

**West Lancashire Borough Council  
Provision for Traveller Sites DPD:  
Options and Preferred Options  
Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report  
October 2015**

**John Harrison, DipEnvP, MRTPI  
Assistant Director Planning  
West Lancashire Borough Council**

**WEST LANCASHIRE**



**LOCAL PLAN**

## CONTENTS

<b>Chapter</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Planning Policy Context</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>West Lancashire Borough Council's Approach to the Sustainability Appraisal</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Evidence from the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Consultation on the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Framework and Objectives</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Methodology - Developing and Appraising Options</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Appraisal of Policy GT1 of the Draft Traveller Sites DPD and Alternative Policies</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Appraisal of Preferred and Alternative Traveller Sites</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>Review of Relevant Plans and Programmes</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>Collection of Relevant Economic, Social and Environmental Baseline Data</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Appendix 3</b>	<b>Identifying Sustainability Issues</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Appendix 4</b>	<b>Site Assessments (Sustainability Criteria)</b>	<b>58</b>

## 1. Introduction

This Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been structured in order to meet the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC “on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment”, known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (or SEA) Directive. The SA has been prepared by Council officers.

The document that has been appraised is the Provision for Traveller Sites Development Plan Document – Options and Preferred Options (‘the Traveller Sites DPD’), an early draft of a development plan document (DPD) being prepared by West Lancashire Borough Council. The DPD’s purpose is threefold – firstly to set out the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers or Travelling Showpeople (referred to hereafter as ‘Travellers’), secondly to provide a policy against which proposals for Traveller sites for can be assessed, and thirdly to allocate a number of specific sites across the Borough to meet the objectively assessed needs for Traveller accommodation.

Further details about West Lancashire Borough Council’s approach to Sustainability Appraisal can be found in the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, available on the Council’s website at:

<http://www.westlancs.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/the-local-plan/the-local-plan-2012-2027/sustainability-appraisals.aspx>

The consultants AECOM have provided a critical review of a draft version of this Interim Appraisal, including guidance as to the content of the report. Many of the consultants’ recommendations have already been taken on board in this document; the remainder will be addressed in a future iteration of this Appraisal, to accompany the Publication version of the DPD.

Table 1.1 overleaf outlines how this Interim Sustainability Appraisal report of the Traveller Sites DPD complies with the SEA Directive.

**Table 1.1 Compliance of this Sustainability Appraisal with the SEA Directive**

<b>Information required by the SEA Directive</b>	<b>Existence of this information in the Traveller Sites DPD SA report</b>
Contents, objectives and relationship with other plans and programmes.	Summarised in Appendix 1 of this report. Full details can be found within the Local Plan (LDF) Scoping Report.
Current state of the environment and implications without the supporting DPD.	Baseline data - Appendix 2.
Characteristics likely to be affected.	Baseline data - Appendix 2.
Existing environmental problems.	Baseline data - Appendix 2.
Environmental protection objectives that are relevant to the DPD.	Appendix 1: key policy documents
Likely significant effects on the environment	Options Appraisal, Section 9.
Measures to offset significant adverse effects on the environment	Appendix 3.
Reasons for selecting the alternatives, describing how the assessment was undertaken.	Section 8.
Measures envisaged concerning monitoring.	To be addressed in SA Report for Final DPD

## 2. Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal

It is a requirement of law that Sustainability Appraisal (SA) be undertaken in line with the procedures prescribed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 ('the Regulations'), which were prepared in order to transpose the European Union Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive into UK law.

The implications of the Regulations for the Traveller Sites DPD are that a report is required to be published for consultation alongside the draft plan, in this case the Options & Preferred Options document, that 'identifies, describes and evaluates' the likely significant effects of implementing the Provision for Traveller Sites DPD, and any 'reasonable alternatives' that have been identified. The report must then be taken into account, alongside consultation responses, when finalising the DPD.

In line with the Regulations, the report (which for the purposes of Sustainability Appraisal is known as the 'SA Report') must essentially answer four questions:

1. What is the scope of the SA?
2. What has plan-making / SA involved up to this point?
  - Preparation of the final Plan must have been informed by at least one earlier plan-making / SA iteration at which point 'alternatives' are appraised.
3. What are the appraisal findings at this current stage?
  - i.e. in relation to the options / preferred options for the Provision for Traveller Sites DPD.
4. What happens next?

Sustainable development is central to the planning system. The purpose of an SA is to promote sustainable development, through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations, into the preparation of new or revised Supplementary Planning Documents and Development Plan Documents. This approach is reiterated within paragraph 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

An SA is a methodology for assessing strategy and policy (in this case the Traveller Sites DPD), investigating whether such plans, policies or programmes are likely to promote a sustainable pattern of development, and where possible, seeking to avoid or mitigate any negative social, environmental and economic effects.

In order to establish the most important sustainability issues, this report draws upon the SA of the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 (which covers the whole Borough) and reviews the relevant evidence and baseline data in order to inform and support the assessment of the Provision for Traveller Sites DPD.

Alternative options for potential site allocations, and the criteria for site selection for the Traveller Sites DPD have been considered, and the potential environmental, social and economic effects have been assessed for each option.

In summary, the Sustainability Appraisal Report does the following:

- Describes the purpose and content of the DPD, and the policy context within which it sits.
- Outlines the approach to sustainability appraisal (i.e. the methodology).
- Provides signposts to the baseline evidence supporting the DPD and against which the effects of the policies and potential candidate sites will be assessed.
- Outlines and evaluates the Local Plan objectives directly relevant to the DPD.
- Identifies and evaluates the environmental, economic and social effects of the proposed policy for assessing planning applications for Traveller development (as well as alternative policies), the potential candidate Traveller sites, the preferred options for Traveller sites, and alternative options for providing Traveller sites.
- Explains how the findings of the SA have influenced the draft Provision for Traveller Sites DPD.

### **3. Planning Policy Context**

The Localism Act 2011 and the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 led to a substantial reform of the planning system. At the heart of the NPPF is the 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development', which should be seen as 'a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking' (NPPF paragraph 14).

National planning policy for Traveller-related development is set out in the government document Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS), first published in March 2012 alongside the NPPF, and updated in August 2015. Paragraph 10 of PPTS places a requirement on local planning authorities to identify and update annually a five year supply of specific deliverable Traveller sites, and to identify a supply of specific developable sites, or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, years 11-15 of their Plan period.

The West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 was adopted by the Borough Council in October 2013. Earlier versions of this Local Plan (i.e. Preferred Options, January 2012, and Publication, August 2012) contained a policy on Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This policy, Policy RS4, was a criteria-based policy whose purpose was to direct Traveller development to the most appropriate places in the Borough, and to provide a means by which planning applications or enforcement cases relating to Traveller development could be judged.

At the Local Plan Examination in early 2013, the Local Plan Inspector advised that he could not find Policy RS4 sound, as it did not fulfil the requirement set out in PPTS to allocate specific deliverable sites to provide a five year supply of land to meet Traveller accommodation needs. In order for the West Lancashire Local Plan as a whole to be found sound, the Inspector recommended that Policy RS4 be deleted in its entirety from the Local Plan, and that the Council commit to preparing a separate Development Plan Document (DPD) to allocate sufficient deliverable sites to meet Traveller accommodation needs over the Local Plan period.

To this end, the Council published an updated Local Development Scheme in May 2013 which included a commitment to prepare a Provision for Traveller Sites DPD, to provide the local planning policy for West Lancashire relating to provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and the anticipated timescales for the preparation of this DPD.

## Content and Objectives of the Provision for Travellers Sites DPD

The Provision for Traveller Sites DPD ('Traveller Sites DPD') comprises the following elements:

1. A statement of objectively assessed accommodation needs for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople ('Travellers');
2. A criteria-based policy against which planning applications for Traveller sites can be assessed (these criteria would also be relied upon in enforcement and appeal cases); and
3. Site-specific allocations for Traveller accommodation.

The objective of the DPD is to meet, as far as is practically possible, the accommodation needs of Travellers where they arise in West Lancashire, in a way which minimises impact upon the settled community and the environment, and which provides a suitable location for Travellers to reside, free for example from unacceptable risks to health.

In terms of the three primary elements of the DPD:

1. The Borough Council participated in the Merseyside and West Lancashire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (August 2014), which concluded that the need for new Traveller accommodation in West Lancashire, additional to that which already has permission, is as follows:
  - 14 pitches<sup>1</sup> on permanent Gypsy and Traveller sites by 2018, rising to 22 pitches by 2033;
  - 4 transit pitches; and
  - 1 yard for Travelling Showpeople with at least 1 residential plot.
2. The proposed criteria-based policy is based upon national policy, as set out in PPTS, tailored to West Lancashire's specific circumstances. The recently-cancelled "Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide" was also used to shape the criteria, although the weight attributed to criteria based solely on this document is limited, given the document has been withdrawn by the government.
3. Whilst it is the intention of the Council to meet locally-arising Traveller accommodation needs in full, the draft DPD sets out the difficulties that have been encountered in searching for deliverable or developable sites ('deliverable' is defined as available now, in a suitable location, and achievable with a realistic prospect that the site can be developed within five years; developable defined as in a suitable location for traveller site development and having a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged). As a result, the current draft DPD is not able to propose for allocation sufficient sites to meet the identified Traveller accommodation needs, and instead proposes the allocation of a smaller number of sites.

---

<sup>1</sup> The general term "pitch" refers to an area of land which would accommodate a Traveller household. It is generally accepted that a pitch should have space for a touring and static caravan, as well as for parking and an amenity block. Typically, therefore, one would expect two caravans per pitch.



The Traveller Sites DPD covers the whole of West Lancashire Borough, as shown in Figure 1 below (West Lancashire is the lighter shaded area containing Burscough, Ormskirk and Skelmersdale):

**Figure 1: West Lancashire - geographical context**



This (Interim) Sustainability Appraisal Report covers the Options and Preferred Options version of the Traveller Sites DPD.

### **Preparation of the Traveller Sites DPD**

The first version of the Traveller Sites DPD is labelled the “Options & Preferred Options” document. This draft DPD has been published for consultation in order to seek the views of the community, stakeholders and other interested parties. The Council is inviting comments on all aspects of the document and in particular the proposed policy for assessing planning applications for Traveller development, the proposed criteria for site selection, and the preferred and alternative options for Traveller site provision. Specific questions on these aspects of the document are set out in the draft DPD itself.

Following consultation, all representations made will be considered, and any necessary and appropriate changes will be incorporated into the subsequent ‘Publication’ version of the DPD. The Provision for Traveller Sites DPD: Publication Version will be subject to a further round of public consultation before being submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. The Publication version of the DPD will be consulted on alongside an SA Report that will meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations. If the DPD is found sound at examination, it will be submitted to West Lancashire Borough Council for adoption.

Figure 2 below sets out the timescales for the preparation of the Provision for Traveller Sites DPD. References to “Regulations” are to the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

**Figure 1 Preparation of the Provision for Traveller Sites DPD**

<b>Preparation Stage</b>	<b>Anticipated / Target Timescale</b>
Evidence base: Preparation and publication of a joint Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment	March 2013 – August 2014
Regulation 18: ‘Scoping’ consultation	September – October 2013
Regulation 18: Options and Preferred Options	Winter 2015
Regulation 19: Publication	Summer 2016
Regulation 22: Submission to Secretary of State	October 2016
Regulation 24: Independent public examination	November 2016 – June 2017
Regulation 26: Adoption	July 2017

#### 4. West Lancashire Borough Council's Approach to the Sustainability Appraisal

There are five distinct stages to undertaking a Sustainability Appraisal, as outlined in government guidance. Although this guidance is now out-of-date, it is still common practice to follow these stages, which are as follows:

Stages of the Sustainability Appraisal Process	
Stage A	Scoping
Stage B	Developing and refining options and assessing effects
Stage C	Preparing the Sustainability Report
Stage D	Consulting on the preferred options of the document in question and the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal
Stage E	Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the document

This Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Provision for Traveller Sites DPD: Options and Preferred Options incorporates Stages A – C of the SA process.

##### Stage A

Stage A contains three principal elements:

*A1: Review key documents and policy context*

*A2: Analysis of baseline information*

*A3: Identification of the main sustainability issues relating to the DPD*

In terms of Stage A, this Sustainability Appraisal Report draws from the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, and from the evidence base that was compiled during the preparation of the Local Plan. Chapter 5 below and Appendices 1-3 (which correspond with stages A1-A3) provide a summary and analysis of the WLLP evidence base and SA Scoping Report, alongside any new or updated evidence which has arisen since this Scoping Report was published.

##### Stage B

Stage B consists of the following elements:

*B1: Testing the objectives of the DPD against the SA Framework.*

This element has been carried out for the Local Plan SA and is discussed in Chapter 7 of this SA report below.

*B2: Developing the options*

The development of options and alternative options is set out in Chapter 8.

*B3: Predicting the effects of the DPD*

*B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD*

The prediction and evaluation of the likely effects of the Traveller Sites Policy (and alternative policies) is set out in Chapter 9. The prediction and evaluation of the likely impacts of specific Traveller sites, including the preferred options for Traveller sites, as well as the impacts of alternative approaches to providing Traveller sites, are set out in Chapter 10.

*B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects.*

This element of Stage B is given some consideration in stages B3 / B4 above, but will be addressed in more detail in subsequent SA reports (i.e. for the Publication version of the DPD)

*B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD.*

This will be covered in detail in subsequent SA reports.

## 5. Evidence from the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

The first stage of the sustainability appraisal process involved reviewing the Local Plan (formerly “Core Strategy”) Scoping Report and considering which objectives and key issues relate specifically to the Traveller Sites DPD. The opportunity was also taken to review some of the baseline data applicable to the background evidence of the DPD, in case any of this information had become out of date; and to identify any further more detailed baseline information that was relevant to preparation of the DPD, but not addressed by the high level Local Plan Scoping Report.

In accordance with Task A1, a review was undertaken of key documents and the policy context; this can be found in Appendix 1. A number of key issues and messages were identified as part of a ‘contextual review’ of key plans, strategies and other evidence. These have been taken into consideration when establishing the key sustainability issues and the appraisal framework. The most relevant and useful document was the Planning Policy for Travellers Sites document (first published March 2012; revised August 2015), which highlights that the government’s overarching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for Travellers in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of Travellers, whilst respecting the interests of the settled community.

Task A2, Analysis of Baseline Information, can be found in Appendix 2. Much of the original data from the original Local Plan Scoping report is still extant (i.e. it has not been superseded). However a review of some data, including census data and population statistics, has been undertaken to reflect the most up-to-date information available. This updated information does not affect the overarching issues or appraisal framework as the trends remain the same; however, it provides an up-to-date baseline for the current Sustainability Appraisal and DPD.

Task A3 entailed identifying the primary sustainability issues facing the Traveller Sites DPD. For the purposes of the SA of the Traveller Sites DPD, this analysis has focused specifically on issues relating to Travellers and their accommodation, as well as on how the issues can be addressed, as set out in Table 5.1 below. A summary of the Baseline Evidence can be found in Appendix 2. Appendix 3 sets out the reasons for the identification of the issues in Table 5.1, and how they can be addressed. The key issues identified below have been drawn out of the available evidence, and have highlighted a number of issues that must be considered as the Traveller sites DPD is prepared.

**Table 5.1 Key Sustainability Issues relating to the Provision for Traveller Sites DPD**

Topic area	Key issues
Access, Highways & Public Transport	One of the key issues facing the Borough relates to the sustainability of transport; there is a need to improve access to sustainable methods of transport including bus services, rail links, cycle paths & footpaths. Car dependency levels are high and need reducing. There is a need to improve the diversity and availability of employment in West Lancashire in accessible locations or with improved public transport links to enable residents of the Borough to find employment locally within the Borough, thereby reducing the need to commute by private motor vehicle.

Topic area	Key issues
Social Inclusion	<p>There is a requirement to deliver a specified number of homes over the period 2012-2027 to meet the needs of the population. There are issues regarding housing affordability in several areas.</p> <p>There are no allocated Traveller sites in the Borough (the reason for preparing the Traveller Sites DPD).</p> <p>In addition to homes, there is a need to provide services, employment opportunities, and access to health-related facilities for residents of the newly developed accommodation.</p> <p>Social exclusion occurs from unemployment, low income, high crime rate, inadequate accommodation, and poor health.</p>
Access to services and amenities	<p>Access to services and amenities is poor in certain locations outside settlement boundaries, e.g. the Northern Parishes, and is less than satisfactory within parts of some settlements.</p> <p>There are various deficiencies in open space, and access to it, throughout the Borough.</p> <p>Play facilities need to be provided</p>
Employment	<p>Whilst unemployment levels and the number of benefit claimants is lower than the regional and national average, there are disparities and inequalities between skills, education, health &amp; employment across the Borough.</p> <p>There are significant levels of out-commuting from the Borough, but relatively low levels of in-commuting.</p>
Education	<p>There is a need to improve the lack of basic skills and address barriers to work as well as linking workless people to vacancies.</p> <p>Education provision may need to be subsidised if additional resources are required, dependent upon the location of the site allocations and increased provision requirement.</p>
Protection of ecology, biodiversity and soils	<p>Whilst there is not a major problem with vacant and derelict land, such land where it exists, in particular unused brownfield sites, would benefit from being remediated and brought back into use.</p> <p>The Borough comprises predominantly Green Belt land, which is required to be protected by national policy.</p> <p>The volume of waste going to landfill needs to be reduced.</p> <p>West Lancashire has roughly one third of the North West's best and most versatile agricultural land. In the light of impending climate change and fuel-related issues, this needs to be protected for crop production to aid food security.</p>
Surface and Waste Water Treatment	<p>West Lancashire has wetlands of international importance as well as other water bodies and watercourses with wildlife and amenity value.</p> <p>There are a number of deep aquifers that supply the horticultural industry. These water resources all require sustainable management and protection, including from foul (waste) water.</p> <p>There is a need for water and wastewater supply for existing and planned housing and employment development, as well as for agriculture and horticulture. There are sewerage and drainage issues in parts of the Borough, most notably the Burscough area.</p> <p>West Lancashire has areas of high flood risk particularly in the Banks area and northern parishes, with implications for the location (or otherwise) of development, including Traveller accommodation.</p>

## **6. Consultation on the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report**

The initial Scoping Report for the (then) Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy was consulted upon for a period of 6 weeks in 2009, in line with planning Regulations. The Scoping Report was sent to the statutory consultees - Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage (now Historic England) for comment. Comments were also invited from a wide range of community groups and other stakeholders, in order to ensure that the appraisal was transparent, comprehensive and addressed the relevant issues.

