the Council to promote cycling (and walking).</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the short term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>On site provision. Improvements to existing provision. New infrastructure. Secured by S.106. Travel Plan measures. Cycle storage/vouchers etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Opportunities exist within the scope of a development to promote and improve walking and cycling</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of such measures. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal would have strong and sustained impacts on healthy lifestyles and improve well-being through physical activity, recreational activity, improved environmental quality through its safeguarding and development of walking and cycling links through new developments. Walking and cycling are beneficial to health and wellbeing and a higher take up by residents will reduce pressure on healthcare services. The policy is therefore assessed as having a significant positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects largely in the medium term, however continuing in the long run.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>On site provision. Improvements to existing provision. New infrastructure. Secured by S.106. Travel Plan measures. Cycle storage/vouchers etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Opportunities exist within the scope of a development to promote and improve walking and cycling</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of such measures. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal would encourage access via walking and cycling, safeguarding and developing routes at proposed development locations, securing links to existing infrastructure, and providing means to enhance existing infrastructure to the benefit of all users. The accessibility, quality, and safety of walking and cycling routes is important in encouraging their use and to secure a modal shift from polluting forms of transport.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>On site provision. Improvements to existing provision. New infrastructure. Secured by S.106. Travel Plan measures. Cycle storage/vouchers etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The proposal site is accessible via foot/bicycle (including travel times) to relevant essential services, infrastructure and sources of employment.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Walking and cycling improvements are feasible and viable. Medium risk.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages non-residential development likely to generate significant level of footfall to be located in highly accessible locations such as town or local shopping centres to encourage access for pedestrian and cyclists. By its effects the policy therefore also promotes the efficient use of land, encouraging development of land close to or within town/local shopping centres.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the short term for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>High accessible locations are generally previously developed sites.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Trend</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Trend</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal would encourage access via walking and cycling, safeguarding and developing routes at proposed development locations, securing links to existing infrastructure, and providing means to enhance existing infrastructure to the benefit of all users. The accessibility, quality, and safety of walking and cycling routes is important in encouraging their use and to secure a modal shift from polluting forms of transport leading to improvements in air quality.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>On site provision. Improvements to existing provision. New infrastructure. Secured by S.106. Travel Plan measures. Cycle storage/vouchers etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The proposal site is accessible via foot/bicycle (including travel times) to relevant essential services, infrastructure and sources of employment</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Securing use of walking/cycling infrastructure by future site users. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal would encourage access via walking and cycling, safeguarding and developing routes at proposed development locations, securing links to existing infrastructure, and providing means to enhance existing infrastructure to the benefit of all users. The accessibility, quality, and safety of walking and cycling routes is important in encouraging their use and to secure a modal shift from polluting forms of transport leading to improvements in air quality and reduced emissions. The policy assists in continuing trends of reduced CO2 emissions from the Borough over time.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>On site provision. Improvements to existing provision. New infrastructure. Secured by S.106. Travel Plan measures. Cycle storage/vouchers etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The proposal site is accessible via foot/bicycle (including travel times) to relevant essential services, infrastructure and sources of employment</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Securing use of walking/cycling infrastructure by future site users. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy ENV 25: Parking

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to ensure that new development benefits from sufficient parking, avoid adverse effects on highway safety and capacity and the appearance and functionality of an area due to parking problems. Parking can additionally cause significant stress where parking issues cause confrontation or lead to harm on amenity. The Policy also sets out measures to secure electric charging infrastructure, important to secure a shift from fuel based cars to electric/hybrid cars with benefits for the environment. Overall the policy is assessed to benefit have some social and environmental benefits, with a largely neutral effect for other objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: In its current form the policy sets out parking standards (as confirmed in Appendix 4 to the Part 2 Local Plan) which prescribes parking levels according to the scale and type of development proposed. The policy also requires electric charging provision. A reasonable alternative would be a policy which simply guides applicants on the consideration of parking through development proposals without establishing minimum or maximum requirements. Whilst this may benefit usage of land, this weaker position would increase the amount of development in the Borough with insufficient levels of parking and contribute to parking problems with adverse effects for highway capacity and safety, environmental factors, and amenity. The policy approach is rejected as a result.

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets parking requirements, in terms of quantity, siting and design, for residential development to ensure parking is sufficiently accounted for through the design process to promote the quality of the development and minimise uncontrolled on-street parking. The overall effect on housing numbers is likely to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Parking requirements are assessed at the design stage and accounted for when determining a capacity of a site for development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets parking guidance for residential development to ensure parking is sufficiently accounted for through the design process avoiding adverse effects on the built environment. The overall effect on housing numbers is likely to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Parking requirements are assessed at the design stage and accounted for when determining a capacity of a site for development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Sets parking requirements, in terms of quantity, siting and design, for commercial development to ensure parking is sufficiently accounted for through the design process to promote the quality of the development and minimise uncontrolled parking. The overall effect on the development of employment land is likely to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Parking requirements are assessed at the design stage and accounted for when determining a capacity of a site for development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets parking guidance for commercial development to ensure parking is sufficiently accounted for through the design process avoiding adverse effects on the built environment. The overall effect on the development of employment land is likely to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Parking requirements are assessed at the design stage and accounted for when determining a capacity of a site for development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes electric car usage by securing electric charging points within developments and new parking provision. It also seeks to promote cycling at new developments to secure development which promotes travel by sustainable modes of transport. Equally the policy promotes car usage by ensuring sufficient car parking spaces are provided at new developments. Overall it is considered that the policy results in a neutral effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Infrastructure provision secured by condition/obligation.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>That new infrastructure encourages a modal shift to cycling from car usage. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages electric charging points within developments and new parking provision. It also seeks to promote cycling at new developments. Weaker policy guidance is less likely to secure a modal shift and more likely to result in adverse effects for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Infrastructure provision secured by condition/obligation.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>That new infrastructure encourages a modal shift to cycling from car usage. Low-medium risk</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to provide greater opportunity for cycling within the Borough by requirement cycling storage/parking facilities on sites providing car parking over a certain threshold. The opportunity for cycling has benefits for health and wellbeing from exercise and recreation, supports Council objectives to promote cycling.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Infrastructure provision secured by condition/obligation</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Changes in attitudes change how the car is used reducing the effectiveness of the policy. Low risk.</p> | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy encourages cycling storage and sufficient parking levels to be provided on site. The policy provides guidance which might not be followed where site specific circumstances do not allow and is less likely to be followed. Insufficient parking can cause harm to health and wellbeing with adverse effects for this objective as a result.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Infrastructure provision secured by condition/obligation</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Changes in attitudes change how the car is used reducing the effectiveness of the policy. Low risk.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy promotes electric car usage by securing electric charging points within developments and new parking provision. It also seeks to promote cycling at new developments. Equally the policy promotes car usage by ensuring sufficient car parking spaces are provided at new developments. Overall it is considered that the policy results in a neutral effect for this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Parking provision secured by condition/obligation</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Take up of electric cars and encouragement of modal shift to cycling. Viability of implementing requirements. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy encourages electric charging points within developments and new parking provision. It also seeks to promote cycling at new developments. Weaker policy guidance is less likely to secure a modal shift and more likely to result in adverse effects for this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Infrastructure provision secured by condition/obligation</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Take up of electric cars and encouragement of modal shift to cycling. Viability of implementing requirements. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Parking requirements will need to be considered in developing the layout and capacity for the Site. There is a risk that where policy is not satisfied (owing to absence of capacity) development will be refused. The result of the policy could be a greater amount of land given over to parking, though the policy also provides for land to be used to provide and support sustainable modes of transport. The overall effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Effects may alter per scheme. Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Parking provision secured by condition/obligation</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sufficient scope exists within the context of a development to meet policy requirements. Low risk.</p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The flexible approach of the policy will ensure that land is efficiently developed and not given over to potentially large areas of land. The assessed effect of the policy is considered to be positive.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Effects may alter per scheme. Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Parking provision secured by condition/obligation</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sufficient scope exists within the context of a development to meet policy requirements. Low Risk.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy requires a design response in setting out parking within developments to ensure that drainage is taken into account.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Permanent neutral effect.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>SUDs, landscaping, swales/drains etc.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> | ~ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy promotes electric car usage by securing electric charging points within developments and new parking provision. It also seeks to promote cycling at new developments. Both measures will have beneficial effects on air quality. However the policy equally promotes car usage by ensuring sufficient car parking spaces are provided at new developments. Overall it is considered that the policy results in a neutral effect for this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Initially adverse effect changing to a positive effect in the latter years of the plan period as electric vehicle and hybrid vehicles increase as a proportion of cars on the road.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Securing electric infrastructure and cycling provision by condition and obligation.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Take up of electric cars and encouragement of modal shift to cycling. Viability of implementing requirements. Low-medium risk</p> | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy encourages electric car usage with electric charging points within developments and new parking provision. It also seeks to promote cycling at new developments. Both measures if secured will have beneficial effects on air quality. However the policy equally promotes car usage by ensuring sufficient car parking spaces are provided at new developments. The reasonable alternative is however weaker than the preferred approach in securing parking provision at developments for sustainable modes of transport and as such will be less effective in securing this type of provision. Overall the policy is assessed as having a minor negative effect for this objective in its promotion of car access to new development.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period, potentially improving over the plan period as technology changes.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Securing electric infrastructure and cycling provision by condition and obligation.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Take up of electric cars and encouragement of modal shift to cycling. Viability of implementing requirements. Low-medium risk</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy promotes electric car usage by securing electric charging points within developments and new parking provision. It also seeks to promote cycling at new developments. Both measures will have beneficial effects on climate change and responding to its effects. However the policy equally promotes car usage by ensuring sufficient car parking spaces are provided at new developments. Overall it is considered that the policy results in a neutral effect for this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Initially adverse effect changing to a positive effect in the latter years of the plan period as electric vehicle and hybrid vehicles increase as a proportion of cars on the road.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Securing electric infrastructure and cycling provision by condition and obligation.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Take up of electric cars and encouragement of modal shift to cycling. Viability of implementing requirements.</p> | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy encourages electric car usage with electric charging points within developments and new parking provision. It also seeks to promote cycling at new developments. Both measures if secured will have beneficial effects for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in new development. However the policy equally promotes car usage by ensuring sufficient car parking spaces are provided at new developments. The reasonable alternative is however weaker than the preferred approach in securing parking provision at developments for sustainable modes of transport and as such will be less effective in securing this type of provision. Overall the policy is assessed as having a minor negative effect for this objective in its promotion of car access to new development.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period, potentially improving over the plan period as technology changes.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Securing electric infrastructure and cycling provision by condition and obligation.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Take up of electric cars and encouragement of modal shift to cycling. Viability of implementing requirements. Low-medium risk</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> | ~ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ~ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> | ~ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that parking does not lead to adverse effects for the quality of the existing built environment, including preventing potential adverse effects for heritage assets.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Neutral impact for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Planning conditions. Design measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Relationship of site to heritage asset. Scope and role of parking within setting/significance of heritage asset.</p> | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy encourages cycling storage and sufficient parking levels to be provided on site. The policy provides guidance which might not be followed where site specific circumstances do not allow. Parking likely to detract from the quality of the built environment. The policy will have minor adverse effects for this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Infrastructure provision secured by condition/obligation</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will ensure that parking does not lead to adverse effects for the visual quality of the built environment, with the potential for parking measures in new development to benefit the built quality and sense of place for the existing built environment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages cycling storage and sufficient parking levels to be provided on site. The policy provides guidance which might not be followed where site specific circumstances do not allow. Parking likely to detract from the quality of the built environment. The policy will have minor adverse effects for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Infrastructure provision secured by condition/obligation</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy ENV 26: Taxis

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to ensure that taxi related development is directed to only suitable locations and to avoid adverse effects on wider users, businesses, residents and the environment with neutral effects assessed for all relevant objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy seeks to control taxi uses within the Borough to ensure that any adverse effects from the location and operation of such businesses are minimised. Taxi operations form a unique type of business in terms of use and operations and the effects this has on wider areas. As such Taxi uses are not sufficiently addressed by other policies of the plan to provide adequate means to assess such proposals. A direct policy is therefore required for these uses. No reasonable alternative to the preferred option is identified.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy provides the decision making framework for taxi office/related development within the Borough. The policy supports taxi related development where suitable. It also seeks to ensure that taxi related development does not adversely affect the functionality of existing businesses.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Use of planning conditions.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that taxi related development does not adversely affect local amenity, functionality, and parking provision. The policy therefore seeks to protect the status quo and as such is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Use of planning conditions. Controlling the location of development. Design requirements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy aims to protect the health and wellbeing of residents and those working in Pendle from the potential adverse effects of taxi related development, ensuring no adverse effect on amenity, by reason of traffic movement, noise, traffic fumes and other nuisance. The policy therefore is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Use of planning conditions. Controlling the location of development. Design requirements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy Provides only a framework for the determination of taxi related development within the Borough. It does not actively promote such development. Taxis offer a more sustainable form of transport than private cars but less than buses, cycling or travel by foot. Provision of electric/cycling infrastructure is through the Car Parking policy, though it is acknowledged that in at least the early part of the plan period, taxis are likely to be petrol/diesel based. Overall it is considered that this policy will have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Use of planning conditions. Design requirements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy provides only a framework for the determination of taxi related development within the Borough. It does not actively promote such development. Taxis offer a more sustainable form of transport than private cars but less than buses, cycling or travel by foot. Provision of electric/cycling infrastructure is through the Car Parking policy, though it is acknowledged that in at least the early part of the plan period, taxis are likely to be petrol/diesel based. Overall it is considered that this policy will have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions. Link to Policy ENV25 re: cycling parking/storage and electric charging points.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy provides only a framework for the determination of taxi related development within the Borough. It does not actively promote such development. Taxis offer a more sustainable form of transport than private cars but less than buses, cycling or travel by foot. Provision of electric/cycling infrastructure is through the Car Parking policy, though it is acknowledged that in at least the early part of the plan period, taxis are likely to be petrol/diesel based. Overall it is considered that this policy will have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions. Link to Policy ENV25 re: cycling parking/storage and electric charging points.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that taxi related development does not adversely impact on the character of the existing area. Where this includes heritage assets, this will be taken into account in applying this policy alongside Policies ENV1 (Protecting and enhancing our natural and historic environments) and EV21 (Historic Environment).</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning Conditions. Design of Development.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that taxi related development does not adversely impact on the character of the existing area. Where this includes heritage assets, this will be taken into account in applying this policy alongside Policies ENV1 (Protecting and enhancing our natural and historic environments).</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning Conditions. Design of Development.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy ENV 27: Zero Net Carbon

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to minimise the effects of new development on greenhouse gas emissions promoting the implementation of energy efficiency in build and operational standards, renewable energy and means for sustainable modes of transport. The policy scores significant positives for environmental objectives, and positive social effects. Policy requirements are likely to affect development viability especially within the M65 corridor and as such potentially score negatively for supply objectives where viability is challenge.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy seeks to ensure that development is sustainable in its form and operation, minimising its effects on the environment and climate change. This is responsive to Paragraph 150 of the 2019 NPPF and the declaration of a climate change emergency by the Council in 2019. Any policy weaker than the proposed would not be successful in securing sustainable forms of development against this context and as such do not form reasonable alternatives. The reasonable alternative contains thresholds in energy efficiency standards and the generation of electricity from renewable sources. Whilst this policy shows significant positive effects for environmental and social effects, the policy score worse for objectives which relate to the delivery of development owing to low levels of viability evident in the Borough. The preferred option is therefore adopted as its achieves the right balance between securing deliverability and ensuring that development is responsive in its form to climate change.

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Community on effects of the policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that new development responds to the declared climate change emergency, built to standards that maximise energy efficiency and promote the use of renewable technologies for the generation of energy. Evidence illustrates that deliverability of full affordable housing need through market-led means is challenging in urban parts of the Borough. This will be worsened by the application of this policy. The policy therefore have a negative impact on this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Immediate and medium minor adverse effects. Potentially improving over time as costs reduce.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions Viability has not improved.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Technology changes may reduce the associated costs of reducing carbon emitted from residential development. Standardisation of building efficiency standards within building regulations towards net zero emissions as per Govt policy by 2050. Medium-high risk.</p> | -- | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy represents a direct response to the declared climate change emergency, ensuring that identified build standards to maximise energy efficiency and promote the use of renewable technologies for the generation of energy. Evidence illustrates that viability in the Borough is low especially in urban area. The policy is likely to result in significant challenges for the delivery of development within the Borough with increased build costs likely to be passed on to purchasers. The policy therefore has a significant negative impact on this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Immediate and medium significant adverse effects. Potentially improving over time as costs reduce.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions Viability has not improved.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Technology changes may reduce the associated costs of reducing carbon emitted from residential development. Standardisation of building efficiency standards within building regulations towards net zero emissions as per Govt policy by 2050. Medium-high risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Community on effects of the policy |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the use of sustainable construction, energy efficiency and renewable energy in new developments over the plan period. On the one hand this could prevent some more marginal development where environmental standards are not reached. On the other, the policy could support expansion within the renewable energy and sustainable materials sector supporting the economy. Overall the policy is considered to have a neutral effects in promoting sustainable build and operation of developments.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial adverse effects turning positive over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets standards for sustainable construction, energy efficiency and renewable energy in new developments over the plan period. On the one hand the policy could support expansion within the renewable energy and sustainable materials sector supporting the economy, on the other, the higher cost to build is likely to prevent some forms of commercial development from taking place during the plan period acting as a barrier to investment in the Borough. Overall the policy is considered to have a minor adverse effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial significant adverse effect becoming more positive over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Community on effects of the policy |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the use of sustainable construction, energy efficiency and renewable energy in new developments over the plan period. On the one hand this could prevent some more marginal development. Equally the policy promotes sustainable communities by securing developments which are low carbon and helps develop further sustainable build technologies. Overall the policy is considered to have a minor positive effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial adverse effects turning positive over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets standards for sustainable construction, energy efficiency and renewable energy in new developments over the plan period. On the one hand the policy could support expansion within the renewable energy and sustainable materials sector supporting the economy, promoting sustainable living, on the other, the higher cost to build is likely to prevent some forms of commercial development from taking place during the plan period acting as a barrier to investment in the Borough. The overall conclusion finds the policy to have a minor positive effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial significant adverse effect becoming more positive over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal implements measures with the aim of securing sustainable development, reducing the effect of development on the environment and climate change, and to implement technologies which are cleaner and less harmful to local communities. The policy is therefore assessed as having a positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning obligations. Sustainable construction methods/materials etc</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal implements measures with the aim of securing sustainable development, reducing the effect of development on the environment and climate change, and to implement technologies which are cleaner and less harmful to local communities. The policy is therefore assessed as having a significant benefit for this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning obligations. Sustainable construction methods/materials etc</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Community on effects of the policy |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Sustainable transport modes and reducing carbon hold significant links, however this policy is related to measures adopted during construction and energy generation. As such notwithstanding this link, it is considered that this policy has a negligible effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Sustainable transport modes and reducing carbon hold significant links, however this policy is related to measures adopted during construction and energy generation. As such notwithstanding this link, it is considered that this policy has a negligible effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets a policy framework for the determination of renewable energy proposals which might be submitted over the plan period. Many of these will take up land in rural areas but equally could provide for a dual usage of such land (for example alongside sheep grazing). The policy is considered to a neutral effect on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning obligations. Sustainable construction methods/materials etc</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The requirement to meet energy needs onsite, make use of sustainable construction methods, and use land effectively, means that the policy scores positively in response to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the middle of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning obligations. Sustainable construction methods/materials etc</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>Sufficient scope is provided within the development/site to meet policy requirements for renewable energy generation.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Community on effects of the policy |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The adaption of higher building standards through developments will help reduce the amount of resources that are used following completion including water consistent with objectives of United Utilities and Yorkshire Water. The policy therefore results in a benefit for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Benefits from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Water collection. Less water intensive uses.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The adaption of high build standards including the adoption of water efficiency measures. This will help significantly reduce the amount of water resources that are used through the operation of the development consistent with objectives of United Utilities and Yorkshire Water. The policy therefore results in a significant benefits for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant benefits from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Water collection. Less water intensive uses.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no direct link between this policy and this objective. The policy is concerned with build standards and energy generation rather than minimising impact of development from climate change. The result of this policy is therefore negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no direct link between this policy and this objective. The policy is concerned with build standards and energy generation rather than minimising impact of development from climate change. The result of this policy is therefore negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Community on effects of the policy |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy would reduce the amount of energy required to run/operate a building. It encourages sustainable materials and the use of renewable energy. The policy would therefore mean that new development is less reliant on and there is less pressure and use of carbon-based energy. The policy is therefore considered to have a positive effect for this policy.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Planning conditions relating to the use of materials, standards, layout</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Viability and feasibility of such measures.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> | ++ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy would set a requirement for the amount of renewable energy to be generated on site, whilst also reducing the amount of energy required to run/operate a building. It requires sustainable materials. The policy would therefore mean that new development is less reliant on and there is less pressure and use of carbon-based energy. The policy is therefore considered to have a significant positive effect for this policy.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Planning conditions relating to the use of materials, standards, layout</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Viability and feasibility of such measures.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy would reduce the amount of energy required to run/operate a building. It encourages sustainable materials and the use of renewable energy. The policy would therefore mean that new development is less reliant and there is less pressure and use of carbon-based energy. The policy is therefore considered to have a positive effect for this policy. The policy would assist in objectives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, adopting a low carbon economy in the achievement of the longer term target of carbon neutrality.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Planning conditions relating to the use of materials, standards, layout</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Viability and feasibility of such measures.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> | ++ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy would set a requirement for the amount of renewable energy to be generated on site, whilst also reducing the amount of energy required to run/operate a building. It requires sustainable materials. The policy would therefore mean that new development is less reliant on and there is less pressure and use of carbon-based energy. The policy is therefore considered to have a significant positive effect for this policy. The policy would assist in objectives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, adopting a low carbon economy in the achievement of the longer term target of carbon neutrality.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Planning conditions relating to the use of materials, standards, layout</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Viability and feasibility of such measures.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium-high risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Community on effects of the policy |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the use of sustainable energy efficient materials in construction of new building and as such supports the achievement of this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Conditions requiring the adoption of specific materials. Energy Efficiency Statement. Construction Management Report</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sustainable construction methods are both feasible and viable.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Government led standards for zero carbon development by 2050 could have untold consequences for viability. Higher energy efficiency standards are expected from 2025 which will effect development in the latter part of the plan period. Medium to High risk.</p> | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requires the use of sustainable energy efficient materials in construction of new building and as such supports the achievement of this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Conditions requiring the adoption of specific materials. Energy Efficiency Statement. Construction Management Report</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Sustainable construction methods are both feasible and viable.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Government led standards for zero carbon development by 2050 could have untold consequences for viability. Higher energy efficiency standards are expected from 2025 which will effect development in the latter part of the plan period. Medium to High risk.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is little connection between sustainable build standards and ecology. The policy includes safeguards for ecology in the consideration of proposed developments of renewable energy schemes ensuring no adverse effect. Overall the policy is considered to have no effect on the achievement of this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design, siting, scale, landscaping measures to reduce any considered adverse effects on the environment</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is little connection between sustainable build standards and ecology. The policy includes safeguards for ecology in the consideration of proposed developments of renewable energy schemes ensuring no adverse effect. Overall the policy is considered to have no effect on the achievement of this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design, siting, scale, landscaping measures to reduce any considered adverse effects on the environment</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Community on effects of the policy |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy includes safeguards for the historic environment in the consideration of proposed developments of renewable energy schemes ensuring no adverse effect. Overall the policy is considered to have no effect on the achievement of this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design, siting, scale, landscaping measures to reduce any considered adverse effects on the built environment</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy includes safeguards for the historic environment in the consideration of proposed developments of renewable energy schemes ensuring no adverse effect. Overall the policy is considered to have no effect on the achievement of this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design, siting, scale, landscaping measures to reduce any considered adverse effects on the built environment</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy includes safeguards for landscape in the consideration of proposed developments of renewable energy schemes ensuring no adverse effect. Overall the policy is considered to have no effect on the achievement of this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design, siting, scale, landscaping measures to reduce any considered adverse effects on the built environment</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy includes safeguards for landscape in the consideration of proposed developments of renewable energy schemes ensuring no adverse effect. Overall the policy is considered to have no effect on the achievement of this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design, siting, scale, landscaping measures to reduce any considered adverse effects on the built environment</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy LIV 6: Revised Housing Requirement

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option establishes a new economic led housing requirement based on the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment, and aligns the Local Plan to the up-to-date methodology of assessing housing need as provided by the Standard Method. The policy scores positively for social and economic objectives, with minor adverse-neutral effects for environmental objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: There are two tested reasonable alternatives to this policy. The first option is the adoption of the minimum housing requirement as outlined by the standard methodology at 146 dwellings per annum. The policy performs well for environmental objectives but causes significant harm to social and economic objectives owing to the significant reduction in housing land supply in response to market and affordable needs and the diversity of needs, and the lack of support to jobs growth. As a result of this policy is dismissed. The second tested option is the retention of the current housing requirement set out in the Core Strategy of 298 dwellings per annum. This scores well for housing and employment objectives but worse for environmental objectives. Considering 298 dwellings is twice the amount of homes needed to meet the local housing need and above the level of homes needed to support the economy the retention of the current housing requirement has also been dismissed.

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146dpa and 298dpa) | |
|--|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>A requirement of 240 is 60% above demographic needs, and will enable a higher amount of new homes to be provided to respond to evidence of high levels of affordable housing need, diversify existing stock including the quality of stock available in the Borough, and respond to the housing needs of these within the local community.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>All developments will be expected to provide for a mix of house types, sizes and tenures which is responsive to local housing need. Affordable Housing delivery will be maximised in accordance with viability. 100% affordable housing schemes which may come forward over the plan period will increase the responsiveness of the Local Plan to fulfilling this need.</p> | - | <p>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146dpa)</p> <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>146 dpa responds only to demographic needs set out in the 2014 household projections. The requirement acts as a constraint on housing delivery in contrast to recent provision and prevents affordable housing needs being met especially given that the adoption of the requirement wouldn't need any additional land to be allocated.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Adverse effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Broader supply potentially could come through windfall 100% affordable housing schemes and rural exception sites.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p><u>Assumptions</u> Viability acts as the main barrier to meeting housing needs in full over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Changes in costs and demands alters the type of housing delivered or required. Low-medium risk.</p> | ++ | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2 (298dpa)</i> <u>Likely significant effects</u> Retention of 298 delivers 100% above the locally assessed demographic need, providing for a variety of housing stock and maximising provision in response to affordable housing need.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Significant benefits over the short, medium and long term</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Secured through condition/s.106.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Capacity of the market to deliver and maintain the delivery of this level of housing is doubtful. The housing requirement has been achieved only once in the plan period so far</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The HNA illustrates that the adoption of 240 would support jobs growth and economic investment in the Borough over the remainder of the plan period by providing sufficient economically active workers to support the delivery of this.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> | -- | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146dpa)</i> <u>Likely Significant Effects</u> 146 dpa would lead to a contraction of the working population, and fail to support job growth within Pendle driving investment elsewhere. People may be forced to commute for work or leave the Borough altogether.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Significant negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None</p> <p><u>Assumption</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146dpa and 298dpa) | |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Economic conditions may alter significantly over the plan period affecting the effectiveness of this policy in responding to economic needs. Low-medium risk.</p> | ++ | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>298 would benefit the local economy helping to support local jobs, attract investment, and provide new labour resources. Additional dwellings in the Borough would support construction jobs and investment in the Borough with increased spend by new residents contributing to the local economy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Wider economic changes and the effects this has on the local economy. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>New homes will provide for higher quality environment and housing stock promoting the attractiveness of the Borough as a place to live, work and invest in. Where required, sites are allocated in rural areas to support the vitality of these areas. Sites are identified accessible to existing services and infrastructure to minimise the need to travel by car. Viability constraints has however limited allocations on urban renewal sites owing to deliverability concerns.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> | 0 | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>New homes will provide for a higher quality environment and diversification of the housing stock. This is however more limited than other options and fail to support the local economy especially given the lack of additional housing supply likely to be provided in addition to commitments through the adoption of this option. Provision of housing is however likely to be on sites with greater sustainability merits owing to the limited need to develop land. On balance this option is considered to have a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p>Urban area viability is assessed as low and as such requires additional funding to provide for a deliverable development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | 0 | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2 (298dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>This option would significantly diversify stock, enable rural housing needs to be met and provide significant investment in the Borough. Delivery of the housing requirement would however lead to the need to develop more land resulting in development which are located further from existing services and infrastructure countering the positive effects of additional housing provision for deprivation and built quality. The option is assessed to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will provide opportunity to access new high quality housing helping to address issues of deprivation and overcrowding. Open space provided as part of developments will give rise to the opportunity to access local sources of recreation helping to increase physical activity especially for the Borough's young population.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design quality standards through materials, siting, layout, aspect, massing etc. Infrastructure improvements through developer funding.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy may help safeguard the open countryside from loss to development, however would result in a reduced supply in comparison to the number of new homes required to meet affordable housing need and the number of new homes required to support the local economy forcing people to travel further to access work.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Exception sites and windfall may enable broader housing needs to be met.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|--|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Achievability with viability issues. Medium risk.</p> | + | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2 (298dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will provide the opportunity to access an increased supply of housing potentially addressing the housing needs of a broad range of the community. The housing requirement would also support the local economy and attract investment. Counter to this is the need to develop more land with potential adverse effects for local amenity and wellbeing due to the loss of greenfield land and potential reduced access to the open countryside. The overall effect is considered to be minor positive for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Implementation of high quality design measures.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Achievability with viability issues. Scope within sites to provide benefits. Medium risk.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The proposed requirement is less than outlined within the Core Strategy and previously been assessed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The proposal is likely to result in limited pressure on existing services, facilities and infrastructure. The extent of this pressure and the need for any policy response will be determined with providers over the remaining plan making stages. At this stage a minor negative effect is assessed.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative in the short term neutralising over the plan period with mitigation.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Developer contributions towards infrastructure and service enhancement. Travel plan measures to discourage car usage.</p> | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Lower housing requirements should mean significantly less/lower pressure on infrastructure and facilities. Lower development however may adversely impact the deliverability of the Infrastructure Development Plan outlined at adoption of the Core Strategy. It may also give rise to unsustainable commuting patterns as housing provision has been insufficient to support economic investment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Direct provision or funding via S.106.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146dpa and 298dpa) | |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | - | <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Site specific circumstances mean it may not be possible to fund infrastructure and service investment. Public sector cuts undermine investments made by developments. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2 (298 dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The release and development of a larger supply of housing land is likely to add further pressure onto local infrastructure. This pressure will be moderated towards a neutral effect by on-site delivery/contributions as required through policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Minor negative effects neutralising in the longer term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Direct provision or funding via S.106.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Viability. Funding for existing infrastructure. Changes in demand/patterns of use. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The proposed housing requirement will require the development of greenfield land to meet identified needs resulting in a permanent loss of greenfield land.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Permanent minor adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Allocated sites fail to come forward as envisaged. A sufficient supply of housing land is not maintained. Development pressures alter over the plan period. Low-Medium Risk.</p> | 0 | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> No further allocations would be required to meet this housing requirement. The policy would not require the development of any further land in addition to committed development and so wouldn't contribute to the renewal of existing land either. The policy would therefore have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Deliverability of existing supply. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | | - | <p>Reasonable Alternative 2 (298 dpa)</p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The proposed housing requirement will require the development of greenfield land to meet identified needs resulting in a permanent loss of greenfield land. There is minimal amounts of BMV in the Borough so the impact is not assessed as significant despite the increased need for land vs. the preferred option.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent minor adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Allocated sites fail to come forward as envisaged. A sufficient supply of housing land is not maintained. Development pressure alter over the plan period. Low-Medium Risk.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The requirement will necessitate further allocated sites is likely to result in an increase in pressure on water resources due to the additional demand created (both supply and waste). The Council will continue to liaise with the relevant bodies and developers to understand the implications of planned development on water supply. At this stage it is considered there is sufficient capacity to accommodate additional development although longer term sensitivities are acknowledged. Furthermore, the adverse effects of this however could be reduced further by policy requirements for developments to adopt efficient standards in water usage.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> | 0 | <p>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146dpa)</p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>No further allocations would be required to meet this housing requirement. The policy would therefore have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Deliverability of existing supply. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|--|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p>The effects of the policy are assessed to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of water efficiency standards in development. Enhancements to the water supply network.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The effects of Climate change events and potential additional pressure on water supply over the course of the plan period as a result. Medium Risk.</p> | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2 (298dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The requirement will necessitate further allocated sites with increase pressure to build closer to water courses and increased usage of water resources due to the additional demand created (both supply and waste). The adverse effects of development may be reduced by directing development away from water courses and through the application of policy requirements for developments to adopt efficient standards in water usage.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential adverse effects, moderating through the application of wider policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of water efficiency standards in development. Enhancements to the water supply network.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The effects of Climate change events and potential additional pressure on water supply over the course of the plan period as a result. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The proposed approach is likely to requirement the identification and development of additional sites most likely on greenfield land. The site selection process has sifted out proposed sites in FZ2 and FZ3. Some sites may include some land at risk of flooding however these areas are to be kept free from development. Site requirement outline the need for the risk of flooding to be evaluated and responded to through the application process to ensure no increase in flood risk on and off site as a result of the development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> | 0 | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>No further allocations would be required to meet this housing requirement. The policy would therefore have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design specific measures to response to flood risk and climate change. Adoption of the SuDs hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Deliverability of existing supply. Effects of climate change. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p>Design specific measures to response to flood risk and climate change. Adoption of the SuDs hierarchy.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainties Climate change events on flooding may be different to currently expected. Development pressures requiring more greenfield land. Medium Risk.</p> | 0 | <p>Reasonable Alternative 2 (298dpa) Likely Significant Effects The proposed approach is likely to requirement the identification and development of additional sites most likely on greenfield land. The site selection process has sifted out proposed sites in FZ2 and FZ3. Some sites may include some land at risk of flooding however these areas are to be kept free from development. Site requirement outline the need for the risk of flooding to be evaluated and responded to through the application process to ensure no increase in flood risk on and off site as a result of the development.</p> <p>Term Neutral effect over the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation Design specific measures to response to flood risk and climate change. Adoption of the SuDs hierarchy.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainties Climate change events on flooding may be different to currently expected. Development pressures requiring more greenfield land. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects This option will require additional sites with likely increased demand on the need to travel. The site selection process has identified sites only in areas considered to be accessible to existing services and infrastructure by sustainable modes of transport, greenfield sites are however likely to be more distant from services as settlements expand outwards. Measures are in policy place to secure improvements in infrastructure and services moderating the impact of development on this objective. The overall effect is assessed as a minor negative.</p> <p>Term Minor negative effects reducing over the plan period with mitigation measures put in place.</p> <p>Mitigation Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements</p> | - | <p>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146dpa) Likely Significant Effects No further allocations would be required to meet this housing requirement. The policy would however deliver insufficient development to support housing need and insufficient growth to support the local economy. The policy is therefore likely to increase unsustainable patterns of travel to access suitable housing and/or employment. A minor adverse effect is assessed.</p> <p>Term Minor adverse effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation None.</p> <p>Assumption None.</p> <p>Uncertainties Deliverability of existing supply. Effects of climate change. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Viability of implementing infrastructure requirements. Take up by future users instead of relying on the car. Pressures to development greenfield sites as a result of under supply or changing development needs. Medium risk.</p> | -- | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2 (298 dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> Additional sites are in greenfield locations and are less well served/accessible to services, shops and sources of employment. This promotes increased reliance of unsustainable forms of transport as a means for access and likely increased pressure on local highways particularly areas of poor air quality such as the North Valley.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Significant Negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements. Contributions towards services and facilities and public transport. Onsite energy generation. Carbon offsetting measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Viability and scope to address infrastructure requirements. Take up of sustainable modes by users. Changing needs and demand. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The requirement will require additional sites with likely increased demand on the need to travel and of resources as a result of the carbon based economy. The site selection process has identified sites only in areas considered to be accessible to existing services and infrastructure by sustainable modes of transport. Measures are in policy place to secure improvements in infrastructure and services, as well as adoption of measures to reduce energy usage will moderate the impact of development on this objective. The overall effect is assessed as a minor negative.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Minor negative effects reducing over the plan period with mitigation measures put in place.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements. Adoption of suitable design, construction and operation measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1 (146 dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> No further allocations would be required to meet this housing requirement. Measures outlined in the Local Plan to mitigate and adapt to climate change could not be implemented given that sufficient development is already approved. Development would not therefore respond to this objective effectively. The policy would however deliver insufficient development to support housing need and insufficient growth to support the local economy. The policy is therefore likely to increase unsustainable patterns of travel to access suitable housing and/or employment. A minor adverse effect is assessed.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Minor adverse effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Deliverability of existing supply. Effects of climate change. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability of adopting higher build quality standards. Pressures to development greenfield sites as a result of under supply or changing development needs. Medium risk.</p> | -- | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2 (298dpa)</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The requirement will require additional sites with likely increased demand on the need to travel. The site selection process has identified sites only in areas considered to be accessible to existing services and infrastructure by sustainable modes of transport. This promotes increased reliance of unsustainable forms of transport as a means for access and likely increased pressure on local highways particularly areas of poor air quality such as the North Valley.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant Negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements. Contributions towards services and facilities and public transport. Onsite energy generation. Carbon offsetting measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability of adopting higher build quality standards. Pressures to development greenfield sites as a result of under supply or changing development needs. Medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would require the allocation of additional land for development increasing pressure for development in safeguarding areas which are generally extensive across the plan area. The loss of land within safeguarding areas is considered through the site selection and consultation about the suitability of sites for development in reference to minerals is to be had with Lancashire County Council (the local minerals authority). At face value the policy is likely to have a negative effect on this objective, reducing to neutral potentially by the end of plan preparation.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> | 0 | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1 – 146dpa.</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy does not require the development of any further land thereby safeguarding natural resources.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Deliverability of existing supply. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | - | <p>Potential minor negative effects to be confirmed with Lancashire County Council.</p> <p>Mitigation Efficient use of land. Consultation with LCC. Planning conditions.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainties None.</p> | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects The policy would require the allocation of additional land for development increasing pressure for development in safeguarding areas. The loss of land within safeguarding areas is considered through the site selection and consultation about the suitability of sites for development in reference to minerals is to be had with Lancashire County Council (the local minerals authority). At face value the policy is likely to have a negative effect on this objective, reducing to neutral potentially by the end of plan preparation.</p> <p>Term Potential minor negative effects to be confirmed with Lancashire County Council.</p> <p>Mitigation Efficient use of land. Consultation with LCC. Planning conditions.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainties None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects The proposed requirement will require the development of greenfield land potentially fulfilling a role for wildlife, geodiversity or green infrastructure. The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated ecological and geological sites and the green infrastructure network. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and enhance sites for ecology and green infrastructure. Wider policies of the development plan also apply which seek to secure net benefits for biodiversity through the development of sites. Nevertheless the development of greenfield land to meet development needs will create pressure on the environment and local wildlife. The</p> | + | <p>Reasonable Alternative 1 – 146dpa Likely Significant Effects The policy does not require the allocation of additional land thereby helping to conserve existing biodiversity, geodiversity and the Green Infrastructure network from loss or adverse effects to development.</p> <p>Term Minor positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation None.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainties Deliverability of existing supply. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p>overall effect is assessed as a minor negative effect reducing towards neutral over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative effects for the plan period potentially reducing in the longer term with the implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and habitat areas. Public open space. Specific species measures such as bat and bird boxes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of addressing biodiversity issues. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2 – 298dpa.</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The proposed requirement will require the development of greenfield land potentially important for wildlife, geodiversity or green infrastructure. The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated ecological and geological sites and the green infrastructure network. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and enhance sites for ecology and green infrastructure. Wider policies of the development plan also apply which seek to secure net benefits for biodiversity through the development of sites. Nevertheless the development of greenfield land to meet development needs will create pressure on the environment and local wildlife. The overall effect is assessed as a minor negative effect reducing towards neutral over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative effects for the plan period potentially reducing in the longer term with the implementation of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and habitat areas. Public open space. Specific species measures such as bat and bird boxes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of addressing biodiversity issues. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The requirement for additional housing will increase pressure on heritage assets in the Borough and likelihood for adverse effects. The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated heritage assets. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance historical sites. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be uncertain however this will vary site by site depending on how a site relates to any nearby heritage assets.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> | + | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1 – 146dpa</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy does not require the allocation of additional land thereby helping to conserve existing heritage assets from loss or adverse effects as a result of new development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Deliverability of existing supply. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <u>Assumptions</u> None. <u>Uncertainties</u> Relationship to heritage assets and scope/extent of effect on development proposals. (Low risk) | ? | <i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i> <u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The requirement for additional housing will increase pressure on heritage assets in the Borough and likelihood for adverse effects. The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated heritage assets. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance historical sites. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be uncertain however this will vary site by site depending on how a site relates to any nearby heritage assets. <u>Term</u> Uncertain effects for the plan period. <u>Mitigation</u> Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials <u>Assumptions</u> None. <u>Uncertainties</u> Site by site variation. Low risk. |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | - | <u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The requirement for additional housing will increase pressure on landscape and townscape character in the Borough and likelihood for adverse effects due to the need to develop greenfield sites which generally due to the physical characteristics of the Borough (topography and flood risk) can be prominent on the landscape. The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated areas/assets and landscape character. The spatial strategy directs development towards the main urban areas of the Borough, avoiding those most sensitive to development such as the Green Belt and AONB. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance historical sites. The overall effect of the policy is considered to have a minor negative effect with the potential | + | <i>Reasonable Alternative 1 – 146dpa</i> <u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy does not require the allocation of additional land thereby helping to conserve existing landscape and townscape from potentially adverse effects of new development. <u>Term</u> Minor positive effects for the plan period. <u>Mitigation</u> None. <u>Assumptions</u> None. <u>Uncertainties</u> Deliverability of existing supply. Low-medium risk. |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option (240 dpa) | | Reasonable Alternatives (146pda and 298dpa) | |
|--------------|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| | | <p>for these to be reduced over the plan period depending on the success of site specific mitigation measures put in place.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period, moderating over time with maturity of development and associated landscaping and open space.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Feasibility and viability of implementation of measures (Low-medium risk).</p> | -- | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The requirement for additional housing will increase pressure on landscape and townscape character in the Borough and likelihood for adverse effects due to the need to develop greenfield sites which generally due to the physical characteristics of the Borough (topography and flood risk) can be prominent on the landscape. The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated areas/assets and landscape character. The spatial strategy directs development towards the main urban areas of the Borough, avoiding those most sensitive to development such as the Green Belt and AONB. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance historical sites. The overall effect of the policy is considered to have a minor negative effect with the potential for these to be reduced over the plan period depending on the success of site specific mitigation measures put in place. A higher degree of effect is assessed for this objective owing to the need to develop more land to meet this option in full.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant adverse effects, particularly in the short-medium term. There is the potential for this to moderate over time with maturity of development and associated landscaping and open space.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Feasibility and viability of implementation of measures (Low-medium risk).</p> |

Policy LIV 7: Housing Site Allocations

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option sets out specific requirements for each site identified as an allocation to respond to the housing needs identified for the plan period. The policy scores positively for most objectives ensuring that sites are developed sustainably.