The LDF Core Strategy Scoping Report covered the whole range of matters that were intended to be addressed in the LDF, not just in the Core Strategy but also in the anticipated Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management Policies DPD that were to follow the preparation of the Core Strategy. In 2011, the decision was taken to merge West Lancashire's Core Strategy, Site Allocations DPD and DM Policies DPD into a single "Local Plan" document. The Provision for Traveller Sites DPD deals with one discrete "subset" of the Local Plan, and thus its subject matter is covered by the wider Core Strategy ("Local Plan") Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.

The evidence behind the Scoping Report has been updated regularly throughout the preparation of the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 and, since the Local Plan's adoption, as part of the Council's ongoing monitoring work. The most recent analysis of the evidence base for this SA document (presented in Appendices 1 and 2) has not indicated any significant changes to the baseline information or policy context that would require any change to the SA Framework and Objectives.

Therefore further consultation on the scope of this Sustainability Appraisal is not considered necessary. However the Council would welcome any comments on the suitability of this approach as part of the general consultation on the DPD and its interim SA.

## 7. Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Framework and Objectives

Task B1: Testing the Core Strategy objectives against the Sustainability Appraisal framework, was undertaken in the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. Drawing on the [then] Core Strategy objectives (which became the Local Plan objectives), 18 Sustainability Objectives were established. These cover a full cross section of sustainability issues, including the three tenets of sustainability, namely environmental, social and economic factors, and are set out below.

It is recognised that not all of the 18 Local Plan (or Core Strategy) SA Objectives will be directly relevant to the Traveller Sites DPD, but the complete set of Objectives provides the framework within which the SA of the Traveller Sites DPD can be carried out.

**Table 7.1 West Lancashire Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Objectives**

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Environmental	Social	Economic
1. To reduce the disparities in economic performance within the Borough		✓	✓
2. To secure economic inclusion		✓	✓
3. To develop and maintain a healthy labour market		✓	✓
4. To encourage sustainable economic growth	✓	✓	✓
5. To deliver urban renaissance	✓	✓	✓
6. To deliver rural renaissance	✓	✓	✓
7. To develop and market the Borough's image	✓	✓	✓
8. To improve access to basic goods and services	✓		✓
9. To improve access to good quality affordable and resource efficient housing		✓	✓
10. To reduce crime and disorder and the fear of crime		✓	
11. To reduce the need to travel, improve the choice and use of sustainable transport modes	✓	✓	
12. To improve physical and mental health and reduce health inequalities		✓	
13. To protect places, landscapes and buildings of historical, cultural and archaeological value	✓		
14. To restore and protect land and soil quality	✓		
15. To protect and enhance biodiversity	✓		
16. To protect and improve the quality of both inland and coastal waters and protect against flood risk	✓		
17. To protect and improve air, light and noise quality	✓		
18. To ensure the prudent use of natural resources, including the use of renewable energies and the sustainable management of existing resources	✓		

Each of these 18 objectives has been assigned a series of locally distinctive sub-criteria to allow for a more detailed evaluation of whether the objective will be achieved by the DPD being assessed. The sub-criteria are listed in Table 7.2 on the following pages. Once again, it is recognised that not all the sub-criteria will be of direct relevance to the Traveller Sites DPD. In undertaking the SA of the DPD, attention will be paid to those Objectives and sub-criteria of particular relevance to Traveller accommodation provision.



**Table 7.2 Locally distinctive sub-criteria for the 18 Sustainability Objectives**

SA Objective (high level objective)	Locally Distinctive Sub Criteria
Objective 1: To reduce the disparities in economic performance within the Borough.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy provide job opportunities in areas with residents most at need?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce economic disparities within the Borough and at the Regional level?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy maximise local benefit from investment?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy meet local needs for employment?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the quality of employment opportunities within the Borough?</li> </ul>
Objective 2: To secure economic inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy meet the employment needs of all local people?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy encourage business start-up, especially from under-represented groups?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve physical accessibility to jobs through the location of employment sites and / or public transport links being close to areas of high unemployment?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce poverty in those areas and communities most affected?</li> </ul>
Objective 3: To develop and maintain a healthy labour market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy address the skills gap and enable skills progression?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy provide higher skilled jobs?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy increase the levels of participation and attainment in education?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy provide a broad range of jobs and employment opportunities?</li> </ul>
Objective 4: To encourage sustainable economic growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy help to diversify the Borough's economy?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy promote growth in the key sectors of the Borough's economy?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy attract new businesses to the Borough?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy help develop the Borough's knowledge base?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the range of sustainable employment sites?</li> </ul>
Objective 5: To deliver urban renaissance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve economic, environmental and social conditions in deprived urban areas and for deprived groups?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the quality of the built and historic environment?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the quantity and quality of open space?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy deliver Sustainable Communities?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy deliver regeneration to urban areas and Market Towns</li> </ul>
Objective 6: To deliver rural renaissance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy support sustainable rural diversification?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy to encourage and support the growth of sustainable rural businesses?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy promote the economic growth of market towns?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy retain or promote access to and provision of services?</li> </ul>

SA Objective (high level objective)	Locally Distinctive Sub Criteria
Objective 7: To develop and market the Borough's image	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy support the preservation and/or enhancement of high quality built, natural and historic environments within the Borough?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy promote the Borough as a destination for short and long term visitors, for residents and investors?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy promote the use of locally produced goods and materials?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy increase the economic benefit derived from the Borough's natural environment?</li> </ul>
Objective 8: To improve access to basic goods and services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the access, range and quality of cultural, recreational and leisure facilities including natural green spaces?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the access, range and quality of essential services and amenities?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the access to basic goods, promoting the use of those which are locally sourced?</li> </ul>
Objective 9: To improve access to good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy provide for an appropriate mix of housing to meet all needs including affordable?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce the number of unfit empty homes?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy support the development and operation of resource efficient housing?</li> </ul>
Objective 10: To reduce crime and disorder and the fear of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy support community development?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve relations between all members of the community?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce levels of crime?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce the fear of crime?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy identify and engage with hard to reach groups?</li> </ul>
Objective 11: To reduce the need to travel, improve the choice and use of sustainable transport modes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce vehicular traffic and congestion?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy increase access to and opportunities for walking, cycling and use of public transport?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce freight movement?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve access to and encourage the use of ICT?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the efficiency of the transport network?</li> </ul>
Objective 12: To improve physical and mental health and reduce health inequalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve physical and mental health?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce deaths in key vulnerable groups?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy promote healthier lifestyles?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce health inequalities among different groups in the community?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce isolation for vulnerable groups in the community?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy promote a better quality of life?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce poverty in those areas and communities most affected?</li> </ul>
Objective 13: To protect places, landscapes and buildings of historical, cultural and archaeological value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's landscape strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve access to buildings of historic and cultural value?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy protect and enhance the accessibility of the landscape across the Borough?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy protect Scheduled Ancient Monuments?</li> </ul>

SA Objective (high level objective)	Locally Distinctive Sub Criteria
Objective 14: To restore and protect land and soil quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce the amount of derelict, contaminated, degraded and vacant / underused land?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy encourage the development of brownfield land in preference to Greenfield?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce the loss of high quality Agricultural land to development?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy maintain and enhance soil quality?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy achieve the efficient use of land via appropriate density of development?</li> </ul>
Objective 15: To protect and enhance biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy protect and enhance the biodiversity of the Borough?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy protect and enhance habitats, species and damaged sites?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy provide opportunities for new habitat creation?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy protect and extend habitat connectivity and landscape permeability, suitable for species migration?</li> </ul>
Objective 16: To protect and improve the quality of both inland and coastal waters and protect against flood risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce or manage flood risk?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy maintain and enhance ground water quality?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the quality of coastal waters?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy improve the quality of rivers and inland waters?</li> </ul>
Objective 17: To protect and improve air, light and noise quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy maintain or, where possible, improve local air quality?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce noise and light pollution?</li> </ul>
Objective 18: To ensure the prudent use of natural resources, including the use of renewable energies and the sustainable management of existing resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the plan / policy minimise demand for raw materials?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy support the repair and re-use of existing buildings?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy reduce the amount of waste generated by development?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy promote the use of recycled, reclaimed and secondary materials?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy promote the use of locally sourced materials?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy minimise the need for energy?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy maximise the production / proportion of renewable energy?</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy increase energy efficiency (e.g. energy efficiency in buildings, transport modes, etc.)</li> <li>• Will the plan / policy minimise the use of fossil fuels?</li> </ul>

## 8. Methodology - Developing and Appraising Options

The West Lancashire Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and the analysis of the Local Plan's evidence base were used to assist in identifying the key sustainability issues specifically relating to this Traveller Sites DPD (Section 5 above).

There are a number of ways in which the key issues could be addressed for the DPD; it would not be appropriate to simply choose a single approach that it is assumed would work best. Instead, in line with the requirements of national and European SEA guidance, a number of reasonable alternatives have been assessed and compared with one another, in order to identify the effects of the different reasonable alternatives, and thereby to aid the decision-making process about which alternative is preferred.

The formulation and testing of the reasonable alternatives is a key requirement of the SEA process, allowing for the consideration of different approaches by stakeholder groups and stimulating debate about the key issues, ideas, and ways of going forward.

There are two sets of 'alternatives' in this SA of the first draft of the Traveller Sites DPD. Firstly, there are three alternative approaches towards a policy against which proposals for Traveller accommodation can be assessed. These are highlighted in Chapter 9. Secondly, there are four alternative approaches towards selecting and allocating specific sites for Traveller accommodation. The reasons for these approaches are set out in Chapter 10.

This SA report seeks to assess the effects that each alternative would be likely to have on the baseline position associated with the different sustainability objectives. It does not draw any specific conclusions as to which approach / option should be followed, but it has helped inform the choice of policy and preferred sites set out in the draft Traveller Sites DPD (i.e. the SA has been taken into account in preparing the draft Traveller Sites DPD) by indicating which are the most sustainable options and alternatives.

The sustainability of each presented options and alternatives has been appraised against social, economic and environmental objectives of the SA Framework. The appraisal has sought to highlight the positive and negative effects of each option on sustainability by assigning a 'score'. Residual scores that could be achieved through mitigation were also assigned. Scores were recorded using the following colours:

Very Positive	Positive	No Effect	Negative	Very Negative
---------------	----------	-----------	----------	---------------

**Note: To aid reading of this document when printed in black and white, , table cells shaded with the above colours also have a code at the beginning of the text:**

- **VP – Very Positive**
- **P – Positive**
- **N – Negative**
- **VN – Very Negative**
- **Non-shaded cells are "No Effect".**

The Sustainability Appraisal framework tests the economic, environmental and social 'performance' of each option and the significance of the effects.

The sustainability appraisal framework tests the economic, environmental and social 'performance' of each option and the significance of the effects. In this case what constitutes a significant effect is influenced by the extent to which it affects the wider community, the land, and strategic infrastructure. The effects of the proposed sites on the existing social, economic and environmental characteristics are guided by Schedule 1 of the SEA Directive and this can differ on each Sustainability Appraisal. All of the categories are significant but the colour coding has been used to demonstrate levels of significance. For example the darker green would have a very positive significant effect on the baseline and orange would have a less weighty negative effect on the baseline.

At this early stage it is not possible to accurately and fully determine all of the effects for each option, as they could differ depending upon the type and nature of the Traveller accommodation and how it is implemented. Therefore when considering the type, location and quantity of development, the assessment has generally used wider overall principles when determining the likely outcomes. The assessment of the preferred options and alternatives is displayed in Tables 9.1 and 10.1 respectively.

## 9. Appraisal of Policy GT1 of the Draft Traveller Sites DPD and Alternative Policies

### Development of Alternatives

In terms of sustainability appraisal of policy for assessing planning applications for Traveller-related development, this report has assessed the implications of three alternative approaches, namely:

- (i) Policy GT1, as set out in Chapter 3 of the Traveller Sites DPD: Options and Preferred Options, and repeated below;
- (ii) An amended version of Policy GT1 (labelled “GT1a”) that is similar to Policy GT1, is broadly consistent with national policy, but which places less emphasis on impact on the character of the area / landscape, and has less stringent locational criteria in terms of allowable distance from facilities and public transport routes. The rationale behind this ‘reasonable alternative’ is that the need for Traveller accommodation, and the importance of the human rights of Travellers (in particular the ‘rights of the child’) are such that they are given greater weight than locational environmental sustainability and landscape considerations;
- (iii) Having no policy in place by which to assess planning applications for Traveller accommodation. The basis for this ‘reasonable alternative’ is that relevant national and local plan policy are able to be relied upon, rather than a locally-specific policy. This is similar to the baseline position.

- (i) Policy GT1 is set out as follows, as set out in the draft Traveller Sites DPD:

#### **Policy GT1**

#### **Assessment of Proposals for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites**

##### **Broad Locations**

Proposals for permanent or transit Traveller sites or pitches should be located in areas where need exists, as demonstrated by robust evidence.

##### **Site-Specific Criteria**

##### **Permanent Sites**

Proposed permanent sites for Travellers must not lie within Flood Zone 3.

In order to ensure that sites are fit for purpose and will provide adequate residential amenity, both to members of the travelling community and to members of the settled community, proposed permanent sites for Travellers will be required to meet the following criteria:

- (i) The site does not lie within the Green Belt;
- (ii) The site, on account of its scale and / or location, would not dominate the nearest settled community in such a way that the prospect of peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local settled community would be undermined;
- (iii) The site is sufficiently far from any refuse site, industrial process, high voltage electricity infrastructure, other hazardous place, or any other process, land use or environmental issue (e.g. flyover, motorway), for there to be no unacceptable impact on the health, safety or general well-being of the residents of the site;
- (iv) The site is not subject to any physical constraints or other environmental issues that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level, and that would impact on the health, safety or general well-being of the residents of the site, or on non-residents;
- (v) The site is accessible by a public highway that can accommodate typical Traveller-related vehicles without compromising highway safety;

- (vi) The site is not in Flood Zone 2;
- (vii) The site is not within, adjacent to, or close to (such that it would adversely affect) any area of land subject to a nature conservation designation;
- (viii) The site is not within, adjacent to, or close to (such that it would adversely affect) any area of land subject to an historic environment or historic landscape designation;
- (ix) The site has mains water, drainage and electricity, or else these services could readily be provided and satisfactory drainage achieved;
- (x) The use of this site as a Traveller site would not place undue pressure on local infrastructure and services;
- (xi) The site is within 1.5 kilometres (15 minutes' walk) of a bus route or other public transport facility, and / or it is possible to access from the site by means other than private motor vehicle the following facilities / services:
  - an appropriate health facility;
  - education facilities, in particular a primary school;
  - employment opportunities;
  - shops;
  - other necessary services.
- (xii) It is possible to achieve visual and acoustic privacy on the site without any unacceptable visual impact on the site's surroundings;
- (xiii) The site can accommodate between 3 and 15 pitches.

#### Transit Sites

In the case of transit sites, these should meet the above criteria, and, in addition should be accessible to the M58, or to the strategic highway network.

(ii) Policy GT1(a) is set out as follows, with the differences from Policy GT1 shown as “~~strike through text~~ (deletions) and underlined text (additions)”:

#### **Policy GT1(a) [Alternative ]**

#### **Assessment of Proposals for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites**

#### **Broad Locations**

Proposals for permanent or transit Traveller sites or pitches should be located in areas where need exists, as demonstrated by robust evidence.

#### Site-Specific Criteria

#### Permanent Sites

Proposed permanent sites for Travellers must not lie within Flood Zone 3.

In order to ensure that sites are fit for purpose and will provide adequate residential amenity, both to members of the travelling community and to members of the settled community, proposed permanent sites for Travellers will be required to meet the following criteria:

- ~~(i) The site does not lie within the Green Belt;~~
- (i) The site, on account of its scale and / or location, would not dominate the nearest settled community in such a way that the prospect of peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local settled community would be undermined;
- (ii) The site is sufficiently far from any refuse site, industrial process, high voltage electricity infrastructure, other hazardous place, or any other process, land use or environmental issue (e.g. flyover, motorway), for there to be no unacceptable impact on the health, safety or general well-being of the residents of the site;

- (iii) The site is not subject to any physical constraints or other environmental issues that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level, and that would impact on the health, safety or general well-being of the residents of the site, or on non-residents;
- (iv) The site is accessible by a public highway that can accommodate typical Traveller-related vehicles without compromising highway safety;
- (v) The site is not in Flood Zone 2;
- (vi) The site is not within, adjacent to, or close to (such that it would adversely affect) any area of land subject to a nature conservation designation;
- ~~(vii) The site is not within, adjacent to, or close to (such that it would adversely affect) any area of land subject to an historic environment or historic landscape designation;~~
- (vii) The site has mains water, drainage and electricity, or else these services could readily be provided and satisfactory drainage achieved;
- (viii) The use of this site as a Traveller site would not place undue pressure on local infrastructure and services;
- (ix) The site is within 1.5 ~~3~~ kilometres (15~~30~~ minutes' walk) of a bus route or other public transport facility, ~~and / or it is possible to access from the site by means other than private motor vehicle the following facilities / services:~~
  - ~~-an appropriate health facility;~~
  - ~~-education facilities, in particular a primary school;~~
  - ~~-employment opportunities;~~
  - ~~-shops;~~
  - ~~-other necessary services.~~
- ~~(x) It is possible to achieve visual and acoustic privacy on the site without any unacceptable visual impact on the site's surroundings;~~
- (x) The site can accommodate between 3 and 15 pitches.

#### Transit Sites

In the case of transit sites, these should meet the above criteria, and, in addition should be accessible to the M58, or to the strategic highway network.

Table 9.1, on the following pages, shows the likely effects of Policy GT1, GT1(a) and the absence of any policy on the baseline position relating to the 18 Local Plan Sustainability Objectives.

As stated in Chapter 7 above, not all of the 18 Local Plan sustainability objectives (and their locally distinctive sub-criteria) are of direct relevance to the issue of Traveller accommodation provision. The analysis below concentrates on those objectives and sub-criteria of most relevance to Travellers.



**Table 9.1 Assessment of the likely effects of Policies GT1 and GT1(a), and no policy**

Objective	Environmental	Social	Economic	Policy GT1	Alternative Policy GT1a	No policy
1. To reduce the disparities in economic performance within the Borough		Yes	Yes	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position
2. To secure economic inclusion		Yes	Yes	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position
3. To develop and maintain a healthy labour market		Yes	Yes	<b>(P)</b> Sites are to be located within 1.5 km of a public transport facility and easy accessible to educational facilities particularly a primary school. This would have a positive effect on the baseline position with residents living / working / educated in the Borough.	<b>(N)</b> Sites can be located as far as 3 km away from a public transport facility and do not need to be easily accessible to other facilities, meaning it may be difficult for Travellers to access education. This could have a negative effect on the baseline by affecting the population educated to GCSE standard and the distance required to travel to education.	<b>(N)</b> If sites are not assessed against the distance from educational facilities there will be no measures in place to increase levels of education attainment. This could have a negative effect on the baseline by potentially affecting the population educated to GCSE standard and the distance required to travel to access education.
4. To encourage sustainable economic growth	Yes	Yes	Yes	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position
5. To deliver urban renaissance	Yes	Yes	Yes	<b>(P)</b> The policy seeks to address the needs of the Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople community, potentially a deprived group.	<b>(P)</b> The policy seeks to address the needs of the Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople community, potentially a deprived group.	<b>(P)</b> Without a local criteria-based policy it may be more difficult to address the needs of the Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople community, potentially a deprived group. However, assessment of applications would defer to PPTS, which is no more restrictive than Policy GT1.
6. To deliver rural renaissance	Yes	Yes	Yes	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position
7. To develop and market the Borough's image	Yes	Yes	Yes	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position

Objective	Environmental	Social	Economic	Policy GT1	Alternative Policy GT1a	No policy
8. To improve access to basic goods and services	Yes		Yes	The policy requires that sites be located within a sustainable area 15 min walking distance to public transport or a footpath that is accessible to local facilities. This would be likely to continue to maintain the figures set out within the baseline data for the proportion of planning applications within close proximity to sustainable facilities.	<b>(N)</b> The policy requires that sites be located within a sustainable area 30 min walking distance to public transport or a footpath that is accessible to local facilities. This would be likely to be a negative effect compared with the figures set out within the baseline data for the proportion of planning applications within close proximity to sustainable facilities.	If no policy was introduced, PPTS would apply. Paragraph 25 seeks to limit Traveller site development in countryside away from existing settlements. No effect on the baseline position
9. To improve access to good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing		Yes	Yes	<b>(P)</b> The policy criteria allow for sites to be allocated for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Show People accommodation, therefore helping to meet a specific need identified within the evidence base.	<b>(P)</b> The policy criteria allow for sites to be allocated for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Show People accommodation, therefore helping to meet a specific local need identified within the evidence base. The criteria are less stringent than GT1 and thus the potential to secure sites for development may be increased compared to GT1.	Absence of a criteria-based policy will not assist in providing an appropriate mix of accommodation to meet the needs of the Borough, although PPTS would apply, in which accommodation needs are an issue to be considered with any planning application. No change with respect to the baseline position.
10. To reduce crime and disorder and the fear of crime		Yes		The criteria for assessing sites seek to promote peaceful co-existence and integration between the site and the local settled community. There should be no net effect on the baseline position.	The criteria for assessing sites seek to promote peaceful co-existence and integration between the site and the local settled community. There should be no net effect on the baseline position.	<b>(N)</b> Without a criteria-based policy, PPTS would apply. Paragraph 25 refers to 'not dominating' the nearest settled community, although it provides less strong protection than policy GT1 or GT1(a). This could lead to a small negative effect compared with the baseline position as there could be a potential perceived fear of crime.
11. To reduce the need to travel, improve the choice and use of sustainable transport modes	Yes	Yes		<b>(P)</b> The policy states that Traveller sites should not place undue pressure on local infrastructure, including roads, while sites are to be located within 1.5 km of a bus	<b>(N)</b> The policy states that Traveller sites should not place undue pressure on local infrastructure, including roads. Sites only need to be located within 3	<b>(N)</b> Having no local policy would mean PPTS is relied upon. Paragraph 25 very strictly limits new Traveller site development in open countryside away

Objective	Environmental	Social	Economic	Policy GT1	Alternative Policy GT1a	No policy
				route or other transport facility. Sites must be accessible by a public highway and, in the case of transit sites; these are to be accessible to the M58, or to the strategic highway network. Therefore this should have a likely positive effect upon the baseline figures for the proportion of planning applications determined within sustainable locations.	km of a bus route or other transport facility, which could result in greater private vehicle use than for Policy GT1. Sites must be accessible by a public highway and in the case of transit sites; these are to be accessible to the M58, or to the strategic highway network. Overall, this would be likely to have a negative effect upon the figures in the baseline data for planning applications in sustainable locations.	from existing settlements, although does not set a distance. Effect on the baseline position is likely to be similar to effect of Policy GT1(a) on the baseline position.
12. To improve physical and mental health and reduce inequalities		Yes		<b>(P)</b> Sites are to be located within 1.5 km of a public transport facility and easy accessible to an appropriate health facility. This should have no effect on the overall baseline position. However, it may have a small positive effect on the travelling community whose mortality rate is higher than that of the settled community as provision of 'authorised accommodation' may help improve health.	<b>(N)</b> As sites only need to be located within 3 km of a public transport facility and do not need to be easy accessible to an appropriate health facility, this could lead to Traveller accommodation in locations with inadequate access to health provision. However, provision of 'authorised accommodation' may help improve health. Overall, no significant effects as positives and negatives balance out.	With no policy in place, defer to PPTS. Paragraph 26 requires local authorities to attach weight to promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles; overall effect likely to be insignificant.
13. To protect places, landscapes and buildings of historical, cultural and archaeological value	Yes			<b>(P)</b> The policy states that the scale and location of development should not be located in, adjacent to, or close to any areas of land subject to an historic environment, historic landscape or nature conservation designation. Therefore the policy adheres to protecting and enhancing the character and appearance of the Borough's landscape. There should be a small improvement relative to the baseline position.	Policy GT1(a) has no criterion preventing development near to landscapes and buildings of historic, etc. value. However, this is covered by other Local Plan and national policies, so overall there should be no effect on the baseline.	Even if no criteria-based policy specific to Travellers were in place against which to assess the sites, this topic is covered by other Local Plan and national policies, so overall there should be no effect on the baseline.

Objective	Environmental	Social	Economic	Policy GT1	Alternative Policy GT1a	No policy
14. To restore and protect land and soil quality	Yes			Policy GT1 does not refer to protecting greenfield land nor does it provide any reference towards promoting brownfield over greenfield. However, these matters are generally covered by the Local Plan and NPPF / PPTS. No effect on the baseline	The policy does not refer to protecting greenfield land nor does it provide any reference towards promoting brownfield over greenfield. However, these matters are generally covered by the Local Plan and NPPF / PPTS. No effect on the baseline	If there were no policy, relevant Local Plan and NPPF policy would instead be used. These should give some protection to land and soil quality. No effect on the baseline
15. To protect and enhance biodiversity	Yes			The criteria-based policy states that sites are not to be located in, close to or adjacent to nature conservation designations. Therefore there should be no net effect on the existing or future baseline position.	The site criteria policy states that sites are not to be located in, close to or adjacent to nature conservation designations. Therefore there should be no net effect on the existing or future baseline position.	If no criteria-based policy were in place, reliance would be made on Local Plan policy; this should cover biodiversity, but would offer less protection than policy GT1. No material effect on the baseline.
16. To protect and improve the quality of both inland coastal waters and protect against flood risk	Yes			Policy GT1 specifically requires that the allocated sites are not located within an area at risk of flooding and that satisfactory drainage be achievable.	Policy GT1(a) specifically requires that the allocated sites are not located within an area at risk of flooding and that satisfactory drainage be achievable.	Without a criteria based policy, reliance would be had on PPTs and the NPPF, which would offer protection against flood risk.
17. To protect and improve air, light and noise quality	Yes			Policy GT1 sets criteria stating that the allocated sites must be able to achieve visual and acoustic privacy on the site without any unacceptable visual effect on the sites' surroundings. There should be no negative change compared with the baseline position.	Policy GT1a has no criterion relating to achievement of visual and acoustic privacy and minimisation of visual impact. This could facilitate acoustic privacy but at the expense of visual amenity. Therefore, the overall effect is considered to be neutral compared with the baseline. Local Plan policy (GN3) would offer some protection.	Having no policy could potentially cause harm through an increase in light and noise pollution, although Local Plan policy would offer some protection. Without knowing the sites, it is not possible to assess the likelihood of the effect.
18. To ensure the prudent use of natural resources, including the use of renewable energies and the sustainable management of existing resources	Yes			No net effect on the baseline position.	No net effect on the baseline position.	No net effect on the baseline position.

## 10. Appraisal of Preferred and Alternative Traveller Sites

The sections below set out how sites have been assembled and ‘shortlisted’ in the draft Traveller Sites DPD. The main consideration in choosing preferred sites in the DPD is whether the sites are considered ‘deliverable’, in line with national policy.

To assist the decision makers with the selection of preferred sites, an assessment of the 20 candidate sites against a comprehensive set of sustainability criteria (which relate to the objectives in the SA Framework) has been carried out for this SA report. The assessment is provided at Appendix 4 to this report.

Thus the DPD assesses the deliverability of individual sites against a set of criteria. The SA assesses the sustainability of individual sites against a set of criteria. In assessing the deliverability of a site, one of the considerations is the site’s sustainability in general terms. There is thus a significant amount of overlap between the DPD and the SA in terms of site assessments (including a number of criteria in common), although the two assessments are not exactly the same.

### Initial Site Assembly Process

Chapter 5 of the Provision for Traveller Sites DPD: Options and Preferred Options sets out the process whereby potential candidate Traveller sites were assembled from various sources from 2013-2015. This process yielded 20 distinct sites, as listed in Table 5.1 below. There were no other sites, additional to the 20 listed below in Table 5.1, that were identified in the site assembly process, although questions were asked about the availability of many other sites, e.g. Local Plan sites allocated for housing but not yet developed, sites in the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, land in the Borough Council’s ownership, etc.

Since work started on the DPD in 2013, a number of the 20 potential candidate sites have had to be ruled out from consideration, mostly on grounds of availability. In several cases, owners of sites who initially expresses a willingness for the site to be considered as a potential Traveller site subsequently informed the Council that the site was no longer available for consideration. Other sites were identified by third parties, but subsequent contact with the owner led to the sites being ruled out. A small number of other sites were ruled out on account of “show-stopping” constraints.

In October 2015, just seven of the original 20 sites are “available” for consideration as potential Traveller sites. The seven sites are shaded grey in the table below.

**Table 5.1 Potential Candidate Traveller Sites in West Lancashire**

Site	Source / Current Status
1. Mosslands Stables, Aveling Drive (‘Aveling Drive A’), Banks	Site with planning application pending consideration, although the dismissal of the appeal on the neighbouring site is likely to have implications for this site’s delivery.
2. Land west of Mosslands, Aveling Drive (‘Aveling Drive B’), Banks	Appeal dismissed by the Secretary of State on grounds of harm to the Green Belt and flood risk effectively rules out this site from consideration, although the Occupant has submitted a legal challenge.
3. Land rear of ‘The Poppys’ (sic), Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks	Site with planning permission for one caravan; more recent planning application pending consideration.
4. Land west of Hoole Lane, Banks	SHLAA site; owner initially indicated a willingness for the site to be considered as a Traveller site but has subsequently confirmed that the site is no longer available for consideration as a Traveller site.

Site	Source / Current Status
5. Land west of Ringtail Road, Burscough	Site submitted in the September 2013 Call for Sites exercise. Owner since confirmed he is not willing for the site to be used to accommodate Travelling Showpeople.
6. Land west of The Quays, Burscough	Established Travelling Showpeople site with planning permission.
7. Land west of Tollgate Road, Burscough	Site suggested by a member of the travelling community. Owner has since confirmed that the site is not available for consideration as a potential Traveller site.
8. Pool Hey Lane 'Caravan Park', Scarisbrick	Site with longstanding planning history, also submitted in the Call for Sites exercise.
9. High Brow Farm, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	Site with previous enforcement action relating to unauthorised occupation by Travellers. Site has recently been sold and is no longer available.
10. Land at 1-3 Southport Road, Kew, Southport	Site with previous issues relating to unauthorised occupation by Travellers. Site has more recently been purchased by a developer with a view to development for housing. Site is not available as a potential Traveller site.
11. Land to the rear of 281 Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick	Site submitted in the Call for Sites exercise. Owner has since confirmed that the site is not available for consideration as a potential Traveller site.
12. Former depot, Mere Brow	Site identified as a possible candidate site by WLBC officers. Owner has confirmed that the western part of the site is not available for consideration as a potential Traveller site. The eastern part of the site has recently been sold and is in use; not considered available as a potential Traveller site.
13. White Moss Road South (A), Skelmersdale	Site brought to the Council's attention by a member of the travelling community. Owners have since informed the Council that the site is not available for consideration as a Traveller site.
14. White Moss Road South (B), Skelmersdale	Site with planning permission granted December 2013 for Traveller-related development (stables). Site submitted as a potential Traveller site in the summer 2015 Call for Sites exercise.
15. White Moss Road South (C), Skelmersdale	Site identified by WLBC officers, adjacent to above site. Owners have since informed the Council the land is not available for consideration as a potential Traveller site.
16. Blackacre Lane, Ormskirk	Site submitted in Call for Sites.
17. Land south of Butcher's Lane, Aughton	SHLAA site; owner indicated a willingness for the site to be considered as a Traveller site.
18. Land east of Brookfield Lane, Aughton	SHLAA site; owner indicated a willingness for the site to be considered as a Traveller site.
19. Land east of Middlewood Drive, Aughton	SHLAA site; in 2013, the owner indicated a willingness for the site to be considered as a Traveller site. However, in 2015, the owner informed the Council that the land is no longer available for consideration.
20. Bickerstaffe Colliery, Bickerstaffe	Site previously identified by WLBC officers on account of its proximity to M58 Junction 3. Owners have since confirmed the site is not available for consideration as a potential Traveller site.

## **Choosing 'Preferred Options' for Site Allocation**

A set of criteria similar to those used in Policy GT1 has been drawn up for use in choosing 'preferred options' for site assessment. These criteria are based primarily on national policy, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) (PPTS) documents. The criteria have also been influenced to a lesser extent by the advice contained in the government's now-cancelled Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide (May 2008). Whilst this document no longer has any statutory weight, its general principles and advice are considered to remain of relevance in developing site selection criteria. Where appropriate, the criteria have been tailored to the particular circumstances of West Lancashire.

The criteria, although broadly similar to those used in Policy GT1, have been reordered and grouped into three 'tiers'. 'Tier 1' criteria are essential criteria in that, if they are not met, the site is undeliverable and / or undevelopable. For example, if a site is in Flood Zone 3, national policy proscribes its use for caravan-based accommodation. 'Tier 2' criteria are weighty, and tend to be based on PPTS or Local Plan policies. However, failure to satisfy one or more of these criteria does not necessarily rule out consideration of the site as a potential Traveller site. 'Tier 3' criteria are based on PPTS policy and / or advice in the Good Practice Guide, and can be used to compare the merits of different sites that satisfy Tier 1 and Tier 2 criteria.