Reasonable Alternative: There are two tested reasonable alternatives to this policy. The first (reasonable alternative one) would not be to allocate sites for housing but rather rely on windfall development related to strategic policies. This option scores negatively for most objectives given the uncertainty caused by this approach. The approach outlined in LIV7 is preferred given that it provides the necessary certainty to applicants, decision makers, statutory consultees and the community alike to ensure that a site identified for housing is developed responsive to needs, is delivered sustainably and addresses site specific conditions. The second tested option (reasonable alternative two) is for Reserve Sites, identified in Policy LIV8 are released now through Policy LIV7 giving a greater amount of housing land supply. Whilst this benefits need objectives, this approach would have adverse effects for some environmental objectives. As such this reasonable alternative has also been rejected by the Council.

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|--|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The Local Plan identifies sufficient land to meet the identified housing needs of the Borough in response to demographic, market signals, and economic growth. These sites will contribute significantly to choice in the market, helping to broaden the type of homes available within the Borough, and aid to achieve an increase in the quality of the housing stock. The policy however does not address existing problems experienced in the quality of housing stock, and will fail to meet assessed affordable needs in full owing to environmental and viability considerations.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>All developments will be expected to provide for a mix of house types, sizes and tenures which is responsive to local housing need. Affordable Housing delivery will be maximised in accordance with viability. 100% affordable housing schemes which may come forward over the plan period will increase the responsiveness of the Local Plan to fulfilling this need.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Viability acts as the main barrier to meeting housing needs in full over the plan period.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Changes in costs and demands alters the type of housing delivered or required. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p>Reasonable Alternative 1 - Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Relying on windfall development is unlikely to provide the diversity of land, type and tenures of development required to meet the assessed broad need of housing for the period.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>For the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The scale, location and timing of housing sites is unknown. High risk.</p> |
| | | | ++ | <p>Reasonable Alternative 2</p> <p>Likely significant effects</p> <p>A larger housing land supply would enable a broader range of housing needs to be met in response to identified needs.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Significant benefits over the short, medium and long term</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Secured through condition/s.106.</p> <p>Assumption</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties – Viability. Medium Risk</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The sites identified will help achieve the full delivery of the housing requirement which has been derived to support the provision of a net increase in jobs over the plan period by providing sufficient workforce to enable this growth to be achieved. Identified sites are also largely in close proximity to existing/proposed employment sites, providing employers with access to additional workforce to help meet growth needs. New homes will support jobs in the construction sector. New homes will attract investment in Pendle and greater local spend supporting existing jobs.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Economic conditions may alter significantly over the plan period affecting the effectiveness of this policy in responding to economic needs. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy approach would fail to support the local economy given the uncertainty that sufficient land will come forward as required over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale, location and timing of housing development is unknown. High Risk</p> |
| | | | ++ | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>An increased supply of housing would benefit the local economy helping to support local jobs, attract investment, and provide new labour resources.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Wider economic changes and the effects this has on the local economy. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Allocated sites will provide for higher quality environment and housing stock promoting the attractiveness of the Borough as a place to live, work and invest in. Where required, sites are allocated in rural areas to support the vitality of these areas. Sites are identified accessible to existing services and infrastructure to minimise the need to travel by car. Viability constraints has however limited allocations on urban renewal sites owing to deliverability concerns. Policy LIV7 as drafted does however include brownfield land, as well as greenfield sites in more deprived parts of the Borough to help assist with regeneration.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Urban area viability is assessed as low and as such requires additional funding to provide for a deliverable development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Windfall development wherever delivered will promote investment, help tackle social deprivation and support rural vitality, however the scale, timing and location of this investment is uncertain and would be counterproductive to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>For the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale, location and timing of housing sites is unknown. High risk.</p> |
| | | | + | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites are greenfield and as such have limited positive effects for this policy objective. The development of these sites provides further investment in the Borough, but is not considered higher than the preferred option owing to the fact that this greater supply is unlikely to support urban regeneration and promote sustainable living owing to the need to develop sites which are less sustainable.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy will provide opportunity to access new high quality housing helping to address identified key issues within the baseline for the SA such as deprivation and overcrowding. Policy requirements will secure high quality design with open space provided as part of developments will give rise to the opportunity to access local sources of recreation. Sites have been assessed for their accessibility to existing services including healthcare provision. Sufficient housing is provided to support economic growth, helping to increase access to jobs beneficial to health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Design quality standards through materials, siting, layout, aspect, massing etc. Infrastructure improvements through developer funding.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Achievability with viability issues. Medium risk.</p> | -/? | <p>Reasonable Alternative 1</p> <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy will support the development of new housing over the plan period, but the scale and location of this is unknown. This challenges planning for the necessary infrastructure, and how such sites would contribute to meet health and wellbeing objectives for the plan area. The policy is therefore assessed as having a negative/uncertain effect.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Negative/uncertain effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Infrastructure/contributions provided through proposals.</p> <p>Assumption</p> <p>Means to make the site sustainable exists within the scope of the proposal.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The scale, location and timing of housing sites is unknown. High risk.</p> |
| | | | + | <p>Reasonable Alternative 2</p> <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy will provide greater opportunity to access new high quality housing helping to address issues of deprivation and overcrowding. However the requirement to development more greenfield land is likely to result in adverse effects to amenity and access to recreation as currently undeveloped land is lost permanently.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Implementation of high quality design measures.</p> <p>Assumption</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Achievability with viability issues. Scope within sites to provide benefits. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Identified sites are considered to be accessible to existing services and facilities by sustainable modes of transport. This is illustrated through the site allocation process assisting in the support of this objective. Sites have also been allocated responsive to the spatial strategy as set by the Core Strategy, with an emphasis on the M65 corridor. Whilst brownfield sites make a contribution to the supply, there is also a reliance greenfield sites which can in general be more distant from services than brownfield alternatives. As such, on balance, overall the policy is consider to have a neutral effect in response to this objective</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Developer contributions towards infrastructure and service enhancement. Travel plan measures to discourage car usage.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Site specific circumstances mean it may not be possible to fund infrastructure and service investment. Public sector cuts undermine investments made by developments. Low-medium risk.</p> | -- | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The scale, timing and location of development would be unknown challenging the proper planning of infrastructure and harming the implementation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Means may exist within the scope of a development to fund necessary infrastructure on a site level but this could undermine the wider strategy. Significant negative effects are therefore assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Direct provision or funding via S.106.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale, location and timing of development is unknown. High Risk.</p> |
| | | | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The release and development of a larger supply of housing land is likely to add further pressure onto local infrastructure. The assessed impact is considered to be minor adverse given that the effects of the development will be moderated by on-site delivery/contributions of infrastructure as required through policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Direct provision or funding via S.106.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability. Funding for existing infrastructure. Changes in demand/patterns of use. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Allocated sites will require the development of greenfield land to meet identified needs. The policy seeks to ensure that housing sites are developed efficiently, with the density achieved on site responsive to opportunities therefore reducing the effect of this policy on this objective. Overall the policy is assessed to have a minor negative effect on this objective</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent minor adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Allocated sites fail to come forward as envisaged. A sufficient supply of housing land is not maintained. Development pressures alter over the plan period. Low-Medium Risk.</p> | -/? | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Unclear where development would come forward. There is increased risk that a high proportion of development would come forward on greenfield sites owing to low viability of PDL. This would result in harmful effects for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent minor adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale, location and timing of development is unknown. High Risk.</p> |
| | | | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites are on greenfield land resulting in the permanent loss of undeveloped land. Whilst the loss is increased in comparison to the preferred option, the effect is considered to be broadly the same owing to the absence of BMV in the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent minor adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Allocated sites fail to come forward as envisaged. A sufficient supply of housing land is not maintained. Development pressure alter over the plan period. Low-Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|--|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Further development in the Borough at allocated sites is likely to result in an increase in pressure on water resources due to the additional demand created (both supply and waste). The Council will continue to liaise with the relevant bodies and developers to understand the implications of planned development on water supply. At this stage it is considered there is sufficient capacity to accommodate additional development, though it is acknowledged there is longer term sensitivity in this supply. Furthermore, the adverse effects of this however are reduced by policy requirements for developments to adopt efficient standards in water usage. Development may also affect water quality standards. Safeguards are in place in policy to minimise the potential for adverse effects from development on water quality.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Changing impacts over the duration of the plan period. Overall neutral effect is assessed with mitigation measures implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of water efficiency standards in development. Enhancements to the water supply network.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The effects of Climate change events and potential additional pressure on water supply over the course of the plan period as a result. Medium Risk.</p> | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is uncertain effects for water resource and quality making planning to respond to demand difficult. The overall effects of this policy is assessed as having a minor negative effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design measures. Infrastructure delivery. Water capacity investment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale, type, location and timing of development. Effects of climate change. Means to address supply/resources. Medium risk.</p> |
| | | | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The development of housing over and above assessed need is likely to result in increased pressure on water supply and resources. The overall effect of this increased amount of growth is a minor negative effect for this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasing negative over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design measures. Infrastructure delivery. Water capacity investment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of climate change. Means to address supply/resources. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has sifted out proposed sites in FZ2 and FZ3 in accordance with national planning policy. Some sites identified may include some land at risk of flooding however these areas are to be kept free from development with layout and form of development informed by the SFRA. Site requirement outline the need for the risk of flooding to be evaluated and responded to through the application process to ensure no increase in flood risk on and off site as a result of the development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect over the plan period with adoption of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design specific measures to response to flood risk and climate change. Adoption of the SuDs hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change events on flooding may be different to currently expected. Development pressures requiring more greenfield land. Medium Risk.</p> | ? | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy approach will have an uncertain effect on this objective owing to the absence of knowledge of the scale, type and location of development likely to come forward in accordance with policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain impacts over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting of development. Design specific measures to respond to flood risk and climate change. Adoption of the SuDs hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of climate change. Location, scale and timing of development. Medium-High risk.</p> |
| | | | 0 | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Site selection process has sifted out sites affected by FZ2 and FZ3. Policy requirements will ensure that any land within sites subject to flood risk will not be built on, and sufficient measures are put in place to prevent an increase in flood risk in off-site locations.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral for the plan period with adoption of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Layout and other design measures. Adoption of SuDs Hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Effects of climate change. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|----------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Sites are identified in areas considered to be accessible to existing services and infrastructure by sustainable modes of transport. Measures are in policy place to secure improvements in infrastructure and services. Overall it is considered that proposals will not adversely affect air quality.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period with policy measures implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability of implementing infrastructure requirements. Take up by future users instead of relying on the car. Pressures to development greenfield sites as a result of under supply or changing development needs. Medium risk.</p> | -/? | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>It will be unclear at what location, scale or timing development would come forward. The result is a likely orientation towards greenfield sites due to viability issues for PDL. These sites are less well served/accessible to services, shops, and sources of employment resulting in increased usage of unsustainable forms of transport. The result is a likely adverse effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Location, scale and timing of development. Viability and availability of viable means to address infrastructure issues. Take up by future residents. High - Medium Risk.</p> |
| | | | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Additional sites are in greenfield locations and are less well served/accessible to services, shops and sources of employment. This promotes increased reliance of unsustainable forms of transport as a means for access. A negative effect is likely.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and scope to address infrastructure requirements. Take up of sustainable modes by users. Changing needs and demand. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Sites are identified in areas considered to be accessible to existing services and infrastructure by sustainable modes of transport. Measures are in place through the policy to secure improvements in infrastructure and services. Through policy new buildings are encouraged to adopt sustainable build/material standards and design measures which help to reduce and conserve energy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely collective minor adverse effects reducing towards neutral over the plan period with adoption of wider policy measures to reduce impacts of climate change.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of sustainable design and material measures through the planning and development process. Infrastructure investment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability of adopting higher build quality standards. Pressures to development greenfield sites as a result of under supply or changing development needs. Medium risk.</p> | -/? | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>It will be unclear at what location, scale or timing development would come forward. The result is a likely orientation towards greenfield sites due to viability issues for PDL resulting in a loss of natural resource. These sites are less well served/accessible to services, shops, and sources of employment resulting in increased usage of unsustainable forms of transport. The result is a likely adverse effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements. Open space.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Location, scale and timing of development. Viability and availability of viable means to address infrastructure issues. Take up by future residents. High - Medium Risk.</p> |
| | | | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Additional sites are in greenfield locations and are less well served/accessible to services, shops and sources of employment resulting in greater pressure for the environment and use of resources. This promotes increased reliance of unsustainable forms of transport as a means for access. A negative effect is likely.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and scope to address infrastructure requirements. Take up of sustainable modes by users. Changing needs and demand. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|--|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy allocates land for development, many of which are greenfield. Policy requirements for the development of these sites include the need to adopt sustainable measures during the construction process. The development of greenfield sites will result in the use of land with minerals and loss of natural resources. The overall effect is assessed a minor adverse.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent minor adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Sustainable construction methods to be conditioned as part of planning permission.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | -/? | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy does not control the timing, location or scale of development, and as such is likely to result in a less sustainable use of natural resources, especially where there is greater pressure/prospect of developing greenfield land owing to viability issues.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Sustainable construction methods.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Timing, location or scale of development is uncertain. High Risk.</p> |
| | | | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would result in additional development requiring the use of more natural resources and increased pressure on the waste processing. The development of greenfield sites will result in the use of land with minerals and loss of natural resources. Minor negative effects are therefore assessed.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent minor adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Sustainable methods of construction.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated ecological and geological sites and the green infrastructure network protecting the Borough's most sensitive environmental assets. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and enhance sites for ecology and green infrastructure. Wider policies of the development plan also apply which seek to secure net benefits for biodiversity through the development of sites. Nevertheless the development of greenfield land to meet development needs will create pressure on the environment and local wildlife. The overall effect is assessed as neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial adverse effects likely to be most prominent during construction and in the early years post completion. Improving over time with the adoption of mitigation and enhancement measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and habitat areas. Public open space. Specific species measures such as bat and bird boxes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of addressing biodiversity issues. Low-medium risk.</p> | -/? | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy does not control the timing, location or scale of development, and as such is likely to result in the development of greenfield land with greater pressure on biodiversity and loss/adverse effects to green infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial adverse effects likely to be most prominent during construction and in the early years post completion. Improving over time with the adoption of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and habitat areas. Public open space. Specific species measures such as bat and bird boxes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Timing, location or scale of development is uncertain. High Risk.</p> |
| | | | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated ecological and geological sites and the green infrastructure network. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and enhance sites for ecology and green infrastructure. Wider policies of the development plan also apply which seek to secure net benefits for biodiversity through the development of sites. Nevertheless the development of greenfield land to meet development needs above and beyond those allocated within the Local Plan will create additional pressure on the environment and local wildlife. The overall effect is assessed as a minor adverse effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial adverse effects likely to be most prominent during construction and in the early years post completion. Improving over time with the adoption of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and habitat areas. Public open space. Specific species measures such as bat and bird boxes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of addressing biodiversity issues. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|--|------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated heritage assets. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance historical sites in alignment with wider policies of the Local Plan. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be neutral however this will vary site by site depending on how a site relates to any nearby heritage assets.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period for the Borough as a whole. Varied on a site by site basis.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Relationship to heritage assets and scope/extent of effect on development proposals. (Low risk)</p> | ? | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The enabling of windfall development means that the scale, type, and location of housing is unknown. The local plan constraints policy measures to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance historical sites. Notwithstanding this, the extent of any impact will vary site by site depending on the presence and proximity of heritage assets and their relationship to the development site.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Site by site variation. Low risk.</p> |
| | | | 0 | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated heritage assets. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance historical sites. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be neutral however this will vary site by site depending on how a site relates to any nearby heritage assets.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period for the Borough as a whole. Varied on a site by site basis.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Site by site variation. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternatives | |
|---|------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account, at a high level, the effects of developing sites on landscapes and townscapes. Sites most sensitive to this objective are scored negatively through this process. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to minimise the impacts of development on landscapes and to secure enhancements to the built environment. Notwithstanding this, the development of greenfield land is likely to erode the countryside and adversely affect the local landscapes this is particularly more likely in Pendle where topography can vary quite significant with areas prominent from long distant views. The impact on local townscape is less certain and is likely to vary depending on site specific issues. A minor adverse effect is identified.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period, moderating over time with maturity of development and associated landscaping and open space.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Feasibility and viability of implementation of measures (Low-medium risk).</p> | -/? | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 1</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy does not control the timing, location or scale of development, and as such is likely to result in the development of greenfield land with potential adverse effects for landscape and townscape.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period, moderated in time with maturity of development and associated landscaping and open space.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and habitat areas. Public open space. Specific species measures such as bat and bird boxes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Timing, location or scale of development is uncertain. High Risk.</p> |
| | | | - | <p><i>Reasonable Alternative 2</i></p> <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account to a high level the effects of developing sites on landscapes and townscapes. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to minimise the impacts of development on landscapes and to secure enhancements to the built environment. Nevertheless the development of greenfield land to meet development needs above and beyond those allocated within the Local Plan will create additional pressure on the environment and local wildlife.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse effects for the plan period, moderating over time with maturity of development and associated landscaping and open space.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and habitat areas. Public open space.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of addressing biodiversity issues. Low-medium risk.</p> |

Policy LIV 8: Reserved Sites for Housing

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option identifies additional sites to be released for housing if certain circumstances arise during the plan period. Like Policy LIV6, the policy sets out specific requirements for each site. The policy scores positively for need based objectives, however scores negatively in terms of its environmental effects owing to the need to develop more land.