The site assessment criteria used are as follows:

### **Tier 1**

1. Is the site available for Traveller development?  
(Is the site in the hands of Travellers, or in the hands of an owner who has confirmed a willingness to sell the site for Traveller accommodation at a price which enables the viable development of the site?)
2. Is the site in Flood Zone 3?
3. Is the site subject to any physical or other constraints to delivery that could not reasonably be overcome and that would rule out its use as a Traveller site? (These may include ransom strips, leases, restrictive covenants, multiple ownerships.)

### **Tier 2**

4. Is the site in the Green Belt? Would the use of the site as a Traveller site lead to material harm to the perceived openness of the Green Belt, or to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt?
5. Would this site, on account of its scale and / or location, dominate the nearest settled community in such a way that it would not promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site's occupants and the local settled community?
6. Is the site near to a refuse site (within 200m), un-neighbourly industrial process (200m), electricity pylons (100m), other hazardous place (200m), or any other process or environmental issue? Is the site adjacent to any road flyover or motorway, or any operational railway line? Could satisfactory mitigation realistically be achieved?
7. Is the site subject to any significant physical constraints that would need to be overcome before the site could be used as a Traveller site?
8. Is the site accessible by a public highway of an appropriate standard? Can satisfactory road access be achieved for typical Traveller vehicles?
9. Is the site in Flood Zone 2?
10. Is the site within, adjacent to, or close to (such that it would materially affect) any area of land subject to any nature conservation designation?
11. Is the site within, adjacent to, or close to (such that it would materially affect) any area of land subject to any historic environment or historic landscape designation?
12. Does the site have services (e.g. mains water, sewerage, electricity) or could these be provided reasonably easily and viably? Can satisfactory drainage be achieved?

### Tier 3

13. Is the site in an identified area of Traveller need?
14. Can satisfactory access be achieved onto and within the site for emergency vehicles?
15. Would the use of the site for Traveller accommodation place undue pressure on local infrastructure or services?
16. Is the site in a sustainable location? Is the site within 1.5km (15 minutes' walk) of, or is it possible to access by transport modes other than private motor vehicle, the following services:
  - an appropriate health facility; education (in particular a primary school); employment; shops; other necessary services?
17. Would it be possible, within reason, to achieve visual and acoustic privacy for the site occupants (and neighbours)?
18. Can the site accommodate between 3 and 15 pitches?

For the seven 'available' sites, shaded in Table 5.1 above (i.e. sites 3, 6, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18), the assessment against the criteria has been used to inform the choice of preferred sites. (For completeness, the other 13 sites were also assessed against the criteria, but as these 13 sites are not available for consideration as potential Traveller sites, their assessment against the criteria is to an extent superfluous. The full assessment of all 20 sites against the above criteria is set out in Appendix 1 of the draft DPD.)

Table 5.2 below summarises out the Council's views on the deliverability (suitability and achievability, in addition to availability) of the seven 'available' sites:

**Table 5.2 Deliverability of Sites 3, 6, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18**

Site	Name	Comments on Deliverability
3	Land at Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is in the hands of Travellers, and is already in use as a Traveller site;</li> <li>• Site has a long-established permission for one residential caravan;</li> <li>• Site is close enough to A565 and public transport connections but sufficiently separated from existing built-up areas so as to have a limited impact on the settled population;</li> <li>• Site is sufficiently separated from environmental constraints so as to have a limited impact on (or not to be impacted by) the local environment.</li> <li>• Much of the site is reasonably well screened, especially from the A565, by evergreen hedging. Release of this site from the Green Belt would have a more limited impact than sites 16,17,18 because of the reduced visual impact.</li> </ul>
6	Land west of The Quays, Burscough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site has permission as a Travelling Showpeople site, and its use for Travelling Showpeople accommodation is long-established;</li> <li>• It should be noted that this site does not contribute towards meeting the outstanding need for Travelling Showpeople accommodation in the Borough – the need is over and above this site, and this site's allocation represents the formalisation of an existing permitted use.</li> </ul>
8	Pool Hey Caravan Park, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is in the hands of Travellers, and has been in use as a Traveller site for over 20 years;</li> <li>• As such, the occupants of the site have long-established ties to the area;</li> <li>• Site is close enough to A570 and public transport connections but sufficiently separated from existing built-up areas so as to have a limited impact on the settled population;</li> <li>• Site is sufficiently separated from environmental constraints so as to have a limited impact on (or not to be impacted by) the local environment;</li> <li>• Whilst in the Green Belt, the site is well screened by established hedging, lessening its visual impact;</li> <li>• Site is close to a level crossing, but the Council has no record of any incidents at the level crossing resulting from the use of the site for Traveller accommodation.</li> </ul>



Site	Name	Comments on Deliverability
14	White Moss Road South (B), Skelmersdale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted by its owners as a Traveller site;</li> <li>Site sandwiched between Whitemoss hazardous waste landfill site and M58 motorway, thus considered to have potential for a transit site only;</li> <li>Close to three underground oil and high pressure gas pipelines, all of which are Major Hazardous Installations with buffer zones in which the Health and Safety Executive is opposed to the siting of caravans;</li> <li>Question marks over deliverability – owners are willing to make the site available for Travellers, but do not want to run the site as a transit Traveller site.</li> </ul>
16	Blackacre Lane, Ormskirk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site owned by Travellers; used for grazing horses, rather than for accommodation;</li> <li>Site is not in an area of Traveller accommodation need;</li> <li>Open, slightly elevated, Green Belt land with little ‘screening vegetation’; as a result, use of this site for Travellers would be likely to have significant visual impact and cause harm to the perceived openness of the Green Belt;</li> <li>Poor road access;</li> <li>Site is reasonably sustainable in terms of access to facilities;</li> <li>Use of this site as a Traveller site would be likely to have a negative effect on the nearby settled community (200-300m away).</li> </ul>
17	Butcher’s Lane, Aughton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not in an area of identified Traveller accommodation need;</li> <li>Site is situated on a rural lane with residential properties directly adjacent on both sides, meaning that its use as a Traveller site would be likely to be a significant impact on the local settled community;</li> <li>Green Belt site with little screening vegetation to Butcher’s Lane and to adjacent properties;</li> <li>Site lies partly in Flood Zone 3;</li> <li>Unsustainable location in the sense that it is remote from services and public transport;</li> <li>Owner has expressed willingness for the land to be used for Travellers but is not actively promoting the site as such.</li> </ul>
18	Land east of Brookfield Lane, Aughton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not in an area of identified Traveller accommodation need;</li> <li>Large site with some road frontage, mostly set back from the road; highly visible from the Ormskirk – Liverpool railway;</li> <li>Brookfield Lane is a minor, rural road;</li> <li>Open Green Belt site; it is unlikely to be feasible to achieve adequate screening of the site, especially from the adjacent railway line (on an embankment) and thus the use of the site for Travellers is likely to have significant visual impact;</li> <li>Site comprises a significant area of Grade 1 agricultural land;</li> <li>Public footpath runs through site;</li> <li>Unsustainable location, remote from services and public transport;</li> <li>Owner has expressed willingness for the land to be used for Travellers but is not actively promoting the site as such.</li> </ul>

As a result of the above, just three sites of the original list of 20 (subsequently reduced to 7) potential candidate sites are proposed as ‘preferred options’ for allocation in the Traveller Sites DPD.

Sites 14, 16, 17, and 18 above may be considered as ‘reasonable alternatives’ although the sites are not considered deliverable.

The draft Traveller Sites DPD sets out the 'preferred sites' as follows:

#### Permanent Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

The draft GTAA states a need of 14 pitches by 2018, rising to 22 by 2033 in the Banks / Scarisbrick / Skelmersdale area. The preferred sites to contribute towards meeting this need are:

- (i) Site 3: Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks; 3 pitches
- (ii) Site 8: Pool Hey Caravan Park, Scarisbrick; 5 pitches

#### Transit Site

The draft GTAA states a need of 4 pitches on one site in the Skelmersdale area or the M58 corridor.

Due to site availability / suitability / achievability constraints, it has not been possible to identify a deliverable candidate transit site. There are no reasonable alternatives for provision of a transit site.

#### Travelling Showpeople Site

In terms of sites for Travelling Showpeople and their equipment, a need has been identified in the Burscough area for a Travelling Showpeople yard with at least one residential plot.

Site 6: Land west of The Quays, Burscough, is proposed as a Travelling Showpeople site. However, this is simply a formalisation of an existing consented use; Travelling Showpeople needs, as set out in the GTAA, are over and above the consented use of Land west of The Quays.

Once again, due to site availability / suitability / achievability constraints, it has not been possible to identify a candidate Travelling Showpeople site in the Burscough area. There are no reasonable alternatives for provision of a Travelling Showpeople site.

As such, the 'Preferred Option' does not actually meet identified needs, and due to a lack of deliverable candidate sites, it is difficult to identify any reasonable alternatives for meeting Traveller accommodation needs in West Lancashire through the allocation of specific sites.

## Development of Alternatives

In addition to the allocation of preferred sites, Chapter 6 of the Traveller Sites DPD sets out five broader alternatives for Traveller site provision. The reasons for the choice of the five alternative approaches are set out in the draft DPD itself; the alternatives are summarised as follows:

- Alternative 1: Increase planned provision for Traveller accommodation, in order to offer choice to Travellers seeking accommodation;
- Alternative 2: Increase planned provision for Traveller accommodation, in order to offer help meet neighbouring authorities' needs for Traveller accommodation;
- Alternative 3: Reduce planned provision for Traveller accommodation below the levels set out in the draft GTAA, in anticipation of neighbouring local authorities offering to meet needs in West Lancashire;
- Alternative 4: Allocate fewer sites, or no sites at all, for Traveller provision in West Lancashire, and rely instead on planning applications for sites in suitable locations that meet the criteria set out in policy GT1;
- Alternative 5: Set out a different distribution of proposed Traveller sites, either different sites in the same general locations, or sites in different locations (to provide the same amount of accommodation as in the preferred options).

In terms of this sustainability appraisal, rather than assessing the preferred sites against five different alternative approaches, the assessment has been carried out using Alternatives 1 and 2 above combined into a single alternative (as they both involve allocating a greater number of sites). In a similar manner, Alternatives 3 and 4 have been combined into a single alternative (allocating a smaller number of sites). The resulting combination of alternatives is considered reasonable as it encompasses most possible scenarios (more sites, fewer sites, the proposed sites, different sites).

Table 10.2 overleaf compares the likely effects of the preferred options for Traveller sites, as set out in chapter 6 of the draft Traveller Sites DPD, with Alternatives 1 and 2 (provision of more sites), Alternatives 3 and 4 (provision of fewer sites) and Alternative 5 (a different, although unspecified, distribution of sites to provide the same levels of accommodation as the preferred option<sup>2</sup>).

---

<sup>2</sup> Assuming the alternatives are taken from sites 14, 16, 17 or 18 (Table 5.2), sites 16 and 18 have the capacity to accommodate more pitches than the preferred sites. It is assumed that part of these site (or one of these sites) would be used as Traveller accommodation, with the remainder of the site left undeveloped as at present.

**Table 10.2 Appraisal of the Effects of Preferred and Alternative Options on the 18 Sustainability Objectives**

Objective	Env	Soc	Econ	Preferred Options for Traveller accommodation	Alternatives 1 and 2: Provision of more sites	Alternatives 3 and 4: Provision of fewer sites	Alternative 5: Different distribution of Traveller sites
1. To reduce the disparities in economic performance within the Borough		Y	Y	The Traveller sites DPD is concerned with providing accommodation for Travellers in the most appropriate locations. This Objective is concerned with providing job opportunities / investment, and thus the effect of allocating the preferred sites on this Objective should be minimal. There should be no effect on the baseline position.	The allocation of more sites will have a minimal / neutral effect on meeting the employment needs of the Borough. Many Travellers are self-employed and the transit site is not a permanent residence so would not assist in reducing economic disparities within the Borough. There should be no effect on the baseline position.	Fewer site allocations would most likely have a minimal / neutral effect on meeting the employment needs of local people, given many Travellers are self-employed. There should be no effect on the baseline position.	A different geographical distribution of Traveller sites should have a negligible effect on reducing economic disparities. There should be no effect on the baseline position.
2. To secure economic inclusion		Y	Y	The preferred sites have been selected with the intention of providing accommodation within easy reach of employment (subject to constraints such as flood risk). The preferred sites would have a small positive effect in terms of providing physical accessibility to jobs, although this is likely to be insignificant given many Travellers are self-employed.	The allocation of additional sites should not have any effect on improving the employment needs of the local community. The criteria of the Gypsy and Traveller Policy will seek to ensure that site allocations are in sustainable areas that are easily accessible by public transport and/or close to areas of employment. There should be no effect on the baseline position.	The allocation of fewer sites should not have any effect on improving the employment needs of the local community. The criteria of the Gypsy and Traveller Policy will seek to ensure that site allocations are in sustainable areas that are easily accessible by public transport and/or close to areas of employment. There should be no effect on the baseline position.	Many Travellers are self-employed and thus the overall effect is likely to be insignificant.
3. To develop and maintain a healthy labour market		Y	Y	One sub-criterion of this Objective relates to levels of participation in education. Criteria for selecting the preferred Traveller sites include ease of access to schools, and thus the allocation and use of the preferred sites should help increase participation in education, albeit for	Provision of additional sites, if occupied, should increase levels of participation in education, therefore having no effect upon the baseline position.	Provision of fewer sites will mean fewer opportunities for participation in education, lessening the overall positive effect to insignificant levels.	A different distribution of sites (if the different sites are further from education facilities than the preferred sites) would mean that participation in education is likely to be less easy, hence no effect on the baseline.

Objective	Env	Soc	Econ	Preferred Options for Traveller accommodation	Alternatives 1 and 2: Provision of more sites	Alternatives 3 and 4: Provision of fewer sites	Alternative 5: Different distribution of Traveller sites
				limited numbers of pupils. Overall, the effect is not judged to be significant compared to the baseline.			
4. To encourage sustainable economic growth	Y	Y	Y	The sub-criteria relating to this objective are concerned with economic diversification and the attraction of new business. Self-employed Travellers would not be expected to provide job opportunities for the settled community, and thus the overall effect on economic growth is likely to be positive but minimal.	The allocation and occupation of additional sites could lead to more Travellers residing in the Borough, and more business.	The allocation and occupation of fewer sites would result in fewer Travellers residing in the Borough, and lower business growth, compared with the preferred options for sites; however, the overall effect is likely to be negligible.	A different distribution of sites should result in no difference in effect compared with the preferred distribution of sites.
5. To deliver urban renaissance	Y	Y	Y	The sub-criteria for this Objective relate to the physical fabric of settlements, which has little relevance to provision of Traveller sites, hence no effect of any significance on the baseline position.	No effect on the baseline position.	No effect on the baseline position	No effect (the only urban sites amongst the 20 candidate sites are subject to constraints and have unrealistic prospects of allocation).
6. To deliver rural renaissance	Y	Y	Y	The sub-criteria for this Objective relate to rural diversification, growth of sustainable rural businesses and provision of services. Whilst Traveller sites may accommodate self-employed people and their businesses, these business opportunities are not expected to be available to non-residents of the sites, so the overall effect on the baseline is negligible.	No effect on the baseline position.	No effect on the baseline position.	No effect on the baseline position.

Objective	Env	Soc	Econ	Preferred Options for Traveller accommodation	Alternatives 1 and 2: Provision of more sites	Alternatives 3 and 4: Provision of fewer sites	Alternative 5: Different distribution of Traveller sites
7. To develop and market the Borough's image	Y	Y	Y	<p>Two sub-criteria are of relevance: preservation / enhancement of the built / natural environment in the Borough, and attraction of visitors, investors and residents. Traveller sites are unlikely to enhance the Borough's environment (although a well-planned and tidy site, complying with Local Plan policies on design, etc., need not have any negative effect). Whilst Travellers could be classed as "visitors" to the area, the sub-criteria are more likely to be concerned with tourists and business investors than Travellers.</p> <p>Overall, the effect is likely to be a combination of a minor negative and a minor positive effect, resulting in a neutral effect overall on the baseline.</p>	The "balance" described in the assessment of the effect of the preferred options for sites would apply equally to an increased number of sites. There should be no effect on the baseline position	<b>(N)</b> The "balance" described in the assessment of the effect of the preferred options for sites would apply equally to a reduced number of sites. However, one consequence of under-providing sites would be an increased likelihood of unauthorised encampments, which tend to be unsightly, and thus likely to result in a negative effect.	A different distribution of sites should have no different effect on the Borough's image compared with the preferred sites and the baseline.
8. To improve access to basic goods and services	Y		Y	<p>This objective is concerned with the range and quality of cultural and recreational facilities, essential services, and access to locally-sourced goods.</p> <p>As such it is of limited relevance to the topic of Traveller sites, hence no effect in the baseline data.</p>	No effect on the baseline position.	No effect on the baseline position	No effect on the baseline position.
9. To improve access to good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing		Y		<b>(P)</b> The most pertinent sub-criterion for this Objective refers to an appropriate mix of housing to meet all needs. Assuming Traveller accommodation can be included in this category, the provision of suitable	<b>(VP)</b> The allocation of a greater number of Traveller sites will further assist in meeting the accommodation needs of this group of people.	The allocation of fewer sites will have a less positive effect in comparison to alternatives 1 and 2 on providing accommodation for this group of people than the preferred option. Therefore no	<b>(P)</b> Providing the same amount of accommodation, albeit in different locations, should have a similar effect to the preferred option.