Reasonable Alternative: There are a number of reasonable alternatives to this policy. The first is that all reserved sites are released upfront and form allocations with the remainder of planned allocations. The implications of this is assessed above as a reasonable alternative to LIV7 and so is not repeated here. A second reasonable alternative is that the justification for release is altered from a five year supply type scenario as outlined in the policy to a housing trajectory based approach. Whilst this scenario would mean that the timing of the release may be different, the assessed effects would not alter to those set out below for the preferred option given that this will comprise of the same sites. This approach is not favoured given that the housing trajectory represents the Council's best estimate of housing delivery based on a snapshot of time. The Council consider that the proposed mechanism of five year supply is more effective in securing consistent delivery over the plan period. The final reasonable alternative, which is tested below, is if the overall amount of reserved sites was to be increased by at least 20% to give additional flexibility. The result of this is greater harm for environmental objectives with limited effect for need based, economic and societal objectives. This approach is not therefore favoured by the Council and has been dismissed as an option for Policy LIV7.

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites provide an additional source of supply should delivery issues be experienced with identified allocations. The additional supply of housing brought by reserve sites will have wider benefits for responding to housing needs, providing an increase range, type and sizes of homes in Borough. Additional quality housing stock and affordable housing need. As a result it is considered that the policy provides significant benefits to this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential significant positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>All developments will be expected to provide for a mix of house types, sizes and tenures which is responsive to local housing need. Affordable Housing delivery will be maximised in accordance with viability. 100% affordable housing schemes which may come forward over the plan period will increase the responsiveness of the Local Plan to fulfilling this need.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Viability acts as the main barrier to meeting housing needs in full over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites provide an additional source of supply should delivery issues be experienced with identified allocations. The additional supply of housing brought by reserve sites will have wider benefits for responding to housing needs, providing an increase range, type and sizes of homes in Borough. Additional quality housing stock and affordable housing need. As a result it is considered that the policy provides significant benefits to this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential significant positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>All developments will be expected to provide for a mix of house types, sizes and tenures which is responsive to local housing need. Affordable Housing delivery will be maximised in accordance with viability. 100% affordable housing schemes which may come forward over the plan period will increase the responsiveness of the Local Plan to fulfilling this need.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Viability acts as the main barrier to meeting housing needs in full over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Sites identified will help achieve the full delivery of the housing requirement which has been derived to support the provision of a net increase in jobs over the plan period consistent with the observation made within the HNA. Identified sites are also largely in close proximity to existing/proposed employment sites, providing employers with access to additional workforce to help meet growth needs. New homes will support jobs in the construction sector. New homes will attract investment in Pendle and greater local spend supporting existing jobs.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential medium and long term significant benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Economic conditions may alter significantly over the plan period affecting the effectiveness of this policy in responding to economic needs. Medium risk.</p> | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Sites identified will help achieve the full delivery of the housing requirement which has been derived to support the provision of a net increase in jobs over the plan period. Identified sites are also largely in close proximity to existing/proposed employment sites, providing employers with access to additional workforce to help meet growth needs. New homes will support jobs in the construction sector. New homes will attract investment in Pendle and greater local spend supporting existing jobs.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential medium and long term significant benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Economic conditions may alter significantly over the plan period affecting the effectiveness of this policy in responding to economic needs. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites provide additional supply if needed over the plan period. Such sites will provide for higher quality environment and housing stock promoting the attractiveness of the Borough as a place to live, work and invest in. Reserve sites will help promote rural vitality where there is a shortfall in supply. However are less sustainable than allocated sites in their locational and will add to infrastructure pressures. A neutral effect is assessed.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential medium to longer term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Urban area viability is assessed as low and as such requires additional funding to provide for a deliverable development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites provide additional supply if needed over the plan period. Such sites will provide for higher quality environment and housing stock promoting the attractiveness of the Borough as a place to live, work and invest in. Reserve sites will help promote rural vitality where there is a shortfall in supply. However increased supply at reserve sites may serve to discourage investment within the urban area. As such the benefits of reserve land are nullified due to the potential harmful effects for promoting urban regeneration. A minor adverse effect is assessed.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely minor adverse effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Urban area viability is assessed as low and as such requires additional funding to provide for a deliverable development.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites are greenfield locations adjoining existing settlements, and whilst in agricultural use, may fulfil some role in contributing to the amenity or identity of a community or settlement. If developed, reserve sites will provide for a high quality environment with opportunity to access a broader range of housing enhancing health and wellbeing. Such sites however may be more distant from services, and the increased supply may result in pressure on services. Policy safeguards are however in place to ensure that the development of reserve site does not result in adverse effects on infrastructure capacity and the health and wellbeing of existing residents.</p> <p><u>Trend</u></p> <p>Likely neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Developer contributions. Direct infrastructure provision. Design, layout, open space.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Achievability with viability issues. Medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>If developed, reserve sites will provide for a high quality environment with opportunity to access a broader range of housing enhancing health and wellbeing. Such sites however may be more distant from services, and the increased supply may result in pressure on services sites may also have residential amenity value. Policy safeguards are however in place to ensure that the development of reserve site does not result in adverse effects on infrastructure capacity and the health and wellbeing of existing residents. The impact of the policy is assessed as having a minor adverse owing to the adverse effects increased development will have for existing residents, including potential adverse effects on amenity due to loss of open space.</p> <p><u>Trend</u></p> <p>Likely minor adverse effects reducing in the long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Developer contributions. Direct infrastructure provision. Design, layout, open space.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Achievability with viability issues. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The release and development of a larger supply of housing land is likely to add further pressure onto local infrastructure. The assessed impact is considered to be minor adverse given that the effects of the development will be moderated by on-site delivery/contributions of infrastructure as required through policy. It is also moderated due to the fact that allocated sites align to the spatial strategy outlined within the Core Strategy, and provide for an overall level of growth which is less than anticipated at adoption.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor negative effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Direct provision or funding via S.106.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability. Funding for existing infrastructure. Changes in demand/patterns of use. Low-medium risk.</p> | -- | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites form additional supply in excess to housing requirements should sites allocated not come forward as envisaged. Whilst this supports the deliverability of the housing requirement, the additional housing will place greater pressure on infrastructure with development further and further away from existing facilities. Sites are also considered less sustainable than allocated sites so may have a greater need for travel.. The impact of additional growth provided by reserve sites will be considered in collaboration with key partners and developers and considered further through the remaining plan process. The effect of the policy is significant adverse effects however this could reduce with the application of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential significant adverse effects medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Success of measures in encouraging and facilitating a modal shift. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The development of reserve sites will result in the further loss of greenfield land. Reserve sites will only be released where needed. The amount of reserve sites is kept to a minimum to provide flexibility in fulfilling the plan's development requirements. As such it is not considered that reserve sites result in significant adverse effects in relation to this objectives.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential permanent minor adverse effects in the medium to long term</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design requirements re: density, layout, form, massing etc to enhance development efficiency and provide the best use of land.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The development of reserve sites will result in the further loss of greenfield land. Reserve sites will only be released where needed. Whilst the reasonable alternative would result in an increased use of land for housing than the preferred option, the general absence of BMV in the Borough means that the effects are also assessed as minor adverse.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential permanent minor adverse effects in the medium to long term</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design requirements re: density, layout, form, massing etc to enhance development efficiency and provide the best use of land.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Further development in the Borough at allocated sites is likely to result in an increase in pressure on water resources due to the additional demand created (both supply and waste). The Council will continue to liaise with the relevant bodies and developers to understand the implications of planned development on water supply. The adverse effects of this however are reduced by policy requirements for developments to adopt efficient standards in water usage. The benefit of planned development is that requirements can be addressed ahead or in tandem with the development. Safeguards are in place in policy to minimise the potential for adverse effects from development on water quality. A neutral effect is assessed.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential minor adverse effects reducing to neutral in the longer term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of water efficiency standards in development. Enhancements to the water supply network.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The effects of Climate change events and potential additional pressure on water supply over the course of the plan period as a result. Medium Risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Further development in the Borough at allocated sites is likely to result in an increase in pressure on water resources due to the additional demand created (both supply and waste). The Council will continue to liaise with the relevant bodies and developers to understand the implications of planned development on water supply. The adverse effects of this however are reduced by policy requirements for developments to adopt efficient standards in water usage. Development may also affect water quality standards. Whilst the reasonable alternative will provide for additional development against the preferred option policy safeguards and the site selection process provide for similar minor adverse effects for this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential minor adverse effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of water efficiency standards in development. Enhancements to the water supply network.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The effects of Climate change events and potential additional pressure on water supply over the course of the plan period as a result. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has sifted out proposed sites in FZ2 and FZ3. Some sites may include some land at risk of flooding however the development of these sites is to be informed by the Council's SFRA. Site requirement outline the need for the risk of flooding to be evaluated and responded to through the application process to ensure no increase in flood risk on and off site as a result of the development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design specific measures to response to flood risk and climate change. Adoption of the SuDs hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change events on flooding may be different to currently expected. Medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has sifted out proposed sites in FZ2 and FZ3. Some sites may include some land at risk of flooding however the development of these sites is to be informed by the Council's SFRA. Site requirement outline the need for the risk of flooding to be evaluated and responded to through the application process to ensure no increase in flood risk on and off site as a result of the development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design specific measures to response to flood risk and climate change. Adoption of the SuDs hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Climate change events on flooding may be different to currently expected. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|----------------------------|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 9. To improve air quality. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites will provide for additional opportunity to meet housing needs. Reserve sites are generally less accessible than allocated sites being further away from existing services and facilities. It is considered likely that their development will result in increased usage of the local road network. Measures are in policy place to secure improvements in infrastructure and services which will help soften effects on air quality, with an emphasis on promoting access via walking and cycling.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential minor adverse effects from the medium term, improving overtime.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability of implementing infrastructure requirements. Take up by future users instead of relying on the car. Medium risk.</p> | -- | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Reserve sites will provide for additional opportunity to meet housing needs. Reserve sites are generally less accessible than allocated sites being further away from existing services and facilities. It is considered likely that their development will result in increased usage of the local road network. Measures are in policy place to secure improvements in infrastructure and services which will help soften effects on air quality, with an emphasis on promoting access via walking and cycling. A greater supply of land provided through this policy, of the nature of sites identified, is considered to have a greater degree of adverse effects for this objective than the preferred option.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential significant adverse effects from the medium term, improving overtime.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancements</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability of implementing infrastructure requirements. Take up by future users instead of relying on the car. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Reserve sites will see additional development provided within the plan period to meet overall development requirements. Reserve sites have been through the same site selection process as allocated sites, meaning that at a high level environmental impacts have been taken into account, though nevertheless their development will in further pressures on the environment than just purely allocated growth. The adoption of mitigation measures consistent with policy will help minimise these effects.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Potential medium to long term adverse effects. Moderating overtime.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Sustainable materials/construction measures. Design measures to enhance efficiency and limit use of energy. Infrastructure enhancements and Travel Plan measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Feasibility of accommodating measures within developments. Viability considerations. Extent to which measures outlined to promote sustainable transport measures are adopted. Public funding cuts undermining infrastructure investment. Medium risk.</p> | -- | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Reserve sites will see additional development provided within the plan period to meet overall development requirements. Reserve sites have been through the same site selection process as allocated sites, meaning that at a high level environmental impacts have been taken into account, though nevertheless their development will result in further pressures on the environment than just purely allocated growth leading to significant adverse effects which could be moderated overtime with mitigation measures and reduced further depending on site specific circumstances.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Potential medium to long term significant adverse effects. Moderating overtime.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>Sustainable materials/construction measures. Design measures to enhance efficiency and limit use of energy. Infrastructure enhancements and Travel Plan measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Feasibility of accommodating measures within developments. Viability considerations. Extent to which measures outlined to promote sustainable transport measures are adopted. Public funding cuts undermining infrastructure investment. Medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | - | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy identifies land as reserve sites for housing development, many of which are greenfield with loss of minerals and natural resources. Policy requirements for the development of these sites include the need to adopt sustainable measures during the construction process. Overall the policy is considered to have a minor negative effect on this objective.</p> <p>Term Potential adverse effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation None.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainties None.</p> | -- | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy identifies an increased land as reserve sites for housing development, many of which are greenfield with loss of minerals and natural resources.. Policy requirements for the development of these sites include the need to adopt sustainable measures during the construction process. Overall the policy is considered to have a significant negative effect on this objective.</p> <p>Term Potential significant adverse effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation None.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainties None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated ecological and geological sites and the green infrastructure network ensuring the Borough's most sensitive assets are protected from harm or loss to inappropriate forms of development. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and enhance sites for ecology and green infrastructure. Wider policies of the development plan also apply which seek to secure net benefits for biodiversity through the development of sites. Nevertheless the development of greenfield land to meet development needs above and beyond those allocated within the Local Plan will create additional pressure on the environment and local wildlife.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential minor adverse effects reducing to neutral in the long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and habitat areas. Public open space. Specific species measures such as bat and bird boxes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of addressing biodiversity issues. Low-medium risk.</p> | -- | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated ecological and geological sites and the green infrastructure network. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and enhance sites for ecology and green infrastructure. Wider policies of the development plan also apply which seek to secure net benefits for biodiversity through the development of sites. Nevertheless the development of additional greenfield land to meet development needs above and beyond those allocated within the Local Plan will create additional pressure on the environment and local wildlife. Significant adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential significant adverse effects moderating in the longer term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and habitat areas. Public open space. Specific species measures such as bat and bird boxes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of addressing biodiversity issues. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated heritage assets. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance historical sites. Notwithstanding this, the extent of any impact will vary site by site depending on the presence and proximity of heritage assets and their relationship to the development site.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain potential effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Site by site variation. Low-medium.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account the proximity of sites to designated heritage assets. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance historical sites. Notwithstanding this, the need for additional development is likely to increase the potential for harm on the historic environment and as such the policy is assessed as having a likely adverse effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Site by site variation. Low-medium.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account to a high level the effects of developing sites on landscapes and townscapes. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to minimise the impacts of development on landscapes and to secure enhancements to the built environment. Notwithstanding this, the development of greenfield land and environmental constraints and characteristics of Pendle, means that any development of greenfield land is likely to erode the countryside and adversely affect the local landscapes. The impact on local townscape is less certain and is likely to vary depending on site specific issues. A minor adverse effect is identified.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential minor adverse effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Feasibility, viability, and success of implementation of mitigation measures. Low-medium</p> | -- | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site allocation process has taken into account to a high level the effects of developing sites on landscapes and townscapes. Site specific policy sets out specific measures to minimise the impacts of development on landscapes and to secure enhancements to the built environment. Notwithstanding this, the development of additional greenfield land is likely to erode the countryside and significantly adversely affect the local landscapes, with potential adverse effects also likely for the townscape.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant adverse effects reducing over time with mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting. Landscaping and design features and materials</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Feasibility, viability, and success of implementation of mitigation measures. Low-medium</p> |

Policy LIV 9: Affordable Housing

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to provide additional guidance in support of adopted Policy LIV4 to secure affordable housing within the Borough in response to needs. It sets out the approach for rural exception sites which could come forward to meet localised housing need in the rural area. The policy scores highly for social objectives, with broad neutral effects for economic and environmental objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: No reasonable alternative is considered to exist to this policy. The policy is set out in the context of Policy LIV4 which sets the overall affordable housing requirements for the development and is adopted in the Core Strategy. The policy is therefore drafted in general conformity with Policy LIV4, with guidance on rural exception housing reflective of the NPPF. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy supports the delivery of affordable housing in the Borough, seeking to secure provision responsive to assessed need identified through the HNA and to provide guidance for proposals brought forward in demonstrated response to localised needs. The policy is considered to have a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasingly positive effects over the plan period from the medium term as the policy is implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Medium risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy helps to support the local economy by seeking to provide housing in the area which is affordable for the workforce. Should homes be too expensive for workers, workers may be forced to travel and/or businesses relocate to areas where workers can afford to live. The policy therefore supports this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasingly positive effects over the plan period from the medium term as the policy is implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Affordable housing supports workers who are employed within the Borough.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>New affordable housing will help address local deprivation giving existing households in need of suitable accommodation an opportunity to relocate to. The provision of this housing could address issues of homelessness, overcrowding, and hidden households, which contribute to the high level of affordable housing need identified for the Borough. Affordable housing may in turn be beneficial for urban regeneration where included as part of schemes or where grant funding is available (in some parts of the Borough this is the only form of development which is viable). Affordable housing can contribute significantly to promoting the sustainability of rural areas, helping local people to remain in the areas they are from or work in ensuring that areas retain their young and the services that their presence supports. The effectiveness of the policy is reduced by the fact that the response provided will deliver less affordable homes than required owing to the extent of housing need and viability issues.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasingly positive effects over the plan period from the medium term as the policy is implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The associated costs of the policy has the possibility to negatively affect development viability. Wider costs of developing sites adversely affect the financial capacity of development to support affordable housing delivery. Some uncertainty on location of rural exception schemes though limited in scale and impact. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Access to suitable and affordable housing has a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of residents in the Borough, both physically and mentally. The policy therefore has a positive contribution to this objective, however this is tapered by the fact that the policy will fail to address identified needs in full, and as such the housing provided during the plan period will not meet the needs of everyone.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasingly positive effects over the plan period from the medium term as the policy is implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Windfall development, reserve sites, and 100% affordable sites may increase the amount of expected affordable housing supplied over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Site specific viability and practicality of meeting affordable housing need on site. Some uncertainty on location of rural exception schemes though limited in scale and impact. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requires a suitable contribution of affordable housing based on geographical location in the borough according to viability. Owing to differences in land value, larger percentages of affordable housing are viable in less sustainable locations (the villages of the Borough, in contrast to the main settlements). A larger proportion of growth is however Identified for the main settlements meaning that the majority of housing delivered is to be provided at the more sustainable locations of the Borough. A variable rate is set out in Policy LIV4 to reflect this and to prevent any barriers to investment and secure a sustainable pattern of development. The policy does promote the development of small scale rural exception sites in response to evidence of local needs, which may see some development in less sustainable locations. Overall however it is assessed that the policy will have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that development sites meet the needs of the community as a whole rather than just catering to market demand. This ensures that land is used more effectively to respond to the needs of the community as a whole. The overall benefit of the policy is reduced to neutral however due to the low viability experienced within the Borough which significantly effects the deliverability of affordable housing need. The provision within the policy for small scale rural exception sites to come forward in response to confirmed locally arising affordable housing need is also likely to see a limited amount of greenfield land lost to development. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be neutral for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks a certain type of dwelling to be provided as part of new developments for housing. Whilst affordable housing uses water and waste water, whether or not a house is affordable is not material to the amount of water used or its effect on water resources. The policy also promote rural exception sites. These are small scale evidence based sites at the Borough's sustainable villages. Policy safeguards are in place to ensure no adverse impact on the environment. The policy is likely therefore to have a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks a certain type of dwelling to be provided as part of new developments for housing. Allocated sites and windfall sites are directed by other policies in the plan relating to flood risk and mitigating the effects of flood risk. New development is permitted in the form of small scale rural exception development where justified by evidence and consistent with criteria. Such development would be considered in line with national and local flood risk policy. Therefore whilst affordable housing is affected by flood risk, the relationship of the policy to this objective is minimal and the considered effect is neutral</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks a certain type of dwelling to be provided as part of new developments for housing. Affordable housing affects air quality owing its ongoing use as a residence, however this policy is mainly concerned with its provision as part of allocated or windfall development. Scope is provided within the policy for small scale rural exception development at sustainable villages where evidenced and consistent with criteria. The potential for this provision over the plan period and impact on air quality is limited especially given that the location for such development is likely to be distance from key areas of concern for air quality and as such is likely to make little if not any contribution. As such the impact on this policy on this objective is considered negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks a certain type of dwelling to be provided as part of new developments for housing. Affordable housing influences and is influenced by greenhouse gases owing its ongoing use as a residence, however this policy is mainly concerned with its provision as part of allocated or windfall development. Scope is provided within the policy for small scale rural exception development at sustainable villages where evidenced and consistent with criteria. The potential for this provision over the plan period and impact on greenhouse gas emissions is limited. As such the impact on this policy on this objective is considered negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks a certain type of dwelling to be provided as part of new developments for housing. Affordable housing influences waste owing its construction and after use, however this policy only has regard to its provision as part of allocated or windfall development. Rural Exception schemes have the potential to come forward in mineral safeguarding locations, however will be limited in scale. The overall impact is assessed as negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to secure affordable housing as part of major developments and as such does not affect landscape or townscape for this scale of development. Small rural exception sites are permitted by the policy where consistent with evidence and where policy criteria is met. This include criteria which seeks to safeguard the local environment and wildlife. The overall effect of the policy on this objective is therefore assessed as neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Net biodiversity measures, landscaping, layout and scale of development.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Some uncertainty on location of rural exception schemes though limited in scale and impact. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to secure affordable housing as part of major developments and as such does not affect landscape or townscape for this scale of development. Small rural exception sites are permitted by the policy where consistent with evidence and where policy criteria is met. This include criteria which seeks to safeguard to local historic environment and character. The overall effect of the policy on this objective is therefore assessed as neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design measures, layout and scale, use of high quality materials, siting.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Some uncertainty on location of rural exception schemes though limited in scale and impact. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to secure affordable housing as part of major developments and as such does not affect landscape or townscape for this scale of development. Small rural exception sites are permitted by the policy where consistent with evidence and where policy criteria is met. This include criteria which seeks to safeguard landscape and local character. The overall effect of the policy on this objective is therefore assessed as neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design measures, layout and scale, use of high quality materials, siting. Landscaping and open space.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Some uncertainty on location of rural exception schemes though limited in scale and impact. Low-medium risk.</p> |

Policy LIV 10: Quality Housing

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to secure new homes of a high standard in design and quality, providing sufficient space to protect health and wellbeing, meet the housing needs of the entire community and to respond to environmental standards. The policy scores positively for social and environmental standards, with a negligible effect for economic objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy responds to national planning policy in relation to housing standards, quality, design, and climate change, and also the Council's declaration of a climate change emergency. In this context, the Council do not consider that there is a reasonable alternative to the proposed policy. As such no reasonable alternative has been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the delivery of quality housing at new developments in Pendle, and to ensure that new housing is sufficiently adaptive to meet broad housing needs. This helps to ensure that the standard of housing stock in Pendle improves, providing decent homes in line with the objective, and in response to assessed needs as set out within the HNA (inclusive of adaptable homes to meet the needs of an ageing population). A minor positive effect is assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasingly positive effects over the plan period from the medium term as the policy is implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of policy requirements. Medium risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy relates to the quality of housing. The effects of this on the local economy are assessed to be negligible, though its implementation may support the local construction sector.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negligible effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy/proposal would significantly enhance the attractiveness of the Borough as a place to invest, live, work and visit by providing new quality homes. The adoption of space standards will help tackle issues of overcrowding and social deprivation providing accommodation which is responsive to people's needs. The policy secures homes which meet the needs of the local population such as adaptive homes and homes which accord with space standards.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasingly positive effects over the plan period from the medium term as the policy is implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of policy requirements. Medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would significantly benefit local health and wellbeing, ensuring that new homes are of a high quality, and of a sufficient size to meet the housing needs of local people including elderly and disabled in response to the findings of the HNA. This could mean that people currently living in inappropriate and undersized accommodation have the opportunity to live in a more appropriate setting. The policy promotes accessibility and connectivity to recreational space promoting exercise and recreation.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasingly positive effects over the plan period from the medium term as the policy is implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability and feasibility of policy requirements. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy relates to the design and appearance of new housing and as such does not have a direct link to this objective. The effect of this policy on this objective is therefore considered to be negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to secure quality housing relating to the design, layout and appearance of new dwellings. The requirement for space standards is likely to mean that more land is required to develop sites. Equally the policy promotes the efficient use of land through new housing developments by using sites more effectively to meet the housing needs of the local population. Overall the policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to secure quality housing including the adoption sustainable methods of design and construction which seek to reduce water usage and provide additional storage. This provides a positive response to the aims of United Utilities and Yorkshire Water to conserve water usage as one of the key methods in tackling longer term supply shortfalls. As a result it is considered that the policy results in a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term as the policy is implemented through new development proposals.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability issues prevent the adoption of sustainable design methods to reduce water consumption. Medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy outlines the need to avoid areas which are at a high risk of flooding. The policy also sets out the requirement to avoid/minimise non-porous surfaces which contribute to surface water runoff and worsening flood risk off site. The adoption of these measures mean that developments would not worsening flood risk and as such the policy scores neutrally for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requires developments to be design and constructed using sustainable materials, and use measures to minimise energy usage and to limit waste. The policy also promotes the adoption of renewable energy sources in new developments to minimise emissions. The policy therefore scores positively for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Feasibility and viability of accommodating policy requirements within proposed developments. Medium risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requires developments to be design and constructed using sustainable materials, and use measures to minimise energy usage and to limit waste. The policy also promotes the adoption of renewable energy sources in new developments to minimise emissions. The policy therefore scores positively for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Layout, massing, design features, landscaping, adoption of renewable energy, water saving devices etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Feasibility and viability of accommodating policy requirements within proposed developments. Medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requires developments to be design and constructed using sustainable materials, and to limit waste. The policy therefore scores positively for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Conditioned use of materials. Construction Management Plan etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to provide for high quality housing through new development. In doing so the policy requires that there are no adverse effects for biodiversity and internationally designated sites. The policy is therefore considered to score neutrally on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Layout, massing, design features, landscaping, adoption of renewable energy, water saving devices etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to provide for high quality housing through new development. In doing so the policy requires that there are no adverse effects on the built environment which includes historical assets. The policy is therefore considered to score neutrally on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Layout, massing, design features, landscaping, adoption of renewable energy, water saving devices etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to provide for high quality housing through new development. In doing so the policy requires that there are no adverse effects on the built environment which includes historical assets. The policy is therefore considered to score neutrally on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Layout, massing, design features, landscaping, adoption of renewable energy, water saving devices etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy LIV 11: Self and Custom Build Housing

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to secure the provision of self-build homes in the Borough, discharging the Council's duty in this regard. The policy seeks to secure this through direct allocation, as a proportion of new builds at allocated sites for general housing over a certain threshold, and encouragement at windfall sites. The policy scores positively for social objectives, with neutral effects for social and economic objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy responds to the requirement placed on local authorities to secure the provision of self-build housing in response to identified self-build needs. The Council maintains a self-build register which is updated annually. This register identifies a demand for self-build in the Borough. The policy provides the delivery mechanism to meet this need. The Council do not consider that there is a reasonable alternative to the proposed policy approach which would be effective in responding to this housing need. As a result no reasonable alternative has been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy enables the development of niche housing products within the Borough which meet an individual's specific housing need. This includes the allocation of specific plots within larger development sites and at windfall enabling self-homes to be built in response to identified need as indicated by the Council's self-build register. This enables the delivery of a broader range of house types which are not typically delivered by the market, ensuring a wider housing need is addressed in policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period from adoption of the Plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Amount of self-build which comes forward through Windfall development. Low risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy contributes to the amount of housing provided within the Borough which will also help support the local economy and job creation in Pendle.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period from adoption of the Plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy enables bespoke housing needs to be met, diversifying the housing stock and the scope of the plan in addressing the needs of the community in response to those households included within the Council's Self Build Register. The policy enables self-build at rural exception sites where criteria is met, supporting the vitality of rural areas and promoting rural sustainability.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period from adoption of the Plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy enables the development of new homes which may be more responsive to the needs and/or circumstances of the future occupier as reflected by the needs of that household to be included within the self-build register. This will have some benefit to the health and wellbeing of that resident should the new home provided through this policy be more suitable and responsive to their specific need than existing stock.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks self-build as an allocation, proportion of allocated sites, or at rural exception sites. All locations will need to be accessible via sustainable modes of transport and to at least essential services. This has been taken into account in the site assessment process. Rural exception sites will be only permitted at sustainable rural villages and be of small scale. Reflecting on the above it is considered the policy has a neutral effect on this policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Amount of self-build which comes forward through Windfall development. Low risk.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that land which comes forward over the plan period meets a broader housing need over the plan period by securing self and custom build provision. This makes for a more efficient use of land, however may include development of greenfield land but at a very small scale. The policy scores neutrally for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Amount of self-build which comes forward through Windfall development. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages self-build by way of allocation, a proportion of allocated development, and rural exception schemes. The development of self-build homes will add to pressures for the supply of water, however self-build proposals will be small in scale and subject to wider policies of the development plan.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Amount of self-build which comes forward through Windfall development. Low risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages self-build by way of allocation, a proportion of allocated development, and rural exception schemes which will include greenfield land. Allocated sites have been assessed through the site selection process with sites in FZ2/FZ3 screened out. Proposals will be small in scale, and will be subject to local and national flood risk policy. It is anticipated that the policy will therefore score neutrally against this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages self-build by way of allocation, a proportion of allocated development, and rural exception schemes which will include greenfield land. Allocated sites have been assessed through the site selection process for their accessibility to services promoting travel by sustainable modes of transport. Proposals will be small in scale, with windfall development only permitted at the Borough's sustainable settlements. It is anticipated that the policy will therefore score neutrally against this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Amount of self-build which comes forward through Windfall development. Low risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages self-build by way of allocation, a proportion of allocated development, and rural exception schemes which will include greenfield land. Allocated sites have been assessed through the site selection process for their accessibility to services promoting travel by sustainable modes of transport. Proposals will be small in scale, with windfall development only permitted at the Borough's sustainable settlements. It is anticipated that the policy will therefore score neutrally against this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Amount of self-build which comes forward through Windfall development. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages self-build by way of allocation, a proportion of allocated development, and rural exception schemes. Self-build homes will therefore contribute towards waste and make use of materials. Wider policies of the local plan set out the approach to addressing and minimising waste. As such, it is considered that the link between this policy and this objective is limited and the effect is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages self-build by way of allocation, a proportion of allocated development, and rural exception schemes. Allocated site have been assessed at a high level their impact on designated sites with sites directly affecting designations discounted. Wider policies of the local plan will be implemented to address ecology and green infrastructure issues. This should result in at least a neutral effect, however the timing and location of windfall self-build is uncertain albeit the effects are likely to be insignificant given that proposals will be small in scale. A dual effect is therefore assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral/uncertain effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Implementation of ENV1, ENV12, ENV13</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Amount of self-build which comes forward through Windfall development. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages self-build by way of allocation, a proportion of allocated development, and rural exception schemes. Allocated sites have been assessed at a high level their impact on listed assets sites with sites directly affecting listed assets discounted. Wider policies of the local plan will be implemented to address heritage and the historic environment however the degree of effect caused by the policy on this objective will largely depend on site/development specific circumstances. The effect of self-build on this objective is therefore uncertain.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Implementation of ENV1, ENV2, ENV21 and ENV22</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Amount of self-build which comes forward through Windfall development. Low risk.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages self-build by way of allocation, a proportion of allocated development, and rural exception schemes. Allocated sites have been assessed at a high level their impact landscapes and townscapes with sites in sensitive areas discounted. Wider policies of the local plan will be implemented to address landscape and townscape effects. This should result in at least a neutral effect, however the timing and location of windfall self-build is uncertain though the small scale nature of this form of development should ensure that effects are kept to a minimum/local level. A dual effect is therefore assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral/Uncertain effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Implementation of ENV1, ENV2, ENV8, ENV9, ENV21.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Amount of self-build which comes forward through Windfall development. Low risk.</p> |

Policy LIV 12: Housing in the Countryside

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy provides direction in terms of the type of housing which is permitted in the open countryside. The policy enables limited change in the open countryside supporting its sustainable development and evolution over time in response to localised rural housing need. The policy results in some benefit for social objectives with neutral environmental and economic effects.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy relates to ENV8 and the spatial strategy setting out the limited forms of housing development which may be permitted in the open countryside. This is consistent with objectives to secure a sustainable pattern of development as defined within the adopted Core Strategy, and is consistent with environmental objectives. There is no reasonable alternative to this policy

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy enables a precise list of housing developments with the open countryside. This is limited to reuse, conversions, extensions to buildings, worker dwellings, and buildings of exceptional design further diversifying the range and role of housing stock which could be provided (albeit at a very small scale) over the plan period. The proposal will make a small scale contribution to this policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the duration of the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The scope given by the policy to permit worker dwellings in specific circumstances, together with limited opportunity for development in the open countryside will support the vitality of the rural economy and its industries.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the duration of the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The scope given by the policy to worker dwellings, together with limited opportunity for development in the open countryside will support the rural economy assisting with its long term sustainability.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the duration of the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to protect the open countryside from inappropriate forms of development, but also provides limited scope for rural development to support communities and the economy of rural Pendle which is beneficial to the health and wellbeing of residents living in rural parts of the Borough. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | -/0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy permits limited development in the open countryside where criteria are met. This includes potentially isolated dwellings which are inaccessible to sustainable modes of transport. Whilst the extent of development permitted in accordance with the policy over the plan period will be limited, the policy will still nevertheless result in a minor adverse effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral to minor adverse effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to support the vitality and vibrancy of the open countryside permitting limited forms of development to support the rural economy. This includes permitting the reuse and conversion of existing buildings. Only in exceptional circumstances are sites which are not previously developed will be allowed for development where design is shown to be exceptional/innovative. Overall the policy is considered to score positively to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the redevelopment or reuse of existing buildings and supports the agricultural sector. Only in exceptional circumstances will new forms of development be permitted. The may lead to a marginal pressure on water supply and resources, however will be subject to broader policies of the Local Plan. With this in mind the policy is considered to have a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to support the vitality and vibrancy of the open countryside permitting limited forms of development to support the rural economy. This includes permitting the reuse and conversion of existing buildings. Only in exceptional circumstances are sites which are not previously developed will be allowed for development where design is shown to be exceptional/innovative. The policy will not therefore lead to a significant urbanising of the open countryside and worsening flood risk and as such scores neutrally for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy permits limited development in the open countryside where criteria are met. This includes potentially isolated dwellings which may be far from services and sustainable modes of transport. The development however will take place in parts of the Borough which do not experience poor levels of air quality. The development potentially allowed through the policy is of such small scale that they would not affect existing air quality problem areas. As a result the policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | -/0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy permits limited development in the open countryside where criteria are met. This includes potentially isolated dwellings which may be far from services and sustainable modes of transport. Broader policy requirements will apply to proposals requiring sustainable design and construction methods, as well as the adoption of energy efficient design and renewable technologies as appropriate. Nonetheless the effect of the policy is considered to be a minor negative in response to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral to minor negative effect for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy permits only limited opportunity for development in the open countryside, for reuse, replacement, conversion, extensions, workers dwellings, and exceptional design. The policy will result in waste and require the use of materials. This is consistent with this objective, as such the policy is considered to have a positive effect. The policy is unlikely to affect minerals and natural resources owing to the limited scope/scale of development enabled by the policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy permits only limited opportunity for small scale development in the open countryside, for reuse, replacement, conversion, extensions, workers dwellings, and exceptional design. The effect of the policy on wildlife will therefore be limited to habitats form in built structures with developments affecting wildlife dealt with via wider policies of the Local Plan. The effect of this policy on this objective is therefore neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Opportunity is provided within the policy to make use of barns/redundant buildings. Replacement buildings and extensions to existing buildings are also allowed in accordance with criteria. For all types of development there is a requirement in policy to ensure that the design and materials used is appropriate to and consistent with the setting on the area, ensuring no adverse effects on character. The policy is assessed to have a positive effect on this policy because it enables vacant and potentially dilapidated structures (potentially of note historically) to be used. It also makes clear that proposals should provide an enhancement to the character of the existing site and wider area.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Use of local materials, architectural features, construction methods. High quality materials. Buildings scaled appropriately to existing built structures and the wider countryside.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Opportunity is provided within the policy to make use of barns/redundant buildings. Replacement buildings and extensions to existing buildings are also allowed in accordance with criteria. For all types of development there is a requirement in policy to ensure that the design and materials used is appropriate to and consistent with the setting on the area, ensuring no adverse effects on character. The policy is assessed to have a positive effect on this policy because it enables vacant and potentially dilapidated structures (potentially of note historically) to be used. It also makes clear that proposals should provide an enhancement to the character of the existing site and wider area.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Use of local materials, architectural features, construction methods. High quality materials. Buildings scaled appropriately to existing built structures and the wider countryside.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

Policy LIV 13: Communal Living

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy offers guidance for proposals for older person accommodation, HMOs and Student Accommodation. The policy ensures that needs for each type of accommodation can be delivered sustainably and without adverse effects on the wider population and environment where brought forward. The policy scores positively in addressing needs and for social and environmental objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy provides a decision making framework for proposals for older person accommodation, HMOs and Student Accommodation. Needs for older person housing is found in the Housing Needs Assessment and partially fulfilled by this policy and through LIV10 for quality housing adaptive to needs. This flexible approach is considered to provide for a more effective approach for meeting older person housing needs than specific allocations which may or may not come forward over the plan period, and likely to be insufficient in scale to meet identified need. There is no specific need for HMO or Student Accommodation within the Borough and as such an allocations approach is not considered necessary. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy provides a decision making framework for applications responding broader housing needs which will arise over the plan period which are not directly catered for through planned supply. This includes developments for older people and students, with a positive policy framework set for these types of development and for the former where a need arises as identified through the HNA as a result of an ageing population (the older aged cohorts being the only ones displaying natural growth over the plan period within the demographic data). The policy is assessed as having a positive benefit for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone.</p> | <p>0</p> | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy does not allocate specific locations for development to respond to this housing need. The occupants of older people housing are broadly not economically active. There is currently no specific need for student accommodation within the Borough. Overall it is considered that the policy has a neutral effect on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| <p>3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living.</p> | <p>0</p> | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy seeks to support older people and student housing where criteria is met and seeks to manage HMOs within the Borough. No direct provision is made through the policy to deliver this type of development. The overall effect of this policy on this objective is considered to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Planning conditions, design measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy welcomes specific forms of accommodation which is responsive to needs of sections of the community. A limit is placed on HMOs to avoid over concentration and to limit adverse effects which are likely to arise for the existing population (noise, litter, parking etc). All proposals are to have regard to residential amenity and avoid adverse effects which may be harmful to the health and wellbeing of existing residents. Overall the policy is considered to perform strongly in response to this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions. Design Measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to promote elderly accommodation and where appropriate student accommodation, and limit the opportunity for HMOs. The policy requires proposals for elderly accommodation to be situated in a location which is well-connected to local services and employment by walking, cycling and public transport. The policy therefore is beneficial for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy directs proposals to areas which are accessible and sustainable. The policy however limits the use of dwellings within an area for HMOs, potentially resulting in pressure for new development elsewhere. Overall the policy is assessed to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adherence to design policy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Whilst elderly, student and HMO development will effect and use water resources, the policy itself is concerned only by providing a policy framework for the determination of proposals which may be submitted during the plan period. The policy is not therefore directly linked to this objective and as a result is considered to have a negligible effect on water quality and resources.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Whilst elderly, student and HMO development will effect flood risk and the risk of flooding, the policy itself is concerned only by providing a policy framework for the determination of proposals which may be submitted during the plan period. The policy is not therefore directly linked to this objective and as a result is considered to have a negligible effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to promote elderly accommodation and where appropriate student accommodation, and limit the opportunity for HMOs. The policy requires proposals for elderly accommodation to be situated in a location which is well-connected to local services and employment by walking, cycling and public transport. The policy therefore is beneficial for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects over the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to promote elderly accommodation and where appropriate student accommodation, and limit the opportunity for HMOs. The policy requires proposals for elderly accommodation to be situated in a location which is well-connected to local services and employment by walking, cycling and public transport. At the same time the policy seeks to limit HMO development which might provide for a more sustainable means of living in using less resources and reducing the need for further homes. The policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects across the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Whilst elderly, student and HMO development will effect waste and the use of materials, the policy itself is concerned only by providing a policy framework for the determination of proposals which may be submitted during the plan period. The policy is not therefore directly linked to this objective and as a result is considered to have a negligible effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Whilst elderly, student and HMO development may impact biodiversity and green infrastructure. The policy does not allocate land for this type of development, and only provides a policy framework for the determination of proposals which may be submitted during the plan period. The effect of this policy on biodiversity and green infrastructure is therefore considered to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Application of Local Plan policy and mitigation measures where necessary.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Whilst elderly, student and HMO development may impact the historical environment. The policy does not allocate land for this type of development, and only provides a policy framework for the determination of proposals which may be submitted during the plan period. The effect of this policy on the historic environment is therefore considered to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Application of Local Plan policy and mitigation measures where necessary.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Whilst elderly, student and HMO development may impact landscape and townscape. The policy does not allocate land for this type of development, and only provides a policy framework for the determination of proposals which may be submitted during the plan period. The effect of this policy on landscape and townscape is therefore considered to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Application of Local Plan policy and mitigation measures where necessary.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