Objective	Env	Soc	Econ	Preferred Options for Traveller accommodation	Alternatives 1 and 2: Provision of more sites	Alternatives 3 and 4: Provision of fewer sites	Alternative 5: Different distribution of Traveller sites
				accommodation to meet Traveller needs will have a positive effect on this group of people and on the baseline position.		effect on the baseline	
10. To reduce crime and disorder and the fear of crime		Y		Sub-criteria relate to community development, relations between sections of the community, crime and fear of crime. These issues are emotive and are likely to be a hindrance in securing the allocation of sites in the first place. However, the allocation of appropriate, good quality sites, and community cohesion through the criterion policy should help ensure positive effects in terms of this Objective. As these outcomes are not guaranteed, this category has been assigned a “no effect” score rather than “likely positive” score compared with the baseline.	A greater number of site allocations is likely to have a similar effect to the preferred option, subject to the same conditions / caveats. There should be no effect on the baseline position.	<b>(N)</b> Fewer site allocations could result in needs not being met, leading to a greater likelihood of unauthorised encampments, which tend to reinforce negative public perceptions of Travellers, and provide little motivation on the part of Travellers to integrate with the local settled community. Negative effect compared with the baseline position.	Providing enough sites to meet Traveller needs should have a similar effect to the preferred option, although it is likely to be less positive in comparison to preferred option and alternatives 1 and 2, if sites are in less appropriate locations.
11. To reduce the need to travel, improve the choice and use of sustainable transport modes	Y	Y		The most relevant sub-criteria relate to increased walking, cycling and public transport use. The preferred sites have been chosen taking into account, <i>inter alia</i> , their proximity to services and public transport, but in practice it is recognised that Travellers tend to have and use private motorised transport. The overall effect, therefore, is likely to be positive but not significant compared with the baseline position.	More site allocations could have both a negative and positive effect on the use of sustainable transport modes. If more sites were located in sustainable areas this would have a greater positive effect. However, if more rural unsustainable sites were allocated this would have less of a positive effect. Overall, it is assumed the effect on the baseline position will be similar to that of the preferred option.	If fewer sites were allocated, these “fewer sites” would be in equally sustainable locations to the preferred sites. However, not meeting needs would be likely to result in unauthorised encampments, and these could be in less sustainable locations (but may not be). No effect on baseline position assumed because of uncertainty	A different distribution of proposed Traveller sites is likely to be less sustainable than those set out in the preferred options, but the overall effect / change in effect is likely to be insignificant.

Objective	Env	Soc	Econ	Preferred Options for Traveller accommodation	Alternatives 1 and 2: Provision of more sites	Alternatives 3 and 4: Provision of fewer sites	Alternative 5: Different distribution of Traveller sites
12. To improve physical and mental health and reduce inequalities		Y		<b>(P)</b> Sub-criteria refer to improve physical and mental health, vulnerable groups, health inequalities and isolation. By providing suitable sites for Traveller accommodation, the preferred options can contribute towards a positive effect on these issues for Travellers. Ease of access to health facilities is one of the criteria used in site assessment. Overall, it is anticipated there would be a positive effect compared with the baseline position.	<b>(P)</b> Additional site allocations should result in a similar, or greater positive effect compared with the preferred options for sites.	<b>(N)</b> Fewer site allocations could result in the accommodation needs of some Travellers not being met, which could lead to unauthorised encampments and constant “moving on”, allowing less access to health facilities and a lower quality of life for some.  (Moving on refers to unauthorised transit sites, that are closed down through enforcement action)	<b>(P)</b> Providing enough sites to meet Traveller accommodation needs should help address this Objective. However, a different distribution of sites may (or may not) result in health facilities being more difficult to access, hence a less positive effect than for the preferred option or alternative options 1 & 2. Overall, a small positive effect compared with the baseline position.
13. To protect places, landscapes and buildings of historical, cultural and archaeological value	Y			<b>(N)</b> The preferred Traveller sites are generally in rural locations, and thus there is a high possibility that the landscape in these locations will be adversely affected, although the site selection criteria seek to avoid negative effect on important or historic landscapes. Overall, it is anticipated there would be a minor negative effect compared with the baseline.	<b>(N)</b> Providing further sites could lead to greater effect on landscapes and / or countryside, especially if the additional sites have issues with regard to their effect on the landscape. However it may be possible to mitigate the effects for some sites. Effect could be judged to be “negative” or “very negative” compared with the baseline.	<b>(VN)</b> Whilst provision of fewer sites will lead to less cumulative effect on the landscape, this could result in an increased likelihood of unauthorised encampments. Such encampments may have a much more negative effect on the countryside. Conversely, occupants of longer-term unauthorised sites may sometimes screen their sites, in which case the effect could be “negative” rather than “very negative”.	<b>(N)</b> A different distribution of Traveller sites is likely to have a similar or slightly more negative effect on the landscape, although once again, these sites can be appropriately screened to mitigate their effect; however there still could be unauthorised encampments.
14. To restore and protect land and soil quality	Y			<b>(N)</b> The two preferred sites which are already in use will have resulted in the loss of a small amount of greenfield land and some low grade agricultural land. The other site is on brownfield	<b>(N)</b> An increase in allocated sites is likely to result in a greater loss of greenfield land, and could potentially lead to loss of more significant amounts of agricultural land,	<b>(N)</b> Whilst provision of fewer sites will lead to a lesser cumulative effect, it could also result in more unauthorised encampments in more “harmful” locations, with a	<b>(N)</b> A different distribution of sites is likely to have a slightly more negative effect on the baseline than the preferred sites, although, depending on



Objective	Env	Soc	Econ	Preferred Options for Traveller accommodation	Alternatives 1 and 2: Provision of more sites	Alternatives 3 and 4: Provision of fewer sites	Alternative 5: Different distribution of Traveller sites
				land. The overall effect is likely to a minor negative effect compared with the baseline position.	however this could be offset as there would be a reduction in unauthorised encampments.	greater overall “net” negative effect than for the preferred option depending upon their location. Whether this is “negative” or “very negative” depends on the locations of any unauthorised encampments.	which sites are chosen, could have a more significant negative effect.
15. To protect and enhance biodiversity	Y			<p>The preferred sites have been selected using, <i>inter alia</i>, a criterion seeking to avoid negative effects on nature conservation sites. The sites chosen will not enhance biodiversity, but should not have any significant negative effect on biodiversity in the baseline evidence.</p> <p>A number of the preferred sites are already in Traveller use at present. No overall effect upon the baseline position.</p>	<p><b>(N)</b> An increase in allocated sites would potentially increase the likelihood of some effect upon habitats and species, through a cumulative effect, mitigation measures would need to be implemented to deal with any loss. Overall it is likely there would be a minor negative effect compared with the baseline position.</p>	<p><b>(N)</b> Fewer allocated sites would reduce the effect upon habitat and species within the borough, but could result in a greater number of unauthorised developments in locations affecting nature conservation sites.</p>	<p>A different distribution of sites to meet the same accommodation needs is unlikely to have any significantly worse effect on biodiversity compared to the baseline position than the preferred sites.</p>
16. To protect and improve the quality of both inland coastal waters and protect against flood risk	Y			<p>The preferred sites avoid Flood Zone 3, in accordance with national policy. Any allocated sites will need to satisfy the Exceptions Test, where applicable. Allocating the preferred sites will not have a positive effect on flood risk, but neither should it have any significant negative effect. Thus overall, no net effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p><b>(N)</b> Providing more sites could result in an increase in flood risk, depending on the location of the sites chosen. The extent of any negative effects depends on the sites chosen.</p>	<p><b>(N)</b> Providing fewer sites could result in unauthorised encampments, which may be in flood risk areas. Two current unauthorised sites are in Flood Zone 3. The extent of negative effects depends on the occurrence and location of any unauthorised encampments.</p>	<p>A different distribution of sites to meet the same accommodation needs is unlikely to have any significantly worse effect on flood risk, provided sites in Flood Zone 3 are avoided.</p> <p>Whether or not the effect is negative and significant depends on the location of the alternative sites. Thus overall, no net effect on the baseline position.</p>

Objective	Env	Soc	Econ	Preferred Options for Traveller accommodation	Alternatives 1 and 2: Provision of more sites	Alternatives 3 and 4: Provision of fewer sites	Alternative 5: Different distribution of Traveller sites
17. To protect and improve air, light and noise quality.	Y			The preferred sites should have no significant effect on air quality and noise / light pollution, provided suitable measures be put in place on allocated sites to provide suitable acoustic and visual screening. There is no indication of any likely effect upon the baseline position.	An increase in sites could potentially mean an increase in car usage, thus decreasing air quality. (Having said that, unauthorised sites could also generate a greater number of vehicle movements.) This would be dependent upon the location of sites and if they were in sustainable locations.  There is no indication of any likely effect upon the baseline position.	Fewer allocated sites would potentially have a lesser effect upon noise and air quality. However the effect would be dependent upon the location of sites the sustainability of their locations. Unauthorised encampments also generate vehicle movements  There is no indication of any material effect upon the baseline.	A different distribution of sites should have no significant effect on air quality and noise / light pollution, provided suitable measures are put in place to provide suitable acoustic and visual screening and reduce effects on air quality if located further away from services. Unauthorised encampments also generate vehicle movements There is no indication of likely effect upon the baseline position.
18. To ensure the prudent use of natural resources, including the use of renewable energies and the sustainable management of existing resources	Y			Providing accommodation to meet Traveller needs will have implications for use of resources, but these effects are not likely to be significant given the relatively small Traveller accommodation requirements in West Lancashire, compared with, say bricks and mortar housing requirements. There is no evidence of a likely material effect upon the baseline position.	More sites will inevitably produce a higher demand on the use of resources; however policies within the Local Plan ensure that renewable energies and sustainable design/ construction will be implemented. There is no evidence of a likely material effect upon the baseline position.	Fewer sites will in theory produce a lower demand on the use of resources. Unlikely to be any material effect on the baseline position.	A different distribution of sites should have no noticeable different effect on the use of resources compared with the preferred options for sites.

## 11. Conclusions

This interim Sustainability Appraisal report represents a fulfilment of the Stages A – C of the Sustainability Appraisal process for the Provision for Traveller Sites Development Plan Document: Options and Preferred Options (“the Traveller Site DPD”).

An assessment has been made of the Traveller Sites DPD’s proposed policy to assess planning applications for Traveller sites (policy GT1) against the baseline position with regard to the 18 Sustainability Objectives of the West Lancashire Local Plan. For comparison purposes, two reasonable alternatives to policy GT1 were assessed: an alternative, less stringent policy, and a scenario where there would be no policy in place.

It is concluded that the proposed Policy GT1 would be likely to have the most beneficial effects overall compared with the baseline position, its criteria seeking to minimise negative effects on matters linked with the 18 sustainability objectives of the Local Plan insofar as they relate to the provision of accommodation for Travellers. A less stringent policy (allowing development further away from facilities, and / or in the Green Belt, and / or in areas of landscape value), or a lack of a specific local policy would be likely to have a slightly more negative effect overall in terms of sustainability.

In the same way, an assessment was made of the preferred options for Traveller site allocation against the 18 Local Plan Sustainability Objectives, and this was compared with three reasonable alternative approaches of providing additional sites, providing fewer sites, and providing sites of the same capacity but in different geographical locations from the preferred sites.

In the light of an assessment of the deliverability of potential candidate sites, the preferred Traveller sites for allocation are:

- Site 3 – Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks. Permanent Gypsy and Traveller accommodation; 3 pitches;
- Site 6 – Land west of The Quays, Burscough. Travelling Showpeople accommodation; 10 pitches;
- Site 8 – Pool Hey Caravan Park, Pool Hey Lane – Permanent Gypsy and Traveller accommodation; 5 pitches.

Table 10.2 indicates that the preferred sites are likely to have the most positive overall effects in terms of sustainability (environmental, social, and economic), but that an alternative distribution of sites is likely to have similar effects under many of the sustainability objectives. The provision of additional sites is likely to lead to greater negative effects in terms of environmental sustainability, but may be preferable in terms of social sustainability as providing more sites would meet accommodation needs to a greater extent. Conversely, providing fewer sites would have a more significant negative effect as needs would be met to a lesser extent than under the preferred options, and as there may consequently be a greater probability of unauthorised Traveller encampments.

All four scenarios include elements of negative impact; this is because the allocation of sites for Travellers will inevitably result in impacts such as the loss of agricultural or horticultural land, and the use of private motorised transport.

## **Next Steps**

The results of this Interim Sustainability Appraisal have fed into the Traveller Sites DPD: Options and Preferred Options document. This report will be consulted upon, alongside the draft DPD. Comments received through the consultation process will be taken into account when preparing the next stage of the DPD (Publication version), at which point a further Sustainability Appraisal will be undertaken.

## APPENDIX 1: REVIEW OF RELEVANT PLANS AND PROGRAMMES

Strategy/Plan/Programme	Key Objectives relevant to Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Key targets and indicators relevant to Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
<b>INTERNATIONAL</b>				
Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment to building a humane equitable global community for all.</li> <li>• Renewable energy and efficiency</li> <li>• Sustainable construction.</li> <li>• Reducing impacts on biodiversity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater resource energy efficiency.</li> <li>• Renewable energy.</li> <li>• Increase energy efficiency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Gypsy and Travellers Policy and allocated sites should encourage the use of energy efficiency resource and the use of renewables where possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SA will be required to provide objectives relating to the environment and the use of natural resources and renewable energy.</li> </ul>
Kyoto Protocol (1997)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To prevent greenhouses gases and climate change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce emission levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage renewable energy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SA will be required to provide objectives relating to the environment and the use of natural resources and renewable energy.</li> </ul>
European Spatial Development Perspective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic/Social cohesion.</li> <li>• Conservation of natural and cultural heritage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the Directive within the SA.</li> </ul>
Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans on the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of the environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must apply to plans after 21/07/2006.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a Policy and ensure allocated sites take account of Directives requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirements of the Directive must be met within the SA.</li> </ul>
EU Air Quality Framework Directive 1996/62/EC and 1999/30/EC, 2000/3/EC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain good air quality and improve where possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a Policy and ensure allocated sites take account of the requirements of the Directive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SA should include objectives to consider air quality.</li> </ul>
EU Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent deterioration of aquatic water systems.</li> <li>• Promote sustainable water use.</li> <li>• Reduce underground pollution</li> <li>• Mitigate effects of flooding and droughts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a Policy and ensure allocated sites take account of the requirements of the Directive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SA should include objectives to consider water quality.</li> </ul>

Strategy/Plan/Programme	Key Objectives relevant to Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Key targets and indicators relevant to Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
Drinking Water Directive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of drinking water</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards are legally binding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a Policy and ensure allocated sites take account of the requirements of the Directive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA should include objectives to consider water quality.</li> </ul>
Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (1979)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure conservation of wild flora and fauna species and habitats. Special attention should be given to endangered and vulnerable species, included endangered and vulnerable migratory species.</li> </ul> <p>There are three main aims:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conserve wild flora, fauna and Natural Habitats.</li> <li>2. To promote co-operation between states.</li> <li>3. To give particular attention to vulnerable/endangered species.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No targets identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a Policy and ensure that allocated sites take account of the requirements of the Directive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA should consider the natural environment, biodiversity issues and the protection of endangered species.</li> </ul>
EU Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds 79/409/EEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of endangered species for which Member States are required to designate Special Protection Areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creation of protected areas;</li> <li>Upkeep and Management;</li> <li>Re-establishment of destroyed biotopes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a Policy and ensure allocated sites take account of the requirements of the Directive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA should consider the protection of endangered species.</li> </ul>
EU Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Flora and Fauna 92/43/EEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To conserve natural habitats;</li> <li>Identification of areas of conservation and maintain landscape features;</li> <li>Protection of Species.</li> <li>The consideration of Appropriate Assessments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a Policy and ensure allocated sites take account of the requirements of the Directive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA should consider the protection of landscape benefit for ecological issues.</li> </ul>
RAMSAR Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (1971)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The conventions mission statement is 'the conservation and wise use of all wetlands through local, regional and national actions and international co-operation, as a contribution to sustainable development throughout the world'.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a Policy and ensure allocated sites take account of the requirements of the Directive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA should consider the protection of identified European sites of nature conservation significance.</li> </ul>

Strategy/Plan/Programme	Key Objectives relevant to Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Key targets and indicators relevant to Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
EU Framework Waste Directive 75/442/EEC (as amended)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seeks to prevent and reduce the production of waste and its impacts;</li> <li>Where necessary waste should be disposed of with creating environmental problems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting of the development of clean technologies to process waste;</li> <li>Promote re-cycling and re-use</li> </ul>	To develop policies and programmes which take account of the Directive's requirements and consider recycling and treatment of waste?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SA should include the minimisation of waste as an objective.</li> </ul>
Aarhus Convention (1998)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribute to the protection of the right of every person and future generations to live in an environment adequate to his / her health and well-being by:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to Information;</li> <li>Public Participation in Decision Making;</li> <li>Access to Justice.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure public are consulted at relevant stages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure the public are consulted at the relevant stages.</li> </ul>
<b>NATIONAL</b>				
NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;</li> <li>A social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and</li> <li>An environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Making it easier for jobs to be created in cities, towns and villages;</li> <li>Moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature;6</li> <li>Replacing poor design with better design;</li> <li>Improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure; and</li> <li>Widening the choice of high quality homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop the Policy ensuring that allocates sites take account of the NPPF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that the Policy and site allocations are economically, socially and environmentally sustainable.</li> </ul>