Policy LIV 14: Accommodation for Travelling Communities

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy offers guidance for proposals for accommodation for travelling communities. The policy ensures that needs for each type of accommodation can be delivered sustainably and without adverse effects on wider amenity and the environment where brought forward. The policy scores positively in addressing needs and for social and environmental objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy provides a decision making framework for proposals accommodation for travelling communities. Consultation with the travelling community has shown that there is no need/demand for any permanent site within the Borough as such as reasonable alternative which would directly allocate specific sites to meet this accommodation need is not deemed necessary. No reasonable alternative is therefore assessed for this policy.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Housing Needs Assessment has found no specific needs for this type of accommodation at this point in time. The policy provides a positive decision making framework to address the accommodation needs of gypsy, traveller, travelling showpeople and boat dwellers should they arise over the plan period. The policy therefore makes a positive contribution in meeting housing needs of all communities.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective as it is likely to address the accommodation needs of people or groups of people already residing in the Borough, or a relatively small group of people where they do not.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to positively respond to proposals for specific forms of accommodation as submitted within the Borough. Such forms of accommodation would respond to cultural and social needs of these groups, ensuring suitable sites can be delivered. Overall the policy is considered to have a minor positive effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would assist in providing certainty for applicant peoples or groups to this type of accommodation once approved ensuring that their housing needs can be catered for if they come forward (No need for this type of accommodation is currently identified). The assistance made by this policy in addressing the housing needs of gypsy, traveller, travelling showpeople and boat dwellers is therefore considered to have a positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Site specific design measures where justified.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Policy requirements seek to promote potential sites which are accessible to local shops, facilities, services and sources of public transport. The policy requirements therefore provide the opportunity for accessible via sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to encourage the efficient use of land. It is not necessarily the case however that sites will always be brownfield – though this is likely given the need for hard standing for pitches. Boat dweller moorings with no affect the use of land, but rather apply to the Borough’s existing waterways. Given that there is currently no need identified for this type accommodation at present, the likely effect and use of the land is considered to be limited. Overall the policy is assessed to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption. Though this may vary depending on site specific circumstances.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Clearly the development of land for use by gypsy, traveller, and travelling showpeople communities, together with new moorings for boat dwellers is likely to have some bearing on water usage and quality, however the policy does not concern itself with the allocation of specific sites and only sets a policy framework for the determination of any received planning application. As a result it is considered that the policy is not directly linked to this objective. Overall therefore the effect of this policy on this objective is considered negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>A mooring will not adversely affect flood risk being water based. The policy requirements for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople, ensures that developments do not take place in areas of high risk of flooding. The policy is therefore considered to have a neutral effect on this policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Application of SuDs Hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Policy requirements seek to promote potential sites which are accessible to local shops, facilities, services and sources of public transport. The policy requirements therefore provide the opportunity for accessible via sustainable modes of transport which will reduce reliance on travel by unsustainable modes of transport. The scale of development likely under this policy is likely limited, though its location (which might be close to sources of poor air quality) is not controlled. Overall the policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Policy requirements seek to promote potential sites which are accessible to local shops, facilities, services and sources of public transport. The policy requirements therefore provide the opportunity for accessible via sustainable modes of transport which will reduce reliance on travel by unsustainable modes of transport. Owing to the nature of the development which the policy responds the opportunity to control design, form, structures and materials used is limited. The scale of development likely under this policy is likely limited. Overall the policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople developments and moorings for boat dwellings use limited materials, with the accommodation used (in most cases) pre-existing, transportable and temporary in nature. The overall use and effect of the policy is likely to be limited. As a result the policy has a positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potential positive effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requires proposals to respect areas of high conservation or ecological value. The policy does not however allocate specific sites for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople communities or identify moorings for boat dwellers. The policy is therefore considered to have neutral effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Application of wider policy requirements of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requires proposals to respect areas of high conservation or ecological value ensuring that there are no adverse effects caused. The policy does not however allocate specific sites for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople communities or identify moorings for boat dwellers relying on windfall proposals for its implementation. However given that there is currently no known need for this type of accommodation the effects of the policy is likely to be limited. The policy is therefore considered to have neutral effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Application of wider policy requirements of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy requires proposals to respect areas of high conservation or ecological value ensuring that there are no adverse effects caused. The policy does not however allocate specific sites for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople communities or identify moorings for boat dwellers relying on windfall proposals for its implementation. However given that there is currently no known need for this type of accommodation the effects of the policy is likely to be limited. The policy is therefore considered to have neutral effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period from adoption.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Application of wider policy requirements of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy relies on windfall development and as such the scale, location and timing of development put forward in common with and in response to this policy is uncertain. (Low risk).</p> |

Policy WRK 7: Employment Site Allocations

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option sets out specific requirements for each employment site identified as an allocation to respond to residual employment land needs identified for the plan period. The policy scores positively for social and economic objectives, with largely neutral effects for environmental policy.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy responds to evidence and policy requirements of the Core Strategy regarding employment land needs, meeting the residual land required to meet this need in full. A reasonable alternative to identify additional land is disregarded given that the existing employment land requirement contains a surplus built in to allow for market churn. A further reasonable alternative to establish a windfall policy to this residual need is examined below, but is rejected owing to the uncertainty that employment land delivered through this means would sufficiently respond to identified needs in the right locations. The preferred option is therefore adopted by the Council as the basis of Policy WRK7.

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy allocates land for employment use and as such, given that the housing requirement is to be met in full, has no effect on the supply of housing land.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy allocates land for employment use and as such, given that the housing requirement is to be met in full, has no effect on the supply of housing land.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | ++ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The Policy will enable full delivery of employment land needs as assessed through the Employment Land Review and as a required by the Core Strategy to facilitate the delivery of net jobs growth of the plan period in line with the objectives of the Local Plan and where spatially required (in West Craven). The policy therefore contributes significant to the achievement of this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term over the duration and the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Job market stability over the plan period. The type and extent of employment land needed over the duration of the plan period to satisfy demand. Medium Risk.</p> | 0 | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Relying on windfall development it is unlikely that assessed employment needs will be fulfilled at the right time in the right locations. A flexible approach may foster enhanced economic growth in the Borough over the plan period, but equally threaten the Borough's existing employment land supply. Neutral effects are assessed for this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Balanced neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumption</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The type, scale, timing and location of new employment land over the plan period. High Risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | ++ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy will aid sustainable living and tackle deprivation by giving people the opportunity to access sources of employment locally reducing the need to travel, giving increased prospects of a steady income and raising the standard of living. As a result, the policy is considered to contribute significantly to this objective.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term over the duration and the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Job market stability over the plan period. The type and extent of employment land needed over the duration of the plan period to satisfy demand.</p> | -/? | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>Relying on windfall development it will be unclear whether employment needs will be fulfilled and whether employment land comes forward at the right time in the right locations. This may have adverse effects on local investment and regeneration with less complex greenfield sites likely to be favoured. A flexible approach may foster enhanced economic growth in the Borough over the plan period, however this is not guaranteed. The overall effect is a negative/uncertain effect for the plan period.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Negative/Uncertain effects for the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumption</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>The type, scale, timing and location of new employment land over the plan period. High Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will assist in the delivery of net jobs growth over the plan period. The policy will provide opportunities for employment for local people in Pendle. Access to employment is a key issue affecting health and wellbeing both mentally and physically with positive effects on both as people maintain an active lifestyle and earn income contributing to their standard of living. It is therefore concluded that the policy contributes significantly to the achievement of this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term over the duration and the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Job market stability over the plan period. The type and extent of employment land needed over the duration of the plan period to satisfy demand.</p> | -/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy may fail to deliver the jobs growth and in the necessary sectors as envisaged at the plan making stage. Equally a flexible approach may foster enhanced economic growth in the Borough over the plan period, however this is not guaranteed. The location of employment may threaten local health and wellbeing with investment promoted at inappropriate locations which may have amenity value for residents. Overall a negative/uncertain effect is identified for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative/Uncertain effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The type, scale, timing and location of new employment land over the plan period. High Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will provide additional sites for employment over the plan period. This will improve access to jobs for existing residents, limiting the need to travel to access work. The site selection process has considered accessibility to public transport and suitable infrastructure in arriving at the preferred options. It also delivers a coordinated approach for meeting housing need. As a result the policy is considered to contribute significantly to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects from the medium term over the duration and the plan period and beyond.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures and infrastructure requirements may be required of proposed developments to promote sustainable modes of travel.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Success of travel plan measures etc Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Windfall development makes planning for infrastructure requirements and investment challenging resulting in increased likelihood of adverse effects and ill prepared sites. Enabling windfall development is also likely to result in the need for increased unsustainable patterns of travel as investment is directed to sites which are less well accessible and served by public transport as allocated sites.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Negative effects at least in the medium term (longer term effects may be reduced due to changing investment priorities).</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures and infrastructure requirements may be required of proposed developments to promote sustainable modes of travel.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The type, scale, timing and location of new employment land over the plan period. High Risk. Flexibility/availability of funding to address infrastructure needs. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has considered submitted proposals for additional employment land to ensure that the employment requirements of the Local Plan as set by the Core Strategy are met in full and are responsive to needs. The identified site at West Craven Business Park is considered to provide for the best opportunity for West Craven to meet employment needs at an established and successful employment site which benefits from good access to the road network and existing infrastructure. Alternatives were not viable, deliverable, available, of sufficient size, or location to respond effectively to this need. Notwithstanding this, the site is greenfield in its current form, and as such the policy results in a minor negative effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent negative effects where greenfield land is developed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Windfall development is more likely to come forward at greenfield locations resulting in the loss of undeveloped land. Such development may or may not be more effective at meeting and responding to the needs of the local economy than allocated development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent negative effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The type, scale, timing and location of new employment land over the plan period. High Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has considered, at a high level, the effect of development on water quality and resources by taking into account proximity of sites to watercourses. Sites likely to result in adverse effects have been screened out. Identified employment land are allocated for B2 and B8. To a degree water needs will be limited but this will vary from site to site and operation to operation. Overall the impact of the policy on this objective is assessed as neutral. The implications of West Craven Extension for this objective is set out in the site specific appraisal (See Appendix 6).</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects are envisaged over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Ground remediation measures to reduce the potential for polluting water through the redevelopment of sites. Protective measures to prevent pollution of runoff.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Different sites will effect water quality and resources differently. Medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Size, scale, use and location of development enabled through the policy is unknown and likely to vary on a site by site basis. This makes planning for water requirements challenging with potentially and most likely adverse effects for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Initial adverse effects potentially moderating over the plan period</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Site design measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The type, scale, timing and location of new employment land over the plan period. High Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has discounted any site known to be significantly affected by flood risk from rivers, surface water and other sources with the design and form of development to be informed by the findings of the Council's SFRA. Policy requirements are in place to ensure that proposals do not adversely affect flood risk in off-site locations. Overall the policy is considered to have a neutral effect for this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of SuDs hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale and intensity of use which could affect drainage is unknown.</p> | -/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>A windfall policy is likely to result in an increase role and use of greenfield land to respond to employment land needs. This will result in greater loss of greenfield land to development with increased hard standing with potentially adverse effects for flood risk owing to surface water flooding. The scale, location, and type of development is uncertain and as a result the impact of the policy on flood risk is not clear.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Potentially adverse effects. Uncertain depending on scale, location and type of development which comes forward consistent with the policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of SuDs hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The type, scale, timing and location of new employment land over the plan period. High Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|----------------------------|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has considered air quality and the potential effects for areas which suffer from poor air quality. Sites have been identified which minimise effects on air quality and benefit from connections to existing communities and public transport infrastructure to minimise the need to travel via non-sustainable transport modes. Overall it is considered that the policy will have a neutral impact on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning contributions. Travel Plan.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The use and activity at an employment site will vary depending on the nature of the business operating from the site. Distribution centres may cause adverse effects to air quality owing to trips to and from the site. Industrial processes within a site, connected to the production of an item/substance may also result in harmful effects for air quality. This will need to be considered at the planning application stage. Medium Risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>An unplanned approach to meeting employment land requirements is likely to result in a disconnect between strategies for meeting development needs resulting in increased use and role of the car. This will have adverse effects for air quality.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Adverse effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning Conditions. Travel Plan.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale, type and location of development permitted in accordance with this policy is unknown and as such broader effects of activity at sites including access and processes on air quality is unknown. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has considered air quality and the potential effects for areas which suffer from poor air quality. Sites have been identified which minimise effects on air quality and benefit from connections to existing communities and public transport infrastructure to minimise the need to travel via non-sustainable transport modes. The policy also promotes sustainable design/construction and the use of energy efficient design and renewable energy sources. Overall it is considered that the policy will have a neutral impact on this objective.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning conditions. Material/energy requirements. Travel Plan requirements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The use and activity at an employment site will vary depending on the nature of the business operating from the site. Distribution centres may cause adverse effects to air quality and the environment owing to trips to and from the site. Industrial processes within a site, connected to the production of an item/substance may also result in harmful effects for air quality and the environment. This will need to be considered at the planning application stage.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>An unplanned approach to meeting employment land requirements is likely to result in a disconnect between strategies for meeting development needs resulting in increased use and role of the car. This will have adverse effects for climate change.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Adverse effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Planning Conditions. Material/energy requirements. Travel Plan requirements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scale, type and location of development permitted in accordance with this policy is unknown and as such broader effects of activity at sites including access and processes on greenhouse gas emissions is unknown. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | -/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy allocates greenfield land for development for employment uses potentially resulting in the loss of mineral extraction land and natural resources. Other policies of the plan will be used to promote the adoption of the waste hierarchy through the development of this sites and to ensure the sustainable use of materials and natural resources. Future operations may create additional resource/waste pressures. The overall effect of the policy is assessed to have a minor adverse to uncertain effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse/Uncertain effects for the plan period depending on scale and nature of development which come forward at employment sites.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Waste hierarchy. Sustainable design and construction.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The use and activity at sites may contribute significantly (Positively and negatively) to this sustainability objective. Industrial processes at sites may well make effective use of waste or cycle materials. Equally industrial processes may lead to substantial waste and require unsustainable use of materials and resources. Low-medium risk.</p> | -/? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the development of greenfield land for development for employment uses. Other policies of the plan will be used to promote the adoption of the waste hierarchy through the development of this sites and to ensure the sustainable use of materials and natural resources. Future operations may create additional resource/waste pressures. The overall effect of the policy is assessed to have a minor adverse to uncertain effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse/Uncertain effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Waste hierarchy. Sustainable design and construction.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The use and activity at sites may contribute significantly (Positively and negatively) to this sustainability objective. Industrial processes at sites may well make effective use of waste or cycle materials. Equally industrial processes may lead to substantial waste and require unsustainable use of materials and resources. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The potential effect of developing sites for employment has been taken into account through the site selection process with regard given to key data sets of designated sites and condition applying the protection afforded within the NPPF, as well as site specific evidence. The policy requires biodiversity and green infrastructure to be protected from inappropriate forms of development. The policy also requires developments to adopt measures to secure a net gain for biodiversity. These measures, applied to the site selection process ensures that development will, in the longer term, have a neutral effect on biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Habitat areas, landscaping, SuDs, open space. Retaining existing natural features.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Adverse effects in the short and medium term, potentially softening over time with application of mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The success of biodiversity enhancement measures at sites in commercial and industrial use.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>A windfall policy is likely to result in an increase role and use of greenfield land to respond to employment land needs. This will result in greater loss of greenfield land to development with likely adverse effects for wildlife. Whilst offsetting and measures to encourage net gain will be required, ongoing uses, operations and activity taking place at the site would likely have a adverse effect for ecology.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Adverse effects in the short and medium term, potentially softening over time.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting of development. Adoption of landscaping. High quality design.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The type, scale, timing and location of new employment land over the plan period. High Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has considered the impact of employment areas on historical assets with areas which would have significant adverse effects discounted. Policy requirements require applicants to avoid, mitigate, and where possible enhance, through development proposals. Overall however the true effects on the policy on this objective will only be known on a site by site basis at the planning application stage and will vary depending on the location, scale and type of development involved.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting of development. Adoption of landscaping. High quality design.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The impact on the historic environment will vary depending on site specific circumstances and the nature of the proposals and continuing use. Low-medium risk.</p> | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The scale, type and location of development enabled through this policy and its relationship with the historic environment is unknown. This will vary site by site and depending on the scale of development, uses proposed and nature of activity at the Site.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Sitting of development, Adoption of landscaping. High quality design.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The type, scale, timing and location of new employment land over the plan period. High Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The site selection process has considered the impact of employment areas on landscape and townscapes with those locations most sensitive discounted. Policy measures, such as the adoption of landscaping and design measures will help to reduce the impact of employment development. Nevertheless employment uses are often large in scale and difficult to integrate effectively into the landscape, especially in an area like Pendle where topography varies so significantly. The result is a minor adverse effect on landscape.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting of development. Adoption of landscaping. High quality design.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Degree of effect on landscape and townscape will vary site by site proposal by proposal (low-medium risk).</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>A windfall policy is likely to result in an increase role and use of greenfield land to respond to employment land needs. This will result in greater loss of greenfield land to development and, given the nature of employment development, likely to result in an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Adverse effects in the short and medium term, softening over time.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting of development. Adoption of landscaping. High quality design.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Degree of effect on landscape and townscape will vary site by site proposal by proposal (low-medium risk).</p> |

Policy WRK 8: Protected Employment Areas

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to protect existing sites in use for employment (B2, B8 uses) from other uses maintaining locally important sites for jobs for the plan period. The policy scores positively for environmental and economic objectives and also supports social objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The alternative option would be to not retain any land for employment through the Local Plan Part 2 enabling alternative uses where brought forward. This scores positively for recycling land and protecting the environment from loss/adverse effects to development but has potentially harmful economic and social effects and as a result is not taken forward by the Council as the approach for the Local Plan Part 2.

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the Policy |
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to protect land for employment use and as such, given that the housing requirement is to be met in full, has no effect on the supply of housing land.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Deliverability of allocations and scope for windfall beyond allocations whilst being in accordance with policy. (Low risk).</p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would increase the amount of land which could become available for housing. This would provide for a boost in housing land supply and may result in increased delivery which is responsive to broader housing needs.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Suitability of employment sites for housing. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the Policy |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The retention of existing employment land in employment use is important for local jobs and businesses. Existing employment land are well established and can provide important knowledge and trading clusters driving innovation and economic activity. Such sites are therefore of significant importance to the local economy. They are important in retaining the economic base and businesses within the borough and its workforce. The policy will enable their renewal and adaption overtime to meet the needs of businesses. The policy therefore contributes significantly to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects for the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sites remain viable and responsive to the needs of businesses and the market. Medium Risk.</p> | -- | <p><u>Likely Significant Effect</u></p> <p>The policy could see all or most of the Borough's most important land for employment lost to other land uses. This could cause significant harm to the local economy with reduced activity and force local people to commute further to access employment.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasingly harmful effects over the plan period cumulating into significant negative effects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Development of protected employment land for other uses will support jobs in construction for the duration of the build programme.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sites viable and responsive to the needs of businesses and the market. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the Policy |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy helps maintain access to local sources of employment ensuring that deprivation does not worsen and promotes sustainable living with existing employment sites generally benefitting from good access links. New employment facilities are permitted within protected employment areas provided that the use is B2/B8 (with some E Class use). Existing protected employment sites are largely built up and well used but the policy will enable their renewal and adaption overtime to meet the needs of businesses.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects felt for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy acts positively in enabling and encouraging the reuse of existing employment land. Low-medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would secure the regeneration of existing employment sites with potential environmental enhancements. Whilst this has positive effects for this objective, equally there is need to balance this against the adverse effects of the policy whereby employment opportunities may be located further away from communities increasing the need to travel. Overall the policy is assessed as having a neutral impact.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None,</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy would have uncertain effects for deprivation. On the one have the policy would benefit environmental quality regenerating potentially contaminated land. On the other, the loss of employment land would result in less opportunity for jobs in the local area. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to maintain existing levels of employment within the Borough and accessibility to jobs. The policy also encourages the ongoing use, renewal and enhancement of existing employment sites. The policy therefore plays an important role in improving the health and wellbeing of residents in Pendle who depend on these jobs, and will help secure environmental improvements to existing employment sites.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects felt for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Volatility in the market. Changes in demand. Business decisions to restructure or relocate. Medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would secure the regeneration of existing employment sites with potential environmental enhancements. This is balanced against the adverse effects of the policy whereby employment opportunities may be located further away from communities increasing the need to travel. Overall the policy is assessed as having a neutral impact.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None,</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy would have uncertain effects for health and wellbeing. On the one have the policy would benefit environmental quality regenerating potentially contaminated land. On the other, the loss of employment land would result in less opportunity for jobs in the local area. Medium Risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the Policy |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy's focus is to retain and renew sites in protected employment use through the plan period. This is important to the fulfilment of this policy objective where protected employment sites are typically served by established infrastructure, and are accessible to communities and public transport.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The state of this infrastructure may require investment. Existing sites may not be sufficiently served by infrastructure to meet modern needs. Low-medium risk.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The loss of employment land is likely to increase the need for local people to travel to access jobs with particular reliance on cars. The adverse effects of this is reduced slightly by redeveloped land being generally accessible to existing services and facilities and public transport and as such future users of sites would be less reliant on car use to access wider goods, services and employment. Overall a minor adverse effect is assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Balancing out at a minor negative effect over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The extent to which local employers employ local people and the result the loss of this employment to locations outside the Borough would impact commuting patterns and modes of transport for commuting. Medium risk.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to retain existing employment sites in employment use, including encouraging their reinvestment. The policy therefore seeks to recycle land in employment use reducing the need for greenfield development. The policy therefore strongly contributes towards the achievement of this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Protected Employment Sites, by way of their infrastructure, local, or neighbouring uses, may be inappropriate locations for some types of employment uses. Low-medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy recycles existing land for other uses, however by doing so discourages reinvestment of employment land for employment uses with this either moving out of the Borough or moving to greenfield site. The policy approach is assessed as having a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The policy results in less employment land in the Borough.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Suitability of employment land for other uses.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the Policy |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy seeks to retain existing employment sites and as such would not adversely affect the achievement of this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Issue of water quality and supply to be assessed during the planning application stage.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Existing employment sites may contribute to water quality problems, and where sufficiently old enough be served by decaying infrastructure. Low-medium risk.</p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The redevelopment of employment land for other uses could result in positive effects for water quality and resources where polluting employment sites are remediated and used for other uses which have a lesser effect on the environment.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Increasing positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> Ground remediation measures. Water recycling measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Existing employment sites cause adverse effects to water quality and resources.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Viability and scope for addressing ground contamination. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy seeks to retain existing employment sites and as such would not adversely affect the achievement of this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Employment uses generally have a lower sensitivity to flooding and flood risk than others.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Existing employment sites may contribute to flooding problems. Low risk.</p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The reuse of employment land for other uses will save greenfield land from development from other uses. Existing employment sites may contribute to flood risk and as such a less intensive use of a site may benefit flood risk. The policy may equally encourage the development of greenfield land for employment uses. A minor positive effect is assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Employment uses generally have a lower sensitivity to flooding and flood risk than others.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Role of a site within the river basin in mitigating/contributing towards flood risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|----------------------------|------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the Policy |
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to retain existing sites in employment use thus maintaining the status quo unless there are proposals to replace existing facilities/premises. In part this is beneficial for air quality, as employment provision is maintained concentrated at existing sites preventing any spread of air quality issues, with such established sites likely to be served by existing infrastructure and public transport. On the other hand the retention of existing sites which may contribute significantly to poor levels of air quality does not improve this objective. Overall it is considered that the policy will have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancement. Planning contributions.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Mode of transport used to access employment sites. Medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would result in localised benefits in air quality as employment uses are replaced by less intensive potentially greener uses. This is however countered by the fact that the local population will need to travel further to access sources of employment most likely via car. The policy is assessed as having a neutral effect for this policy objective therefore.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancement. Planning contributions.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Mode of transport used to access employment sites. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the Policy |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to retain existing sites in employment use thus maintaining the status quo unless there are proposals to replace existing facilities/premises. In part this is beneficial for greenhouse gas emissions, as employment provision is maintained concentrated at existing sites preventing any spread of air quality issues, with such established sites likely to be served by existing infrastructure and public transport. On the other hand the retention of existing sites which may contribute significantly to climate change, and makes use of inefficient premises does not improve this objective. Overall it is considered that the policy will have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>New development gives rise to the possibility of securing more sustainable buildings within an existing protected employment site.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy would enable the recycling of land potentially meaning that other land uses could be accommodated in accessible locations, with enhanced energy efficiency merits. However the policy is likely to result in the loss of employment land and local jobs within the Borough forcing residents to travel further afield for work. This would exacerbate unsustainable commuting patterns with broader adverse effects for climate change owing to increased greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Adverse effects in the short and medium term, potentially moderating longer term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure delivery. Planning contributions.</p> <p><u>Assumption</u></p> <p>New sites for employment are less accessible than existing sites.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The scope for and take up of green technology for personal travel (low-medium risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|---|------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the Policy |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promote the retention and reuse of existing premises and infrastructure to secure that protected employment sites remain so. The policy therefore (on a site level at least) promotes sustainable methods in dealing with waste, and prevents the need to develop new sites (which may have some value for mineral extraction). Overall the policy is considered to provide for a minor benefit to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promote the reuse of existing developed land and infrastructure reducing the need to develop in the open countryside. Overall the policy is considered to provide for a minor benefit to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy ensures that employment activity is retained on existing sites, protecting undeveloped areas which are potentially important to wildlife from development particularly those which might be designated or within/close to wildlife corridors and green infrastructure. Vacant buildings may however hold some importance for wildlife and as such it is important that the effects of development upon nature is taken into account for all proposed developments. The policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Policy requirements for net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The intensification of uses, or specific industrial processes may be harmful to the environment.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the reuse of existing sites in use for employment, protecting undeveloped areas which are potentially important to wildlife from development. The policy could also push investment for employment uses towards greenfield sites with potential adverse effects for wildlife and green infrastructure. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be neutral for this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Policy requirements for net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The intensification of uses, or specific industrial processes may be harmful to the environment.</p> |

| SA Objective | Preferred Option | | Reasonable Alternative | |
|--|------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy | Score | Commentary on effects of the Policy |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy ensures that employment activity is retained on existing sites, protecting undeveloped areas which are potentially significant for historical development. Vacant buildings, and other buildings within or closely related to protected employment areas may also be important historically and as such it is important that the effects of development upon nature is taken into account It is therefore unclear what effect the policy will have for heritage.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Site by site variation in terms of impact on the historic environment. Medium risk.</p> | ? | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the reuse of sites in employment use with potential enhancements to the built environment. Vacant buildings, and other buildings within or closely related to protected employment areas may also be important historically and as such it is important that the effects of development upon nature is taken into account It is therefore unclear what effect the policy will have for heritage.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Uncertain effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Site by site variation in terms of impact on the historic environment. Medium risk.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy ensures that employment activity is retained on existing sites. This protects undeveloped areas which may be significant in landscape or townscape terms from inappropriate development. Equally existing protected employment sites may be within important landscapes and townscapes, and their retention, intensification or reuse may be equality detrimental. A neutral effect is assessed for this policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Landscaping and design measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The intensification of uses, or specific industrial processes may be harmful to the local landscape/townscape. Medium risk.</p> | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the reuse of existing sites in use for employment, protecting undeveloped areas which are potentially important to landscape and townscape. The policy also promote the reuse/redevelopment of existing employment sites which may adversely affect the existing built and natural landscape. The policy could also push investment for employment uses towards greenfield sites with potential adverse effects for landscape/townscape. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be neutral for this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Landscaping and design measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The type, scale and uses brought forward in accordance with policy. Medium risk.</p> |

Policy WRK 9: Mixed Use Development

Summary

Preferred Option: The policy offers guidance for proposals for mixed use development, confirming acceptable locations and types of land for mixed use proposals and setting out the key issues to be taken into account and responded to through applications for mixed use type developments. The policy scores positively for environmental and social objectives and helps to promote the delivery of economic and housing targets by providing further opportunities for sustainable forms of development.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy sets out a policy framework for the determination of mixed use development proposals. A reasonable alternative to this could have been the direct allocation of mixed use developments. This is however not considered necessary to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy and deliver identified housing and employment targets in full. This reasonable alternative has not therefore been assessed given that it is not necessary to secure alignment and the implementation of adopted policy.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets out a supportive position for mixed use proposals in a variety of locations across the Borough, which, if released over the plan period, could help boost the level of housing land supply and the diversity of housing stock across the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Mixed-use schemes are residential led or contain a residential element.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sites are not allocated so may or may not come forward over the plan period. Medium risk.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets out a supportive position for mixed use proposals in a variety of locations across the Borough, which, if released over the plan period, could help boost the level of housing and employment land supply in the Borough. Mixed use development could also include other uses which support the local economy, in particular the town centres which help increase footfall and prolong visits to the Borough and its settlements.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sites are not allocated so may or may not come forward over the plan period. Proposed uses may not be compatible with existing uses. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the redevelopment and investment within the urban areas by establishing a positive policy framework for determining potential applications received. In general mixed use development provides an opportunity for regeneration, reduce levels of deprivation and to enhance opportunity for sustainable living by providing an increased range of uses within accessible distances.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sites are not allocated so may or may not come forward over the plan period. The type of developments which might come forward is also uncertain. Medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy could help secure the regeneration of decaying, potentially unsafe and sites which detract from the wider environment. The suitable redevelopment of these sites will result in benefits for wider health and wellbeing where such sites currently result in adverse effects for residents and businesses. The policy gives rise to the opportunity to provide sites with multiple functions. This could reduce the need for travel, create multi-purpose trips, and avoid dead spaces and frontage which detract from the built quality of the wider environment, and help reduce the opportunity for crime enhancing the safety of existing areas.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sites are not allocated so may or may not come forward over the plan period. The type of developments which might come forward is also uncertain. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The promotion of mixed use development has clear advantages in reducing the need to travel and promoting access via sustainable transport modes. This permits single multipurpose trips and provide communities and businesses with more of the uses, services and facilities they need in a short distance of existing communities.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant permanent positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sites are not allocated so may or may not come forward over the plan period. The type of developments which might come forward is also uncertain. Medium risk.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the development of land within the urban area for new and a variety of uses, this is beneficial in recycling existing buildings, derelict or vacant land within communities, and also making better use of land by using it for multiple uses preventing the loss of greenfield land to development</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Sites are not allocated so may or may not come forward over the plan period. The type of developments which might come forward is also uncertain. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the redevelopment of existing sites and as such would address any problems caused in water quality and resources by contaminated sites. The regeneration of sites would also enable the delivery of newer and more sustainable buildings which are constructed to the latest standards, inclusive of using natural resources efficiently.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The extent that contamination can be addressed within the scope and viability of the scheme. Medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the development of land for mixed use development. The policy is not specific on what type of land is to be developed and may include greenfield land provided that locational criteria is met. No sites are specifically allocated to respond to this with its delivery reliant on windfall. As such the impact of this policy on this objective is Neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>SuDs hierarchy. Reducing development footprint. Less intensive uses.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Role of site within floodplain and development effect on flood risk will vary site by site. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to encourage the delivery of mixed use developments. This would benefit air quality by reducing the need to travel from within a particular site to access employment or shops or services. It would also benefit existing communities by providing them with enhanced accessibility to an increased range of facilities, shops, or sources of employment without needing to travel far distances. The regeneration of sites would also enable the delivery of newer and more sustainable buildings which are constructed to the latest standards, inclusive of using natural resources efficiently.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancement. Planning contributions.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Mixed use sites are not allocated so their location, timing, and uses are not controllable over the plan period. Medium risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes an enhanced way of living sustainability where people may be able to live, work, and even play at the same site. Mixed use developments would also benefit existing communities by providing an increased range of facilities, shops or sources of employment without the need to travel far distances. The regeneration of sites would also enable the delivery of newer and more sustainable buildings which are constructed to the latest standards, inclusive of using natural resources efficiently.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Likely permanent positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures. Infrastructure enhancement. Planning contributions.</p> <p>Sustainable build requirements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Mixed use sites are not allocated so their location, timing, and uses are not controllable. Whilst travel is one key aspect of mitigating climate change, the policy does not address others such as build quality, efficiency and energy generation. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Whilst mixed use developments inevitably with use and result in waste (and have opportunities for this to be addressed) the policy outlined represents only a decision making framework for submitted schemes and does not result in allocated sites. As such the policy is not directly connected to this objective and as such is assessed as negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Although the policy does not allocate any specific sites, the policy does seek to ensure that proposals submitted in response to and compliance with this policy does not result in unacceptable impacts on the environment, with improvements sought where possible. The policy is therefore considered to score neutrally for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Adoption of net gains for biodiversity. Implementation of open space within developments to enhance green infrastructure network.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The exact impact of proposals for biodiversity and green infrastructure will depend on the scale, location and nature of the development proposed. The means and scope to address and mitigate this will vary from development to development however the policy sets a marker to ensure no adverse effects. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that mixed use development does not result in adverse effects for the environment with enhancements sought to the physical quality of the urban environment. The policy also seeks mixed use development to act as flagship schemes to attract further development and investment especially in areas where the existing environment is poor, and unemployment and levels of deprivation are high. Clearly where a historic environment is dilapidated and/or affected by a poor urban environment, a mixed use development promoted in accordance with this policy would lead to local enhancements to the benefit of the historical asset.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design features, use of local materials, massing, creation of landmarks, enhanced areas of open space etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The achievability of the policy requirements within the scope and viability of a development. Medium Risk.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that mixed use development does not result in adverse effects for the environment with enhancements sought to the physical quality of the urban environment. The policy also seeks mixed use development to act almost as flagship schemes to attract further development and investment especially in areas where the existing environment is poor, and unemployment and levels of deprivation are high. Clearly where a townscape or landscape is dilapidated and/or affected by a poor urban environment, a mixed use development promoted in accordance with this policy would lead to local enhancements to the benefit of the landscape/townscape.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from the medium term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design features, use of local materials, massing, creation of landmarks, enhanced areas of open space etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The achievability of the policy requirements within the scope and viability of a development. Medium Risk.</p> |

Policy WRK 10: Vibrant Town Centres

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to safeguard the role, vibrancy and activity of the Borough's town centres as the principle and most appropriate location for town centre uses. The policy makes a positive response to the changes made to the use class order in Summer 2020, setting out local guidance for Class E uses and non-E Class uses within the town centre. The policy seeks to ensure that non-commercial uses do not undermine the functionality of town centres within the wider Borough, and enables broader uses where conditions are met. The policy strongly supports the economic, social and environment role played by town centres and performs well against assessed sustainability objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The preferred option is responsive to changes in use class order made in Summer 2020. An alternative approach to implement a more restrictive approach similar to that set out in current policy is no longer possible given that changes of use within Class E is not considered to be development and as a result is not controllable. Such an alternative is not therefore feasible. A further alternative to relax further the permissible uses within town centres is not considered appropriate given that such an approach would not be consistent with the NPPF to promote vibrant town centres, owing to the increased likelihood that floorspace would be lost to non-commercial uses. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed to the preferred option.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy recognises that town centres provide a role in meeting housing need and enable housing growth within designated centres. Any housing provided in the town centre will help meet identified housing need and provide stock which caters to a broader range of housing need, such as homes for first time buyers, single households, professional workers etc.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long terms of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Opportunities for town centre living both exist and are taken up.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Economic conditions and viability. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to encourage investment and maintain the role of our town centres by encouraging a wide range of uses in appropriate locations and directing commercial activity to the town centre. To policy also protects the main function of the town centre by limiting the amount of non-commercial uses within its central area. This will help support the economy of Pendle and maintain and promote increases in jobs.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects in the short, medium and long terms of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Broader flexibility in the types of uses permitted in the town centre will encourage greater economic activity.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>How the role of the town centre evolves over the plan period depending on prevailing economic conditions and societal changes/attitudes. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the reuse of existing buildings and developed land within the town centres, encouraging/permitting its use for a broader range of purposes. This approach will provide the opportunity in our town centres ensuring that the role they play at the heart of communities is maintained and enhanced over the plan period which will also help tackle deprivation and provide for enhanced levels of sustainable living.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects in the short, medium and long terms of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Broader flexibility in the types of uses permitted in the town centre will encourage greater economic activity.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>How the role of the town centre evolves over the plan period depending on prevailing economic conditions and societal changes/attitudes. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the reinvestment in and redevelopment of our town centres for a broad range of uses. This will help to reduce the amount of vacant property in the area, reduce the potential for unhealthy uses, and help improve the condition of the town centre for the benefit of its users, workers and those resident in it.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Broader flexibility in the types of uses permitted in the town centre will encourage greater economic activity.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>How the role of the town centre evolves over the plan period depending on prevailing economic conditions and societal changes/attitudes. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes broader uses within our town centres which will help make then meet the needs of a more diverse population. Town Centre living is also promoted which will help reduce the need to travel by car. Our town centres typically benefit from the best range of infrastructure including public transport accessibility, which in some cases, is underutilised, and will promote the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Uses promoted for the town centre over the plan period provide for a diversification of uses which is beneficial to the sustainability of that centre and its wider hinterland.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy enables a broad use of land and buildings within town centres seeking to encourage and direct investment and development to our town centres. The policy will therefore assist in safeguarding undeveloped land and soils from being lost to development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Town Centres provide an appropriate location for development and are viable.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to encourage the reuse and redevelopment of existing buildings in our town centres providing an opportunity to adapt or constructed buildings to higher resource efficiency standards. This would not result in increased pressure on water quality and resources given that the proposal would not result in increased demand due to an extended built footprint or area.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the medium and long term of the plan period</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent to which land and uses within town centres effect water quality and resources. Medium risk.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages reinvestment in our town centres focussing growth towards previously developed land. This should not result increased levels of flooding elsewhere but is also unlikely to result in betterment for flood risk either. The policy therefore scores neutrally for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Mitigation of flood risk may not be possible within the scope of a development on PDL. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the reuse of buildings and land within our town centres diversifying the role and activities in these areas. This provides an opportunity to adapt or constructed buildings to higher resource efficiency standards The policy could also benefit air quality by reducing the need to travel and providing a wider range of goods, services, activities, and residential opportunities in the town centre, which also tend to be the most accessible places by public transport from wider locations. The impact of the policy is tapered by the possible negative effects increased activity could have for air quality in our town centres.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Range of uses provided within town centres as a result of the town. Modal shift to sustainable modes of transport. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the reuse of buildings and land within our town centres diversifying the role and activities in these areas. This provides an opportunity to adapt or constructed buildings to higher resource efficiency standards The policy could also benefit air quality by reducing the need to travel and providing a wider range of goods, services, activities, and residential opportunities in the town centre, which also tend to be the most accessible places by public transport from wider locations. The impact of the policy is tapered by the possible negative effects increased activity could have for air quality in our town centres.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Range of uses provided within town centres as a result of the town. Modal shift to sustainable modes of transport. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages investment and the reuse of existing buildings within our town centres for a broader range of uses. This is supportive of this policy objective by reducing the need for new development elsewhere safeguarding land important for mineral extraction. The redevelopment of the town centre could provide for enhancements to facilities and practices for the storage and management of waste, encouraging higher levels of recycling within the commercial sector.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Existing premises form appropriate locations for other uses.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to encourage and promote the reinvestment of town centres by reuse of existing buildings or redeveloping developed land. This will help to protect areas of undeveloped land which have an important biodiversity, geodiversity, or green infrastructure function, or which would be adversely affected by development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will encourage the reuse of our town centres, ensuring that existing buildings are maintained and are actively used. This will help minimise the adverse effect vacant premises can have on the street scene, including heritage assets. The direction of investment towards town centres will also safeguard heritage assets in semi-rural areas from new development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Proposals for reuse/redevelopment are policy compliant with regard to heritage impact.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will encourage the reuse of our town centres, ensuring that existing buildings are maintained and are actively used. This will help minimise the adverse effect vacant premises can have on the street scene, beneficial to the townscape. The direction of investment towards town centres will also safeguard sensitive and high quality landscapes within the Borough for inappropriate forms of development taking place on the urban edge.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy WRK 11: Retail and Commercial Uses outside of Town and Local Shopping Centres