Strategy/Plan/Programme	Key Objectives relevant to Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Key targets and indicators relevant to Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
	<p>biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.</p>			
<p>NPPF – Planning policy for Traveller Sites August 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LPA's make their own assessment of need for the purpose of planning</li> <li>• LPA's work collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites</li> <li>• Protect Green Belt land from inappropriate development</li> <li>• Reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Policy and site allocations should take into account the key objectives of the Planning Policy for Traveller Site document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SA should consider, where appropriate, the need for objectives relating to social cohesion.</li> </ul>
<p>NPPG - Ensuring effective enforcement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforcement of unauthorised camps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Policy and site allocations should take into account the key objectives of the Planning Policy for Traveller Site document.</li> </ul>	
<b>SUB REGIONAL</b>				
<p>Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To resist minerals or waste developments where they could cause unacceptable impact on people and the environment;</li> <li>• To minimise the adverse impact of minerals or waste developments and seek where appropriate environmental and social benefits;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A variety of targets and indicators are referred to relating to a minerals production, waste minimisation and recycling relates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Policy and site allocations should take into account the key objectives of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SA should consider, where appropriate, the need for objectives relating to minerals and waste.</li> </ul>



Strategy/Plan/Programme	Key Objectives relevant to Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Key targets and indicators relevant to Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To identify the requirements for, and ensure a supply of land to meet necessary local, regional and national supplies of minerals;</li> <li>• To safeguard minerals resources for the future;</li> <li>• Increased emphasis on waste minimisation, re-use and recycling whilst ensuring that adequate provision is made for the treatment and disposal of waste;</li> <li>• To ensure that minerals and waste development are reclaimed to a high standard, to enable an acceptable after the use to be implemented;</li> <li>• To encourage the use of secondary materials;</li> <li>• To minimise the adverse impacts from the transport of minerals and waste; and</li> <li>• To facilitate the establishment of installations needed to minimise waste disposal.</li> </ul>			
A landscape strategy for Lancashire – Landscape Character Assessment (2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To outline how the landscape of Lancashire has evolved in terms of physical forces and human influences;</li> <li>• To classify the landscapes in district landscape types identifying key characteristics and sensitivities and providing principles to guide landscape change;</li> <li>• To describe the current appearance of the landscape, classifying it into district zones of homogenous character, summarising the key features of each landscape character area;</li> <li>• To describe the principal urban landscape types across the County, highlighting their historical development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To incorporate landscape protection into the Policy and site allocations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To include protection of landscapes in the Policy and site allocations.</li> </ul>

Strategy/Plan/Programme	Key Objectives relevant to Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Key targets and indicators relevant to Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
West Lancashire Transport Masterplan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce road casualties;</li> <li>• Improve access to jobs and services;</li> <li>• Improve air quality;</li> <li>• Improve the condition of transport infrastructure;</li> <li>• Reduce delays on journeys;</li> <li>• Increase journeys by bus and rail; and</li> <li>• Increase active travel.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan includes a wide range of targets and indicators relating to areas such as traffic growth, air quality and public transport use, cycling and walking rates, congestion and accessibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the Policy and site allocations in relation to improving the accessibility to services, encouraging the provision and use of public transport and cycling and walking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include sustainability objectives in relation to improving traffic issues.</li> </ul>
<b>LOCAL</b>				
West Lancs Local Plan 2012-2027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stronger and safer communities</li> <li>• Education, training and the economy</li> <li>• Health</li> <li>• Natural Environment</li> <li>• Housing</li> <li>• Services and Accessibility</li> <li>• Location of development and built environment</li> <li>• Climate Change</li> <li>• Provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites (Policy RS4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan includes a wide range of targets and indicators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the Policy and identification of the site allocations to address the relevant objectives of the Local Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To include objectives in the Policy and site allocations.</li> </ul>
West Lancashire District Council Statement of Community Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes the various stages in document preparation when the Council will involve the community, the different groups to be contacted at each stage and for each type of document, and the different ways in which groups will be involved at each stage.</li> <li>• Explains how the Council will provide feedback on any comments received.</li> <li>• Provides a list of organisations and community groups that the Council will consult, both formally and informally.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consultation must comply with the SCI.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure the consultation on the SA in undertaken in accordance with the SCI.</li> </ul>
Housing Needs Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide accurate and robust information about the housing need requirements</li> <li>• Help support the Council's strategic housing role;</li> <li>• Help inform the Housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20% elderly provision and 35% affordable housing provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DPD must address the issues of the Housing Needs Survey.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SA Framework should include for the development of affordable and elderly housing.</li> </ul>

Strategy/Plan/Programme	Key Objectives relevant to Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Key targets and indicators relevant to Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Provision for Traveller Sites DPD	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
	<p>Strategy for the Masterplan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify key priorities to creating a balanced housing market in the District, particularly addressing issues of affordability;</li> <li>• Provide an assessment of housing markets in the District;</li> <li>• Assess the specific housing needs of ethnic minorities, older people and key workers in the District;</li> <li>• Provide projections on future housing need.</li> </ul>			
West Lancashire Open Space Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To prioritise strategic sites for enhancement and development of open space and non-sports pitch facilities.</li> <li>• Provide quality targets and management targets for general open space and individual typologies.</li> <li>• Provide information that can be used within the LDF process and supplementary planning documents.</li> <li>• Protect sites, which increase nature conservation and biodiversity, from over use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DPD must consider open space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SA should take account of open space in the DPD.</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 2:

### COLLECTION OF RELEVANT ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE DATA

The indicators are West Lancashire Performance indicators

Indicator - 1. Encourage sustainable economic growth and performance.

Indicator	Data Source	Data recent at	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
All Economically Active	NOMIS	April 2014 – March 2015	(52500) 75.4%	74.7%	77.4%		No effect
% claiming JSA	NOMIS	August 2015	1.0%	1.5%	1.7%		No effect

Indicator – 2. Secure Economic Inclusion

Indicator	Data Source	Data recent	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
All Economically Active	2011 Census	2011	81,601	5,184,216	3,881,374	As census or NOMIS data above	Unknown

Indicator – 3. To deliver Urban Renaissance

Indicator	Data Source	Data recent	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Number of dwellings.	2011 census (KS401EW)	2011	47,973	3,143,898	22,976,066		No effect
Deficiency of public open space	Playing pitch strategy	2004	Football: minor oversupply of adult pitches; significant shortfall of junior pitches; undersupply of mini pitches. Large undersupply of junior rugby union pitches. Small undersupply of adult rugby league pitches.			Current review underway due to be published 2015	No effect

Alternatively, there are figures for number of households, where numbers vary to above – see AMR 2015 page 54

Indicator – 4. To deliver Rural Renaissance

Indicator	Data Source	Data recent	West Lancs	North West	England	Comment	Expected baseline without the plan
% of new residential completions/ permissions within 1km of 5 basic services	WLBC	2015	65%	-	-	No figures available for overall population. Figures available for % of new residential completions / permissions based on 5 services in 1km. See AMR 2015 page 59	Unknown exact level but if no plan in place the Travelling community would possibly decrease this figure
Proportion of new housing granted consent and completed within 400m of an existing / proposed bus stop	WLBC (AMR 2015)	2015	91% completions	-	-		Unknown exact level but if no plan in place the Travelling community would possibly decrease this figure

Indicator - 5. To protect and improve the quality of inland and coastal waters, and manage flood risk

Indicator	Data Source	Data recent	West Lancs	North West	England	Comment	Expected baseline without the plan
Number of Planning Permissions permitted against Environment Agency Advice	2013 AMR Environment Agency	2013	0			This data is no longer published by the EA	No effect

Indicator – 6. To reduce the need to travel and improve the choice and use of sustainable transport modes.

Indicator	Data Source	Data recent	West Lancs	North West	England	Comment	Expected baseline without the plan
Proportion of new housing granted consent and completed within 400m of an existing / proposed bus stop	WLBC	2014/15	91% completions			Permissions based on 5 services in 1km. See AMR 2015 page 59	Unknown however without the plan unauthorised development and encampments may not meet this requirement
Average distance (km) travelled to a fixed place of work.						Question not asked in 2011 census.	Unknown
Length of Public Footpaths within the District	LCC GIS	2015	383km				No change
Length of cycle ways within the District	LCC GIS	2015	190km				No change
Number of people travelling to work within the borough	<a href="#">ONS Neighbourhood Statistics (2011 Census)</a>	2011	40%			40% of Boroughs workplace population commutes IN to the Borough	This figure would possible increase although it is unknown by how much

Indicator – 7. To minimise the requirement for energy, promote efficient energy use and increase the proportion of energy from renewable sources

Indicator	Data Source	Data relevant	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Daily domestic use of the water supply.	Audit commission	2004	148 Litres		154.14 Litres	No data.	No change
Average annual consumption of gas in Kwh.	Audit commission	2004	22971	20828	20496 (GB)	No data	No change
Average Annual Consumption of electricity in Kwh.	Audit commission	2004	4919	4393	4628 (GB)	No data	No change

Indicator – 8. To protect, enhance and manage West Lancashire’s rich and diverse culture and built environment and archaeological assets.

Indicator	Data Source	Data relevant	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Number of Conservation Areas	Council Heritage List	2015	28				No effect
Listed Buildings	English Heritage	2015	600				No effect
Building of Local Importance	Council Heritage List	2015	120			Under review to be published 2015	No effect

Indicator – 9. To protect and restore land and soil

Indicator	Data Source	Data relevant	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Proportion of land stock that is neglected, underused or derelict.	AMR 2012	2012	29	680	4080	We don't report this any longer. Relates to NLUD. NLUD data is maintained for WLBC use but HCA no longer request it. Also figures here are a total not a proportion	If no plan is in place loss of prime agricultural land could be compromised through unauthorised development/encampments

Indicator – 10. To protect and enhance biodiversity and sites of geological importance

Indicator	Data Source	Data relevant	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Number of RAMSAR sites within the District.	West Lancs AMR	2012	2			No change	No change
Number of SSSIs within the District.	West Lancs AMR	2012	6			No change	No change
Number of TPOs	West Lancs AMR	2015	575				No change
Green Flag Awards	West Lancs AMR	2015	2				No change
Biological Heritage sites			5,111			Unknown. Assume no change.	No change

Indicator – 11. To improve health and well-being and reduce health inequalities.

Indicator	Data Source	Data relevant	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Life expectancy males	ONS	2011-2013	79		79.4		This would remain unchanged for the overall population; however it could increase life expectancy of the ethnic group
Life expectancy Female	ONS	2011-2013	82.5		83.1		This would remain unchanged for the overall population; however it could increase life expectancy of the ethnic group

Indicator – 12. To protect and improve air, light and noise quality

Indicator	Data Source	Data relevant	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Numbers of Air Quality Management Zones	West Lancs	2009	1			Moor Street Ormskirk.	No effect
% of moderate / higher pollutant days	West Lancs					Not recorded by WLBC	No effect



Indicator – 13. To improve access to and the provision of basic goods, services and amenities.

Indicator	Data Source	Data relevant	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Amount of new residential development (completions) within 30 minutes public transport time of essential basic services (GP, Hospital, Primary, Secondary, Retail, Employment)	West Lancs		65%			No longer analysed by LCC. Software unavailable to WLBC.	Unknown, however it would be expected that the figure would decrease if the plan was not implemented as there would be no control over where development was located

Indicator – 14. To develop strong and vibrant communities and reduce the fear of crime.

Indicator	Data Source	Data relevant	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Recorded Crime	AMR 2015	2013/14				No overall figure.	No effect
						No longer recorded in serious acq. crime stats	
Robbery	AMR 2015	2013/14	66	-	-		No effect
Domestic burglary	AMR 2015	2013/14	295				No effect
Vehicle offences	AMR 2015	2013/14	604				No effect

National crime stats for serious acquisitive crime change regularly – descriptions can vary from year to year. Full list available in AMR 2015 page 24.

Indicator – 15. To improve access to a range of good quality affordable and resource efficient homes.

Indicator	Data Source	Data relevant	West Lancs	North West	England	Comments	Expected baseline without the plan
Number of affordable housing units granted permission	AMR 2015	2014/15	17 (2%)				No effect
Proportion of dwellings completed on brownfield sites /conversions sites	AMR 2015	2014/15	57%				Unknown this could increase or decrease depending upon location of applications
Proportion of completed permitted on brownfield sites	AMR 2015	2014/15	43%				Unknown this could increase or decrease depending upon location of applications

### APPENDIX 3: IDENTIFYING SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

Issue	Description of the Issue	Discussion on the relationship with other issues/plans and the reliance of action from other bodies	How can the issue be addressed?
Access, Highways & Public Transport	<p>One of the main issues facing the Borough is improving access to sustainable methods of transport including bus, rail links and cycle &amp; footpaths. This also extends to improving the availability and frequency of bus and rail services. Although sites are assessed against this criteria it is important to reduce car dependency levels.</p> <p>There is the need to improve the diversity and availability of employment in West Lancashire in accessible locations or with improved public transport links to enable residents of the Borough to find employment within West Lancs, thereby reducing the necessity to commute.</p>	<p>The Council and Lancashire County Council must work in partnership, ensuring that the issue of congestion is addressed through assessing problem junctions and ensuring a sustainable public transport network functions to its full potential.</p>	<p>Assessing the sites against criteria and liaising with public transport infrastructure providers regarding the transport network.</p>
Social Inclusion	<p>The Borough is required to deliver a yearly requirement of homes over the plan period 2012-2027 to meet the needs of the population which also includes services, employment opportunities as well as provision of and access to health related facilities.</p> <p>Social exclusion occurs from unemployment, low income, high crime rate, poor housing and poor health. Social inclusion is used to assist in addressing these issues.</p>	<p>Engagement with the Health providers will establish what requirements are needed.</p>	<p>Liaise with providers to establish the required need and either provide a facilities onsite or within the town centre, through planning obligations.</p>
Access to services and amenities	<p>Access to services and amenities needs to be improved in-between settlements; this is expected to be delivered through establishing a network of green corridors. There are various deficiencies in open space throughout the borough. Development needs to maximise the role of open spaces to improve health and physical activity whilst improving the quality of amenity in open spaces. Provide play facilities needs.</p>	<p>Identify areas for linear parks, play areas and footpaths/cycle paths.</p>	<p>Liaise with the green infrastructure providers to establish what provision, if any is required and provide through planning obligations.</p>
Employment	<p>There are levels of disparities and inequalities between skills, education, health &amp; employment across the Borough that need to be reduced.</p> <p>Work is required to reduce unemployment levels and the number of benefit claimants although this is already lower than the regional and national average.</p> <p>Reduce travelling out of the borough for work and increasing the number of those travelling inwards for work will assist in increasing West Lancashire's economy.</p>	<p>Links with improving education and developing skills.</p> <p>It is key to establish any educational and training needs derived from the allocation of sites.</p>	<p>Liaise with the Local Education Authority to establish if an additional education provision is required to link, whilst establishing any local training needs.</p>

Issue	Description of the Issue	Discussion on the relationship with other issues/plans and the reliance of action from other bodies	How can the issue be addressed?
Education	<p>There is a need to improve the lack of basic skills and barriers to work as well as the barriers to work through linking workless people to vacancies.</p> <p>Education provision will need to be subsidised if additional recourses are required dependent upon the location of the site allocations.</p>	<p>The Council will have to liaise with Lancashire county Council in order to establish if a need for additional primary /secondary school places is required.</p>	<p>Liaise with providers to establish the required need and provide a facility within the town centre, through a planning obligation.</p>
Protection of ecology, biodiversity and soils	<p>Protect and promote agricultural land &amp; horticultural land and businesses within West Lancashire.</p> <p>Reduce the amount of vacant land and Brownfield sites unused by promoting their regeneration.</p> <p>Simultaneously review and protect green belt land.</p> <p>Continue to reduce the volume of waste going to landfill.</p> <p>Respond to climate change through protecting the most fertile agricultural land for crop production to respond to the changing needs of the food production industry.</p>	<p>Liaison with Lancashire County Council and RSPB/Natural England will identify areas to be protected; these could be doubled up as areas of public open space.</p>	<p>Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) to identify species on the site and any mitigation/provision for ecology on the site.</p>
Surface and Waste Water Treatment	<p>Sustainably manage and use water resources.</p> <p>Ensure all households, businesses, agriculture and environments have enough water available.</p> <p>Support and protect as many watercourses, wetlands and groundwater &amp; surface water sources as financially viable.</p> <p>Ensure more water efficient designs are incorporated into developments and new buildings.</p> <p>Promote the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).</p> <p>Reduce flood risk through location management of development into areas of the lowest risk and supporting flood defences</p> <p>Respond to the impacts of climate change on water resources such as water quantity and quality, changes to water tables and demands from the public.</p>	<p>Careful consideration is needed in protecting areas from surface water flooding.</p> <p>The Council, along with Lancashire County Council and the Environment Agency will be required to work together to ensure new development and the existing area is protected.</p>	<p>Liaise with United utilities to establish what additional infrastructure will be required to assist in the delivery of the sites, and whether or not there is existing capacity within the existing network.</p>

## **APPENDIX 4: SITE ASSESSMENTS (SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA)**

**Assessments of the 20 Potential Candidate Traveller Sites against a set of Sustainability Criteria used in the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal**

Q	Site Name	1. Aveling Drive A, Banks	2. Aveling Drive B, Banks	3. Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks	4. Land west of Hoole Lane, Banks	5. Land west of Ringtail Road, Burscough
1	Other site references / SHLAA site reference?	No	No	No	SHLAA BA.18	No
2	Site Address	Land at Mossland Stables, Aveling Drive, Banks	Land west of Mosslands, Aveling Drive, Banks	Land at Sugar Stubbs Stables, Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks	Land west of Hoole Lane, Banks	Land west of Ringtail Road, Burscough
3	Post Code	PR9	PR9	PR9	PR9	L40
4	OS Grid Ref - E	339687	339789	340405	339004	342361
5	OS Grid Ref - North	420656	420688	419629	420680	411597
6	Site Area (ha)	0.65	0.23	0.27	0.61	1.35
7	Description of Site	Site comprises former agricultural land, involving areas of hardstanding, some buildings, including stables, and storage of vehicles as well as fenced grassed areas. Site occupied by Travellers.	Site comprises former agricultural land, involving areas of hardstanding, some buildings including stables, and storage of vehicles as well as fenced grassed areas. Site occupied by Travellers.	Site is currently occupied by hardstanding, a few caravans, and storage of vehicles.	Site is currently occupied by horticultural glasshouses. The site is located to the rear of residential properties in the centre of Banks. Drains run along the western perimeter.	Site is Green Belt. A small access road runs along the southern edge of the site, with a storage area in the south-east part of the site. Site has been previously used to site polytunnels.
8	Description of Surrounding Area	Western edge of site is close to housing on Aveling Drive, although a strip of open land and a line of poplar trees separates the two. Immediate area appears to have been used for agricultural /equestrian use. Long Lane runs above the North-east of the site. The site is screened from the south by trees along the southern edge of Aveling Drive.	Western edge of site is close to housing on Aveling Drive, although the existing caravans at Aveling Drive A, a strip of open land and a line of poplar trees separates the two. Immediate area appears to have been used for agricultural /equestrian use. Long Lane runs above the north east of the site. The site is screened from the south by trees along the bottom edge of Aveling Drive.	Site is adjacent to residential property 'The Willows' (to the north of the site) and in proximity to other residential properties. The south and eastern parts of the site are farmed agricultural land.	The east and south of the site is bordered by residential properties, whilst the North is further glasshouses and the west is agricultural land.	The site is adjacent to an industrial estate (east). One residential property lies to the North of the site. Remaining area, and surrounding areas, are Green Belt land in agricultural use.
9	Brief Site History	Site currently has p/p pending decision for accommodation for Irish Travellers. Enforcement action in abeyance. Site in use as Traveller site and owned by Travellers	Site in use as Traveller site and owned by Travellers. Previous application for stationing of caravans for Gypsy Traveller use was refused on grounds of flood risk, Green Belt and Policy DE4. Appeal recovered by SoS, subsequently dismissed. Legal challenge to SoS recovery (hearing oct 2015).	Site formerly had a dwelling; pp granted to replace it with a caravan in 1993; site has been occupied by a varying number of caravans since.		Site is Green Belt, and was subject to unauthorised development, including storage of fairground equipment; enforcement action sanctioned by Council.
10	Relevant planning history	2012/0820/COU (pending), 2010/0885/COU (withdrawn)	2010/0998/COU (Refused)	2004/0880. 2013/1305/LDC - Cert of Lawfulness for stationing of 5 caravans and equestrian use. Refused as LDC cannot relate to a proposed use.	No plan apps.	Planning application (2013/0629/FUL) for park homes to accommodate Travelling Showpeople withdrawn Dec 2013. Other applications: 2004/0248, 2001/0763.
11	Land Ownership Details	Owned by Travellers	Owned by Travellers	Owned by Travellers	Private	Private
12	Source of Site Suggestion	Existing site (unauthorised)	Existing site (unauthorised)	Existing site - part consented (one pitch)	Owner submitted in Call for Sites 2013	Submitted in Call for Sites 2013 by agent
13	Date of Appraisal	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)
<b>Deliverability Issues</b>						
14	Are there any issues of land ownership that could prevent development on the site being delivered?	No. Land currently in hands of Travellers, and in use as Traveller site	No. Land currently in hands of Travellers, and in use as Traveller site	In the hands of Travellers.	Yes - owner indicated in 2015 that the site is no longer available for consideration as a Traveller site.	Yes - owner indicated in 2014 that the site is no longer available for consideration as a Traveller site.
15	Is the site potentially available for development?	Yes. Land currently in hands of Travellers, and in use as Traveller site	Yes. Land currently in hands of Travellers, and in use as Traveller site	Yes. Land currently in hands of Travellers, and in use as Traveller site	No	No
16	Does the planning history of the site caution against its allocation?	"Yes" - as neighbouring site appeal has been dismissed by the Secretary of State - similar issues on this site.	Yes. Previous application for stationing of caravans for Gypsy Traveller use was refused on grounds of flood risk, Green Belt and 2006 Local Plan Policy DE4. Appeal dismissed on account of flood risk and GB harm by Secretary of State.	No - site already has permission for one caravan.	No relevant planning history. Much of current site is Protected Land.	Land is currently Green Belt, site has been subject to enforcement action (unauthorised storage).

Q	Site Name	1. Aveling Drive A, Banks	2. Aveling Drive B, Banks	3. Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks	4. Land west of Hoole Lane, Banks	5. Land west of Ringtail Road, Burscough
17	Potential land use conflicts with nearby sites that could prevent development?	Residential use to the west of the site, although this should not on its own prevent the site being delivered.	Residential use to the west of the site, although this should not on its own prevent the site being delivered.	Overhead electricity cables less than 100m from back of site; main road within 150m of site. However, neither are considered to imply an unacceptable impact on site residents (holiday caravans and residential properties nearby are closer to the A565 / pylons).	Site is likely to cause issues with settled community due to its close proximity to existing residential area. Existing derelict glasshouses would need to be removed should the site be allocated. Unknown as to how access to site would be achieved given that existing properties front Hoole Lane.	Site is on the western edge of the Ringtail Industrial Estate. Mitigation in relation to visual impact may be possible by screening, but mitigation in relation to noise issues more difficult. However, remaining surrounding land is Green Belt, with one residential property to the North.
18	Is the site directly accessible from the highway network or could it reasonably become so?	Aveling Drive is a single track road with a drainage ditch at one side, and reached by passing through a residential area. The narrow lane to the site is not designed for the types of large vehicles associated with Travellers and could not be accessed easily by emergency vehicles	Aveling Drive is a single track road with a drainage ditch at one side, and reached by passing through a residential area. The narrow lane to the site is not designed for the types of large vehicles associated with Travellers and could not be accessed easily by emergency vehicles	Sugar Stubbs Lane is unclassified and narrow, although it is wide enough for two vehicles to pass. It is necessary to use approximately 120m of Sugar Stubbs Lane to access the site from the A565. Site has separate gated access from adjacent dwelling.	Site is on Hoole Lane, although it is not clear as to how access to site would be achieved, given existing properties fronting Hoole Lane.	Proposed site access (from planning application 2013/0629) involves travelling along 500m of unadopted road currently of poor quality, then 300m along the site access track.
19	Any known land contamination or remediation issues?	None known	None known	None known	None known.	None known
20	Any known ground instability?	None known	None known	None known	None known.	None known
21	Can adequate provision be made to supply all major utilities?	Given the proximity of other buildings, including houses, it is expected that utilities could readily be made available.	Given the proximity of other buildings, including houses, it is expected that utilities could readily be made available.	Given the proximity of other houses, it is expected that these services are available or could readily be made available.	Given the site's location within a settlement, it is expected that appropriate services could be provided.	Site does not currently have any formal connection to mains water / drainage / electricity. Given the neighbouring employment uses, it should be possible to obtain connections.
22	Is the site within Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b)?	Yes - Within Flood Zone 3.	Yes - Within Flood Zone 3.	No. Site is within Flood Zone 2, so must be shown to meet Exceptions Test. Within 100m of Flood Zone 3.	Site lies within Flood Zone 3	No
23	Is the site within the Green Belt?	Yes - GB site, but less than 100m to the Banks settlement boundary	Yes - GB site, but less than 100m to the Banks settlement boundary	Yes. Green Belt site, approximately 600m from Banks settlement boundary.	No	Site is in the Green Belt, but adjacent to the Non-Green Belt Burscough Industrial Estate.
24	Would development of the site affect any flight paths?	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site
25	Is there interest in site for development?	Site is in hands of Travellers and in use as a Traveller site.	Site is in hands of Travellers and in use as a Traveller site.	Site is in hands of Travellers and in use as a Traveller site.	None known of.	None known of.
<b>Biodiversity</b>						
26	Within 5km of and / or likely to impact on internationally designated sites?	Site within 5km of Ribble Estuary, but would be deemed unlikely to impact on environmental sites.	Site within 5km of Ribble Estuary, but would be deemed unlikely to impact on environmental sites.	Site within 5km of Ribble Estuary, but would be deemed unlikely to impact on environmental sites.	No	Yes. Within this distance of Martin Mere, however given the industrial uses adjacent, development of this site would be unlikely to impact on designated natural sites.
27	Within 1km of and / or likely to impact on a SSSI?	No.	No.	No.	No	No
28	Within 100m of designated local nature conservation sites?	No.	No.	No.	No	No
29	Protected species and / or habitats?	None known.	None known.	None known.	No	No
30	Within 100m of woodlands, or trees with Tree Preservation Orders?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
31	Effects on the sustainability of biodiversity, locally & wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have an impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have an impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have an impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have an impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have an impact on local, or international, biodiversity.
<b>Water and Land Resources</b>						
32	Is the site subject to any known stability issues?	No	No	No	None known	None known

Q	Site Name	1. Aveling Drive A, Banks	2. Aveling Drive B, Banks	3. Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks	4. Land west of Hoole Lane, Banks	5. Land west of Ringtail Road, Burscough
33	Geological or geomorphological importance?	No	No	No	No	No
34	Does the site have any adverse gradients on it?	No	No	No	No	No
35	Best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a)?	Grade 1, although site is predominantly hardstanding, rather than farmed land.	Grade 1, although site is predominantly hardstanding, rather than farmed land.	Grade 1, although site is predominantly hardstanding, rather than farmed land.	Part urban / Part of site lies in Grade 2 land	Grade 2 agricultural land
36	Active mineral working site?	No	No	No	No	No
37	Contaminated or derelict land?	No contaminated land known. Site currently in use, so not classed as derelict land.	No contaminated land known. Site currently in use, so not classed as derelict land.	No contaminated land known. Site currently in use, so not classed as derelict land.	Derelict glasshouses	No
38	Previously developed land (brownfield)?	Some buildings and hardstanding exist on the site but it is likely they are as a result of agricultural (non-brownfield)	Some buildings and hardstanding exist on the site but it is likely they are as a result of agricultural (non-brownfield)	Some buildings and hardstanding exist on the site but it is likely they are classed as non brownfield.	No (Horticulture classed as non brownfield)	No
39	Effects on the sustainability of land resources locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site is on Grade 1 agricultural land although site is not in active use for farming, containing hardstanding and buildings. Site would therefore be unlikely to have a detrimental effect on land resources.	Site is on Grade 1 agricultural land although site is not in active use for farming, containing hardstanding and buildings. Site would therefore be unlikely to have a detrimental effect on land resources.	Site is on Grade 1 agricultural land although site is not in active use for farming, containing hardstanding and buildings. Site would be unlikely to have a detrimental effect on land resources.	Allocation of site would be unlikely to result in significant loss of land resources.	Allocation of site would lead to loss of agricultural land.
40	Within or adjacent to a Principal Aquifer or Source Protection Zone 1 or 2?	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
41	Effects on the sustainability of water quality and resources locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.
<b>Climatic factors and flooding</b>						
42	Is the site within Zones 2 or 3 of the floodplain?	Yes. Flood Zone 3.	Yes. Flood Zone 3.	Yes. Site is within Flood Zone 2, so must be shown to meet Exceptions Test. Within 100m of Flood Zone 3.	Flood Zone 3.	No
43	Effects on the sustainability of climatic factors and flooding locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be located in an area of flood risk.	Site would be located in an area of flood risk.	Site would be located in an area of flood risk and would need to meet Exceptions Test.	Site would be located in an area of flood risk.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.
<b>Heritage and Landscape</b>						
44	Within or within 5km of and / or likely to impact on an AONB or Heritage Coast?	No	No	No	No	No
45	Within or within 1km of any area designated for its local landscape importance or is it likely to have adverse impacts on the landscape?	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation applies to site; historic landscape of local importance starts 100m to east of site.	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site.	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site.
46	Is the site in the Green Belt? If so, would development on this site cause harm to the objectives of Green Belt designation?	Yes. Site is in GB, although 100m from settlement boundary.	Yes. Site is in GB, although 100m from settlement boundary.	Yes. Site use would fall outside the objectives of Green Belt designation.	No	Yes. Site would also result in weaker GB boundaries. Delineation of GB is currently set by trees.
47	Within 250m of a site or building with a nationally recognized heritage designation?	No	No	No	No	No

Q	Site Name	1. Aveling Drive A, Banks	2. Aveling Drive B, Banks	3. Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks	4. Land west of Hoole Lane, Banks	5. Land west of Ringtail Road, Burscough
48	Effects on the sustainability of heritage and landscape locally and in the wider Borough and sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage and landscape. However, site may impact on the objectives of the Green Belt designation and would affect openness of Green Belt. Given the site is already partly developed, further impact should be minimal.	Site would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage and landscape. However, site may impact on the objectives of the Green Belt designation and would affect openness of Green Belt. Given the site is already partly developed, further impact should be minimal.	Site would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage but will impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Site can be seen from surrounding area.	Site would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage and landscape. The site is screened behind existing residential properties.	Site would be likely to weaken the GB boundary, and would have an impact on the visual of the area, although evergreen screening exists around part of the site. Site would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage.
	<b>Social equality and community services</b>					
49	Will development of the site harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses)?	Development of site for Traveller accommodation would likely be small scale and could be supported by community facilities. If the site is kept small, it should not dominate the settled community.	Development of site for Traveller accommodation would likely be small scale and could be supported by community facilities. If the site is kept small, it should not dominate the settled community.	Development of site for Traveller accommodation would likely be small scale and could be supported by community facilities. If the site is kept small, it should not dominate the settled community.	Development of site for Travellers should not harm community receptors, although may cause issues with the settled community.	Neighbouring residents / occupiers of industrial units have raised concern regarding the moving of Travelling Showpeople equipment in relation to planning application 2013/0629; it may be possible to mitigate some of these issues e.g. via conditions on moving / storage of equipment.
50	How close [how many minutes walk at 5km/h average walking speed] is this site to a public transport facility (bus stop / station on regular route)? (Please note that this walking time is taken into account in the questions below referring to X minutes public transport journey from various facilities.)	650m (8 minutes walk) from bus stops on Guinea Hall Lane	700m (8 minutes walk) from bus stops on Guinea Hall Lane	500m / 700m (6 minutes / 8 minutes walk) from bus stops on A565 (depending on direction of travel)	Within 50m (within 1 minute walk) from bus stops on Hoole Lane.	Approximately 2km (24 minutes walk) from bus stop.
51	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a Primary School?	Yes - at Banks	Yes - at Banks	Yes - at Banks	Yes (within walking distance)	2km to bus stop; 2.7km to school - possibly just about walkable in 30 minutes, but not for young children
52	Is the site within 40 minutes public transport journey of a Secondary School?	Yes - at Southport / Tarleton	Yes - at Southport / Tarleton	Yes - at Southport / Tarleton	Yes - at Southport / Tarleton	School walkable within 40 minutes; could be reached by walking and bus within 40 minutes
53	Is the site within 60 minutes public transport journey of a Further Education Institution?	Yes - at Southport	Yes - at Southport	Yes - at Southport	Yes - at Southport	Yes - at Ormskirk
54	Is the site within 60 minutes public transport journey of a Hospital?	Yes - at Southport	Yes - at Southport	Yes - at Southport	Yes - at Southport	Yes - at Ormskirk (but would entail a long walk or two buses)
55	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a GP Practice?	Yes - at Banks	Yes - at Banks	Yes - at Banks	Yes - at Banks	Could reach a GP with a combination of walking and bus, but not ideal with 2km walk to bus stop.
56	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a Major Centre?	Yes - Southport	Yes - Southport	Yes - Southport	Yes - Southport	Burscough Centre accessible within 30 minutes (most of it involving walking). Ormskirk Centre beyond 30 minutes walk / bus combined.
57	Is the site within 10 minutes walk (800m) of a district or local centre?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
58	Is the site within 15 minutes walk (1200m) of a Public Open Space of at least 5ha in size?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
59	Is the site within 10 minutes walk (800m) of a natural green space (e.g. Local Nature Reserve) of at least 2ha in size?	No	No	No	No	No
60	Is the site within 40 minutes public transport journey of a Leisure / Recreation / Sports Facility?	Yes - Leisure Centre, Banks	Yes - Leisure Centre, Banks	Yes - Leisure Centre, Banks	Yes - Leisure Centre, Banks	Yes - Leisure Centre, Burscough