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option seeks to safeguard the role, vibrancy and activity of the Borough's town centres as the principle and most appropriate location for town centre uses limiting scope for Class E uses to defined locations which lay outside of these town centres. The policy is responsive to changes made to the use class order in Summer 2020. The policy seeks to ensure that commercial uses do not adversely affect neighbouring uses and can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. The policy strongly supports the economic, social and environment role played by town centres and generally performs well against assessed sustainability objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The preferred option is responsive to changes in use class order made in Summer 2020. An alternative approach to implement a more restrictive approach similar to that set out in current policy for sequential assessment is no longer possible given that changes of use within Class E is not considered to be development and as a result is not controllable and as such policy cannot control the location of such development in the same degree as previous policy. Such an alternative is not therefore feasible. A further alternative to relax the approach for Class E development outside town centres is not considered appropriate given that such an approach would not be consistent with the NPPF to promote vibrant town centres and the harmful effect this would have for residential amenity, the environment and infrastructure capacity. This alternative is not therefore considered reasonable. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed to the preferred option.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy does not have a direct effect on this objective and as such is considered to have a negligible impact.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to direct commercial investment beyond town centres to a limited range of locations. This is the aim to safeguard and promote the economic role fulfilled by our town centres but also to prevent commercial development in inappropriate locations. A broader range of uses is permitted by policy at identified sites. The policy works to support the local economy and local jobs. Limitations placed on the location of commercial investment may however result in opportunities for economic growth and investment in the Borough being lost. Such proposals would be considered on their merits.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The state and structure of the economy and how this will change over the plan period. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to direct commercial investment to built areas around the Borough, supporting vibrant town centres, accessible jobs, aiding regeneration, and ensuring that goods and services remain accessible to the entire local population.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Town Centres and functional commercial sites remain the most attractive and optimum locations for economic growth over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Type and range of commercial development proposals which might come forward over the plan period. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The Policy seeks to direct specific uses to specific sites preventing inappropriate and potentially harmful development elsewhere. Safeguards for health and wellbeing and are provided within the policy. The policy seeks to direct commercial investment to built areas around the Borough, supporting vibrant town centres, accessible jobs, aiding regeneration, and ensuring that goods and services remain accessible to the entire local population.</p> <p>The policy is considered to perform positively against this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Restrictions on activity, operation hours etc.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to direct specific uses to certain sites, safeguarding the town centre. Such sites outside the town centre may have limited accessibility. The policy does not alter this position. The policy is considered to have a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel Plan measures/infrastructure contributions to promote sustainable travel.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy both directs and encourages the reuse of buildings and previously developed land for commercial purposes helping to safeguard greenfield land and soils from development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Permanent positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the reinvestment, reuse and redevelopment of sites in existing commercial use and as a result would not result in further pressure on water quality and resources. The policy helps avoid any additional pressure on water quality or resources which may result from new development on greenfield sites. The renewal and regeneration of existing buildings may give rise to the opportunity to reduce water usage where resource efficient standards are implemented</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium, and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Water efficiency standards in build requirements.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the reuse/redevelopment of existing buildings/land in use for commercial activity. The policy will help to reduce pressure to develop greenfield sites for commercial development. The policy however is unlikely to reduce the risk of flooding at existing commercial sites.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to direct commercial development which takes place beyond town centres to existing commercial sites. This would avoid broader impacts on air quality arising from new development on previously undeveloped sites however may result in a concentration of activity, potentially adverse for air quality particularly where these sites exist in close proximity to areas which already suffer from problems with air quality. Overall the policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel Plan measures/infrastructure contributions to promote sustainable travel.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to direct commercial development which takes place beyond town centres to existing commercial sites. The policy would assist in ensuring that commercial development does not take place on previously undeveloped sites which might prolong car journeys. Existing commercial sites, whilst established, may not in every instance be accessible via public transport, walking and cycling. Overall the policy is assessed as having a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages investment and the reuse of existing buildings and land at existing commercial sites enabling a broader range of uses. This is supportive of this policy objective by reducing the need for new development elsewhere reducing the amount of materials needed. This is supportive of this policy objective by reducing the need for new development elsewhere safeguarding land important for mineral extraction. The redevelopment of the town centre could provide for enhancements to facilities and practices for the storage and management of waste, encouraging higher levels of recycling within the commercial sector.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Existing premises form appropriate locations for other uses.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to encourage and promote the reinvestment of existing commercial sites by reuse of existing buildings or redeveloping developed land. This will help to protect areas of undeveloped land which have an important biodiversity, geodiversity, or green infrastructure function, or which would be adversely affected by development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will encourage the reuse of existing commercial sites, ensuring that existing buildings are maintained and are actively used. This will help minimise the adverse effect vacant premises can have on the street scene, including heritage assets. The direction of investment towards town centres will also safeguard heritage assets in semi-rural areas from new development.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Proposals for reuse/redevelopment are policy compliant with regard to heritage impact.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will encourage the reuse of existing commercial sites, ensuring that existing buildings are maintained and are actively used. This will help minimise the adverse effect vacant premises can have on the street scene, beneficial to the townscape. The direction of investment towards commercial sites will also safeguard landscapes for inappropriate forms of development on the urban edge.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effect in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy WRK 12: Tourist Facilities and Accommodation

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option sets out guidance to support the sustainable development of tourist facilities and accommodation. The policy is responsive to aims of the Council to boost visits, overnight stays, and investment in the Borough, and will support the growth and diversification of the local economy. The policy scores positively for social and economic objectives, and generally neutral effects for environmental objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The preferred option provides a positive policy framework to support proposals for sustainable development of tourist facilities and accommodation, including necessary safeguards to provide inappropriate and harmful development. This is consistent with objectives of the Core Strategy. An alternative to allocate specific sites for tourism use would be inappropriate in acting to limit and direct tourism uses to sites which may not be attractive to the market or be used effectively. Such an approach may therefore have the opposite to the desired effect for the local economy. No reasonable alternative is therefore considered to exist.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ~ | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy is not related to this objective and as such will have a negligible effect.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p>Likely Significant Effects</p> <p>The policy provides a positive framework to encourage investment in the local tourism industry, and provide additional accommodation for overnight stays, aiding the delivery of economic growth within the Borough over the plan period in line with aims to support the continued sustainable growth of this sector. This will help diversify the local economy in Pendle which is particularly reliant on the manufacturing sector, support the creation of new jobs, and provide for additional patronage and footfall in the Borough's town centres.</p> <p>Term</p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term of the plan period.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainties</p> <p>Extent, scale, type and location of investment. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will aid the development of the tourism sector in Pendle, aiding urban regeneration and supporting the vitality of rural areas by providing jobs and additional activity benefitting wider businesses. The overall effect is considered to be positive.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Extent, scale, type and location of investment. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy may provide benefits to health and wellbeing by providing a source of employment for residents or providing regeneration of urban areas. Additional visitors however may adversely affect existing residents and businesses. Overall the considered effect of this policy is considered neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | - | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages investment in tourism attractions and overnight accommodation to support the local economy. The effect of this would be to attract more people to Pendle resulting in increased trips. Whilst attractions may be accessible to public transport most trips to and from tourist attractions and accommodation will be made by car, and not necessarily in areas of good infrastructure. Overall the policy is assessed as having a minor negative impact on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Minor adverse effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Travel plan measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scaling, timing and type of investment and proximity/accessibility to investment. Low-medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the sustainable development of the tourism industry with this being concentrated to existing buildings and the built up area. A neutral effect is assessed for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages the sustainable development of the tourism industry with this being concentrated to existing buildings and the built up area. The amount and scope of development permitted through this policy over the plan period is likely to be significant enough to strain water quality and resources.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Building efficiency standards. Rain water recycling.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to encourage investment in the tourist sector in Pendle with this directed towards existing buildings and built up areas. The policy is unlikely to adversely affect flood risk.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy encourages investment in tourism attractions and overnight accommodation to support the local economy. The effect of this would be to attract more people to Pendle resulting in increased trips. The scale and degree of effects of the policy and tourism related development upon this objective is likely to vary depending on site specific circumstances. Whilst attractions may be accessible to public transport most trips to and from tourist attractions and accommodation will be made by car, and not necessarily in areas of good infrastructure. Development is however unlikely to adversely affect those parts of the Borough which experience poor air quality. A neutral effect is found for this policy.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effect over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Changes in technology and attitudes would moderate the effect on the policy on this objective (low risk).</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is likely to have a neutral effect on this objective. The scale and degree of effects of the policy and tourism related development upon this objective is likely to vary depending on site specific circumstances. Increased trips to the Borough by car is likely to be offset by sustainability standards in building and operation.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Sustainable design, methods of construction and operation.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Whilst tourist facilities generate waste both in construction and operation, the policy itself does not allocate specific sites for tourist use and as such does not directly impact on this objective. The result is considered to be negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets out the framework for the determination of proposals for tourist facilities/accommodation. The scale and degree of effects of the policy and tourism related development upon this objective is likely to vary depending on site specific circumstances. The policy does however seek to ensure that proposals avoid adverse effects for wildlife and as such is assessed as resulting in a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Offsetting, net-gain and open space provision where necessary/feasible.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Relationship and effect of development on a designated ecological asset, wildlife, geological designation or green infrastructure. Low to medium risk.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets out the framework for the determination of proposals for tourist facilities/accommodation. The scale and degree of effects of the policy and tourism related development upon this objective is likely to vary depending on site specific circumstances. The policy does however seek to ensure that proposals avoid adverse effects for the historic environment and as such is assessed as resulting in a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting, scale, layout, materials, design features, landscaping.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Relationship and effect of development on a heritage asset. Low to medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy sets out the framework for the determination of proposals for tourist facilities/accommodation. The scale and degree of effects of the policy and tourism related development upon this objective is likely to vary depending on site specific circumstances. The policy does however seek to ensure that proposals avoid adverse effects for landscape and as such is assessed as resulting in a neutral effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting, scale, layout, materials, design features, landscaping.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Relationship and effect of development on landscape/townscape. Low to medium risk.</p> |

Policy WRK 13: Digital and Electronic Communications

Summary

Preferred Option: The preferred option sets out guidance to support the development of Digital and Electronic Communications setting out the necessary considerations to avoid adverse effects on residents, businesses and the environment. The policy scores positively for economic objectives, and scores generally neutrally environmental and social objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The preferred option provides a positive policy framework to support proposals for the development of digital and electronic communications infrastructure, including necessary safeguards to provide inappropriate and harmful development. This is consistent with objectives of the Core Strategy to support economic objectives. An alternative to allocate specific sites would be inappropriate owing to the small scale nature of proposals, differing locational/site/equipment requirements, and the need to enable for advances in technology. A flexible approach to windfall proposals is therefore a more suitable and effective means to deal with this type of development. No reasonable alternative is therefore considered to exist.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy is of limited relevance to this objective and as such will have a negligible impact on this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy will help provide the digital and commercial infrastructure to support economic growth and attract investment in Pendle and ensure that communication infrastructure meets 21st century needs and standards. The policy will help support the development of the current economic base helping businesses to adapt and optimise operations, and secure investment in and an expansion of the industries found within the Borough.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes investment and upgrades in digital and communication infrastructure in Pendle. Better infrastructure will help support sustainable communities by giving access to wider services and goods, as well as supporting local jobs. This infrastructure will help tackle deprivation and the regeneration of urban areas where businesses are attracted to the area as a result of better technological infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy to develop infrastructure may allow access for people to technology which promotes a healthy lifestyle and enhances wellbeing such as greater access to activity or membership groups or families or friends. Health impacts of communication infrastructure are not yet fully understood and so it is inconclusive what effects this would have. Living near communication/digital infrastructure could adversely affect amenity. Overall the policy is considered to have a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Siting, operation and design measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Access to faster and more reliable forms of digital and communication infrastructure can reduce the need to travel to work, purchase goods, or access services. This could support more sustainable patterns of movement.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Change in attitudes and practices. Take up of technology. Relevance of technology for local industries. Low risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|---|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy has a limited relationship with this objective. The overall affect is considered to be negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Access to faster and more reliable forms of digital and communication infrastructure can reduce the need to travel to work, purchase goods, or access services. This could support more sustainable patterns of movement improving air quality both as a result of accessing employment and for business operations.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Change in attitudes and practices. Take up of technology. Relevance of technology for local industries. Low risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>Access to faster and more reliable forms of digital and communication infrastructure can reduce the need to travel to work, purchase goods, or access services. This could support more sustainable patterns of movement helping to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and providing for more sustainable forms of living.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Change in attitudes and practices. Take up of technology. Relevance of technology for local industries. Low risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy provides the decision making framework for proposals for digital and communications infrastructure, ensuring that such development does not result in adverse effects for biodiversity. Overall it is considered that the policy will have a neutral impact on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Policy compliance is achievable.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy provides the decision making framework for proposals for digital and communications infrastructure, ensuring that such development does not result in adverse effects for heritage. Overall it is considered that the policy will have a neutral impact on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Policy compliance is achievable.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy provides the decision making framework for proposals for digital and communications infrastructure, ensuring that such development does not result in adverse effects for townscape/landscape character. Overall it is considered that the policy will have a neutral impact on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Policy compliance is achievable.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

Policy SUP5: Supporting Healthy Places and Lifestyles

Preferred Option: The policy seeks to ensure that new development protects and promotes the health interests of the local population and future users. The policy also sets out guidance to ensure that the health of children is not adversely affected by hot food takeaway proposals, and that hot food takeaways do not adversely affect residential amenity and highway safety. The policy scores positively for social objectives with neutral effects for social and environmental objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The preferred approach implements the Council's objectives to promote and improve health and wellbeing, and prevent harmful effects of development on existing residents. Supporting evidence, as set out in the baseline information, illustrates that the Borough experiences substantial health problems, with pressures for health and social services. A relaxed approach, in contrast to the preferred option is simply not justified by the evidence. No reasonable alternative is therefore considered to exist.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy holds limited connection to this policy and is assessed as having a negligible impact on this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy seeks to ensure that development does not adversely affect health and wellbeing. The policy limits certain types of development in certain locations for health reasons but does not prevent such forms of development elsewhere. The overall effect of the policy is considered to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Neutral effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes health and wellbeing in the siting, type, layout and form of new development to minimise the potential for adverse effects and ensure that development positively contributes to the wider community. The policy will be important in tackling social deprivation and providing for sustainable living ensuring deliver real positive change. The policy is considered to have a minor positive effect for this policy objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy applies to new development and as such cannot be retrospectively applied. Medium risk.</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | ++ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to safeguard and promote health and wellbeing in new development ensuring that new development does not adversely affect existing users and neighbourhoods. This is particularly responsive to findings of child obesity and low activity levels and aims to assist in improving lifestyles. The policy works to prevent development which would be detrimental to the health of residents including those most at risk. The policy is therefore considered to have a significant positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Significant positive effects in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>The policy applies to new development and as such cannot be retrospectively applied. Medium risk.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to promote healthy lifestyles, social and economic inclusion and ensuring good access to a full range of health facilities. Such requirements may have a beneficial effect for objectives to reduce the need to travel or travelling via sustainable modes of transport. Overall the policy is considered to have a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy may influence the form, type and location of development but does not necessarily influence whether a site makes use of brownfield or greenfield land. As such the policy/proposal would not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to promote healthy lifestyles, social and economic inclusion and ensuring good access to a full range of health facilities. Such requirements may have a beneficial effect for objectives to reduce the need to travel or travelling via sustainable modes of transport which would benefit air quality. Overall the policy is considered to have a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to promote healthy lifestyles, social and economic inclusion and ensuring good access to a full range of health facilities. Such requirements may have a beneficial effect for objectives to reduce the need to travel or travelling via sustainable modes of transport. Overall the policy is considered to have a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |

Policy SUP6: Support for Local Communities

Preferred Option: The policy offers guidance for proposals for community facilities to support sustainable communities and is responsive to the change made to the Use Class Order. The policy scores highly for social objectives and broadly neutral/positive for environmental objectives.

Reasonable Alternative: The policy works hand in hand with Policy SUP5 which allocates specific sites for community uses. The policy is also responsive to the use class order amendments of Summer 2020. As a result there is no reasonable alternative to this policy. No reasonable alternative has therefore been assessed.

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 1. To meet the housing needs of all communities in the Pendle area and deliver decent homes. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy has limited connection with this policy and as such is assessed as having a negligible effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 2. To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers high quality and well located employment opportunities for everyone. | 0 | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy provides guidance for small local shops where consistent with criteria. Whilst this may promote access to shops for some, it may also limit opportunities for other shops within the catchment area, or where the floorspace is too large. The overall effect of this policy is considered to be neutral.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Neutral effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Viability of a rural/small shop (Medium risk).</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 3. To promote urban regeneration, support the vitality of rural areas, tackle deprivation and promote sustainable living. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy helps to support rural vitality, tackle social deprivation and promote sustainable living by providing a positive policy framework to promote the delivery of community uses, local shops and recreational facilities in the Borough. The policy will aid the delivery of these types of development where brought forward. The overall effect is assessed as a minor positive outcome.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasing benefits over the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Funding and viability of community uses over the plan period is uncertain (Medium risk).</p> |
| 4. To improve the health and wellbeing of those living and working in the Pendle area. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy promotes the development of facilities for rural communities and neighbourhoods including a local shop, recreation facilities, and community facilities, which would be beneficial to health and wellbeing. The implementation of the policy will improve health lifestyles promoting increase in activity and social interaction both beneficial to wellbeing as well as health. The policy is therefore assessed as having a minor positive effect for this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Short, medium and long term benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Role and extent of use within the community will vary. (low risk)</p> |
| 5. To reduce the need to travel, promote more sustainable modes of transport and align investment in infrastructure with growth. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The provision of a local shop, community facility or recreational facility could help reduce the need to travel to access similar facilities further afield. This is consistent with this objective and as a result is assessed as having a minor positive effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Increasing benefits over the duration of the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Accessibility of proposals to wider community. Role and extent of use by the wider community (low risk)</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|--|-------|--|
| 6. To encourage the efficient use of land and conserve and enhance soils. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> The policy promote the efficient and effective use of existing buildings/built land within communities to promote vibrancy, social interaction and reduce the need to travel.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> Availability of land, viability of use. (low-medium risk).</p> |
| 7. To conserve and enhance water quality and resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |
| 8. To reduce the risk of flooding to people and property, taking into account the effects of climate change. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u> There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u> Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u> None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 9. To improve air quality. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The provision of a local shop, community facility or recreational facility could help reduce the need to travel to access similar facilities further afield. This will benefit air quality as people will need to travel less by car. This is consistent with this objective and as a result is assessed as having a minor positive effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Accessibility to the existing community, role and use. Continued viability. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 10. To minimise greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the effects of climate change. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The provision of a local shop, community facility or recreational facility could help reduce the need to travel to access similar facilities further afield. This will help at a local level reduce greenhouse gas emissions as people will need to travel less by car. This is consistent with this objective and as a result is assessed as having a minor positive effect.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects for the plan period.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Accessibility to the existing community, role and use. Continued viability. Low-medium risk.</p> |
| 11. To promote the waste hierarchy (reduce, reuse, recycle, recover) and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |

| SA Objective | Score | Commentary on effects of the policy |
|---|-------|---|
| 12. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network. | ~ | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>There is no clear relationship between the policy/proposal and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Not assessed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>None.</p> |
| 13. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to direct development proposals to make reuse of existing buildings and well related to the existing settlement pattern. Proposals are also required to be consistent in scale, form and character to the wider built form to ensure no adverse effects. The policy gives rise to the opportunity to make effect use of existing buildings and safeguard the sustainability and culture of a settlement or wider area. The policy is considered to score positively in response to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design responses required as detailed in policy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale, scope and type of development which might come forward over the plan period.</p> |
| 14. To conserve and enhance landscape character and townscapes. | + | <p><u>Likely Significant Effects</u></p> <p>The policy seeks to direct development proposals to make reuse of existing buildings and well related to the existing settlement pattern. Proposals are also required to be consistent in scale, form and character to the wider built form to ensure no adverse effects. The policy gives rise to the opportunity to make effect use of existing buildings and safeguard the sustainability and culture of a settlement or wider area. The policy is considered to score positively in response to this objective.</p> <p><u>Term</u></p> <p>Positive effects from adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation</u></p> <p>Design responses required as detailed in policy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainties</u></p> <p>Scale, scope and type of development which might come forward over the plan period.</p> |

WORKING DRAFT