Q	Site Name	1. Aveling Drive A, Banks	2. Aveling Drive B, Banks	3. Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks	4. Land west of Hoole Lane, Banks	5. Land west of Ringtail Road, Burscough
61	What could the effects of development on this site be on the sustainability of community health and equality, leisure and education locally and wider over time ; temporary / permanent effects?	Site is within reasonable accessible distance of existing services and facilities. Would be unlikely to put too much pressure on them.	Site is within reasonable accessible distance of existing services and facilities. Would be unlikely to put too much pressure on them.	Site is not easily accessible to local services and amenities. Would be unlikely to put too much pressure on them.	Site is within good accessible distance of services and facilities and should not place too much pressure on such amenities.	Site is within reasonable accessible distance of services and facilities but this relies on occupants having access to motorised vehicles. Given the site's size, its development should not have any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.
<b>Local economy and employment</b>						
62	Is the site within 250m of any sensitive commercial receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. sensitive business uses and tourist / visitor attractions)?	No	No	No	No	No
63	Effects on the sustainability of the local economy and employment locally / Borough / sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.) Neighbouring industrial occupiers have expressed concern about the use of this site for Travelling Showpeople.
<b>Housing</b>						
64	Is the site within 250m of residential dwellings (including individual houses)?	Yes. Residential area to west of site. Further development proposed for Greaves Hall site.	Yes. Residential area to west of site. Further development proposed for Greaves Hall site.	Yes. Some residential dwellings (individual houses) located within the rural area. not within an urban settlement.	Yes. Residential properties border the immediate east and south of the site.	Yes. One residential property lies approx 100m to the north of the site.
65	Effects on the sustainability of housing provision locally / Borough / sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible
<b>Transportation and air quality</b>						
66	In or adjacent to an existing Air Quality Management Area?	No.	No.	No	No	No
67	Are there any sensitive receptors nearby (e.g. residential, community facilities) that may be impacted by dust, fumes and emissions caused by the development and end-use of the site?	No.	No.	No	No	Site may be impacted by noise and traffic from the adjacent industrial estate.
68	Effects on the sustainability of air quality locally and in the wider Borough and sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality
69	How suitable is the road network to accommodate expected levels of traffic to and from the site?	Site is accessed by a single track road with a drainage ditch at one site, reached by passing through a residential area. Narrow lane is not designed for types of large vehicles associated with Travellers and would not be easy for large emergency vehicles to access.	Site is accessed by a single track road with a drainage ditch at one site, reached by passing through a residential area. Narrow lane is not designed for types of large vehicles assoc by Travellers and would not be easy for large emergency vehicles to access.	Sugar Stubbs Lane is unclassified and narrow, although it appears wide enough for two vehicles to pass. It is necessary to use approximately 120m of Sugar Stubbs Lane to access the site from the A565. Site has separate gated access from adjacent dwelling. Access for emergency vehicles possible (given the site entrance is set back up to 10m from Sugar Stubbs Lane), although not ideal.	The site is within the settlement of Banks, with generally adequate roads, infrastructure and services (drainage has been raised as a local issue). Provided the site were not too large, it should not place undue pressure on local services. Site is on Hoole Lane, although it is not clear as to how access to site would be achieved, given existing properties fronting Hoole Lane.	This site has been put forward as a Travelling Showpeople site. The type of large vehicles associated with this site may cause issues on the unadopted road leading to the most recent proposed site access.
70	Would traffic from the site onto Primary Road Network cause adverse impacts on amenity of sensitive receptors on the route (residential, schools etc.)?	Traffic flow from the site onto the primary road network would likely be minor, compared to the volume of traffic accessing the network from the residential properties at the bottom of Aveling Drive. Traveller vehicles passing the residential properties on Aveling Drive would have some impact.	Traffic flow from the site onto the primary road network would likely be minor, compared to the volume of traffic accessing the network from the residential properties at the bottom of Aveling Drive. Traveller vehicles passing the residential properties on Aveling Drive would have some impact, although this is a small site.	Unlikely due to the location of the site away from such amenities; just two residential properties at the junction of Sugar Stubbs Lane and A565, but the impact of Traveller traffic on these properties will be minor compared with A565 traffic.	The site is within the settlement of Banks, with generally adequate roads. Provided the site were not too large, it should not place undue pressure on local road networks.	Unlikely due to the location of the site meaning that such amenities need not be passed by traffic travelling from the site to the primary road network.
71	Is the site within 800m of an existing or proposed Cycle Route?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Q	Site Name	1. Aveling Drive A, Banks	2. Aveling Drive B, Banks	3. Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks	4. Land west of Hoole Lane, Banks	5. Land west of Ringtail Road, Burscough
72	Is the site within 800m of a bus stop for a high frequency bus service?	Yes	Yes	Yes. Site is approximately 500m / 700m from nearest bus stop (depending on bus direction).	Yes. Site within 50m of bus stops on Hoole Lane.	No
73	Is the site within 1200m of a Rail Station?	No	No	No	No	No
74	Does the site have public footpaths, rights of way or any other type of footpath on it or near to it?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
75	What could the effects of development on this site be on the sustainability of transportation locally wider over time; temporary / permanent effects?	Site would not be accessible to rail stations, but would be within walking distance of bus services. Narrow lane providing access to the site is less suitable for larger vehicles. Cycle routes and public footpaths can be accessed from the site. Site would be unlikely to cause an unacceptable impact on the local road network.	Site would not be accessible to rail stations, but would be within walking distance of bus services. Narrow lane providing access to the site is less suitable for larger vehicles. Cycle routes and public footpaths can be accessed from the site. Site would be unlikely to cause an impact on the local road network.	Site within walking distance of bus services but few other facilities. Small site should not generate significant traffic.	Providing the site were not too large, it should not place undue pressures on local road and bus services. However, access to the site needs to be considered.	Access to the site would need to be improved. Impact on nearby properties could be significant at times, but could possibly be controlled by means of conditions.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>						
76	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, have an adverse impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area?	Site will impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, given the site is already partly developed, further impact on the character of the area should be minimal. As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	Site will impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, given the site is already partly developed, further impact on the character of the area should be minimal. As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	Development of the site would have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. As the site already exists, although unauthorised, this impact can already be seen. As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	The site is currently occupied by derelict greenhouses and is 'hidden' from the main road by its location to the rear of surrounding residential properties. However, these properties would overlook such a potential Traveller site. As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	Development of the site would have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.
77	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote social cohesion or inclusion in nearby communities?	If site is kept relatively small, it should not dominate the settled community.	If site is kept relatively small, it should not dominate the settled community.	This is a small site sufficiently far from any settled community to avoid issues of the site dominating the community.	The site is likely to cause issues with settled community due to its abutting several residential and other properties on Hoole Lane.	The site is physically separated from predominantly residential areas, although there is one residential property approximately 100m from the site.
78	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote the economic potential of the area?	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Travelling Showpeople site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area, although it is noted that neighbouring occupiers of industrial units have objected to the principle of this site being used as a Travelling Showpeople site.

Q	Site Name	6. Land west of the Quays, Burscough	7. Land west of Tollgate Road, Burscough	8. Pool Hey Caravan Park, Scarisbrick	9. High Brow Farm, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	10. Land at 1-3 Southport Road, Kew, Scarisbrick
1	Other site references / SHLAA site reference?	SHLAA BU.19	No	No	SHLAA SR.37	SHLAA SR.13
2	Site Address	Land west of the Quays, Burscough	Land west of Tollgate Road, Burscough	Pool Hey Caravan Park, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	High Brown Farm, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	Land at 1-3 Southport Road, Scarisbrick
3	Post Code	L40	L40	L40	PR8	PR8
4	OS Grid Ref - E	344132	342947	337243	336461	336167
5	OS Grid Ref - North	412084	411302	415623	415280	415402
6	Site Area (ha)	0.83	1.85	0.33	1.28	2.70
7	Description of Site	Site is adjacent the Leeds Liverpool Canal and located in the centre of Burscough, to the rear of residential properties. Site is opposite Priory High School. The site is currently an authorised Travelling Showpeople site. WLBC are unaware of any issues between the site occupants and the local settled community.	Site has a gated access with some hardstanding. Majority of site is Green Belt and belongs to the former airfield site. Site is currently open with just a low hedge on the road boundary.	Site is a narrow strip of land adjacent the railway line and beside a level crossing. The site contains hardstanding and some buildings, including a park home.	Site is a former poultry farm containing derelict buildings and hardstanding. The site is adjacent to a former agricultural building (poultry shed) that, judging by appearance, may have roofing that contains asbestos. If the site were to be proposed for allocation, this would need to be subject to further careful investigation.	Vacant site on the edge of Southport comprising overgrown hardstanding and some scrub.
8	Description of Surrounding Area	Site is located in the centre of Burscough, adjacent the Leeds Liverpool canal and to the rear of residential properties and opposite a high school.	Site lies between the two industrial estates at Tollgate and Ringtail. Eastern part of site is bordered by Tollgate Road. The site is close to the edge of the Yew Tree Farm Strategic Development Site. The site is adjacent to an industrial area, although this tends to be light industrial uses. Some existing properties on Lordsgate Lane nearby are less than 50m from similar industrial uses.	Site is adjacent to Southport - Manchester railway line, and beside a level crossing. These should not have any greater impact on residents of the site than on other existing residential uses in the locality close to the railway line. Surrounding areas on Green Belt, farmed agricultural land.	Site is bordered by residential properties to the south and west. Open Green Belt land lies to the north and east.	The site is bordered by Kew Retail Park to the north west, the A570 to the south east and residential properties to the south. To the north lies open Green Belt land. The site is directly adjacent to one residential property. A watercourse runs on the north western boundary of the site.
9	Brief Site History	Current, authorised use as Travelling Showpeople site.	No site history of relevance.	Site has in use as a Traveller site for almost 20 years. Permission for one 'park home' tied to an individual; this permission has now expired. Current use unauthorised but long-established.	Site has been subject to enforcement action in the past due to occupation by Travellers.	Site has had planning permission for a DIY store (Wickes), allowed on appeal, which has never been implemented. Previous permission was granted consent in 2001 for erection of a sports, leisure and fitness building. Again, this was never implemented. Site has recently been sold.
10	Relevant planning history	1997/0536 - erection of Dutch barn for storage of fairground vans /equipment and layout of hardstanding.	1997/0345 - use of land for car boot sales (withdrawn)	1999/0106, 1993/0238, 1996/0596 - siting of 6 permanent caravans (Refused), 1999/0755, 2004/0551 - siting of 5 residential caravans for 1 Gypsy family (refused)	No p/p in relation to Gypsy/Traveller uses. 1993/0214, 2007/1350/FUL.	2004/0023, 2001/0289
11	Land Ownership Details	Owned by Travelling Showpeople	Private	Owned by Travellers	Private	Private
12	Source of Site Suggestion	Authorised site, owned by Travelling Showpeople	Suggested by Travelling Showpeople	Call for Sites; existing site	Site with previous Traveller activity, subject to enforcement action.	Site with previous Traveller activity, subject to enforcement action.
13	Date of Appraisal	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)
<b>Deliverability Issues</b>						
14	Are there any issues of land ownership that could prevent development on the site being delivered?	No. Site owned by Travelling Showpeople and in authorised use.	Yes - owner indicated in 2014 that the site is no longer available for consideration as a Traveller site.	No.	Site was available for sale in 2013, but has since been sold and is no longer available for sale.	Yes - owner indicated in 2015 that the site is no longer available for consideration as a Traveller site.
15	Is the site potentially available for development?	Yes. Although availability limited to a particular group or family.	No	Yes.	No	No
16	Does the planning history of the site caution against its allocation?	Land has planning permission.	Site is within the Green Belt.	Site is within the Green Belt. Previous applications for siting of multiple Gypsy caravans have been refused.	Site has been subject to enforcement action in the past due to occupation by Travellers. No planning permission has been sought.	No planning history specific to Traveller uses.

Q	Site Name	6. Land west of the Quays, Burscough	7. Land west of Tollgate Road, Burscough	8. Pool Hey Caravan Park, Scarisbrick	9. High Brow Farm, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	10. Land at 1-3 Southport Road, Kew, Scarisbrick
17	Potential land use conflicts with nearby sites that could prevent development?	Site involves storage and manoeuvring of large vehicles, although it has operated adjacent to flatted development for a number of years. Site is subject to an open space designation and is adjacent to the Leeds Liverpool Canal (wildlife corridor designation), but site is already authorised as a Travelling Showpeople site.	Allocating the site as a Travelling Showpeople site would mean an incursion into a "new" area of Green Belt, and particularly good and robust boundary treatment would be necessary. Given the green, open nature of the site, landscaping rather than fencing would be more appropriate, but this obviously takes longer to be established.	Site is adjacent to railway line. These should not have any greater impact on site residents than on other existing residential uses close to the railway line. Site has existed over 20 years without issues relating to nearby level crossing. Officers unaware of any significant issues arising from the site's use as a Traveller site. Site is physically separate (field / road) from the nearest residential properties.	The site is directly adjacent to a row of bungalows. It is unlikely that peaceful and integrated co-existence could be achieved between the two uses. No industrial processes, etc. are situated adjacent or close to the site. The closest part of Southport landfill site is approximately 500m from the site, but other residential properties are closer to the landfill site than this site is.	Site is directly adjacent to one residential property and a retail development, which may create issues between the integration of this site with the settled community. Site is close 200m (as the crow flies) to waste disposal centre, with a landfill site beyond, although it is separated by a watercourse and retail units. Mitigation by way of appropriate screening should be possible.
18	Is the site directly accessible from the highway network or could it reasonably become so?	Site is close to A59 but accessed via a narrow road between the site and the A59. Nevertheless, the site has functioned as a Travelling Showpeople site for several years using the existing access.	Site has direct access onto the "spine road" through the Burscough Industrial Estate.	This lane has accommodated typical Traveller traffic for 20 years, although access to the site along Pool Hey Lane requires using a narrow stretch of road and thus is not an ideal access road to a Traveller site. However, it appears to have functioned as such since 1994 without significant issues.	Site is on a stretch of Pool Hey Lane used by commercial traffic (Kershaws), and is reasonably close to A570.	Site is adjacent to A570 with its bus services direct to Southport and Ormskirk centres. Site is within easy walking distance of supermarket and other shops. Other services are easy to access via public transport.
19	Any known land contamination or remediation issues?	None known	None known	None known	None known	None known
20	Any known ground instability?	None known	None known	None known	None known	There is evidence of land stability issues in the immediate area. Site is directly adjacent to a watercourse.
21	Can adequate provision be made to supply all major utilities?	Yes. Site currently in use.	Site is currently undeveloped, but provision of services should be straightforward given neighbouring industrial areas.	Yes. Site in use already.	Given the proximity to residential and commercial properties on Pool Hey Lane, and the fact the site has been used in the past, it is assumed that provision of utilities and drainage should be achievable.	Site does not currently appear to have these services, but given its location adjacent to development, these services should be straightforward to provide.
22	Is the site within Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b)?	No	No	No.	Site is wholly within Flood Zone 2; parts of the site are less than 50m from Flood Zone 3.	The part of the site fronting the A570 is not in Flood Zone 2; south-eastern part of the site is in Flood Zone 2.
23	Is the site within the Green Belt?	No	Yes	Yes.	Yes - Site abuts the Brown Edge settlement area.	Front part of the site is within Brown Edge settlement area; rear of site is within Green Belt.
24	Would development of the site affect any flight paths?	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site
25	Is there interest in site for development?	Yes. Site currently in authorised use.	Unknown	Site is in hands of Travellers and in use as a Traveller site.	Not for Traveller accommodation.	No; owners intend to develop the site for [bricks and mortar] housing, and would not sell the site as a Traveller site.
<b>Biodiversity</b>						
26	Within 5km of and / or likely to impact on internationally designated sites?	Yes, however is unlikely to impact on biodiversity sites.	Yes. May have an impact on biodiversity if site is a feeding ground for birds.	No	No	No
27	Within 1km of and / or likely to impact on a SSSI?	No	No	No	No	No
28	Within 100m of designated local nature conservation sites?	Site is adjacent to the wildlife corridor (canal), but is an already authorised site.	No	Yes, but the use of this site as a Traveller site should not have any detrimental impact.	No	No
29	Protected species and / or habitats?	No	No	No	No	No
30	Within 100m of woodlands, or trees with Tree Preservation Orders?	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
31	Effects on the sustainability of biodiversity, locally & wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have an impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have a significant impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have a significant impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have a significant impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have a significant impact on local, or international, biodiversity.
<b>Water and Land Resources</b>						
32	Is the site subject to any known stability issues?	None known	None known	None known	Potentially. There appear to have been some land stability issues on Scarisbrick New Road nearby; further investigation would be required.	None known

Q	Site Name	6. Land west of the Quays, Burscough	7. Land west of Tollgate Road, Burscough	8. Pool Hey Caravan Park, Scarisbrick	9. High Brow Farm, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	10. Land at 1-3 Southport Road, Kew, Scarisbrick
33	Geological or geomorphological importance?	No	No	No	No	No
34	Does the site have any adverse gradients on it?	No	No	No	No	No
35	Best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a)?	No, urban land.	Grade 2	Site falls within Grade 1 designation, although site is not used for farming.	Site falls within Grade 1 designation	Site falls within Grade 1 designation, although is not actively farmed land. Site contains hardstanding and has been previously developed.
36	Active mineral working site?	No	No	No	No	No
37	Contaminated or derelict land?	No	No	No	Yes. Derelict land/farm buildings.	Yes, derelict land - areas of hardstanding.
38	Previously developed land (brownfield)?	Site is developed and in use.	Small amount of hardstanding on site, but no permanent buildings.	Part; site in use as an (unauthorised) caravan park	Yes. Derelict land / farm buildings.	Yes.
39	Effects on the sustainability of land resources locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Allocation of site would not create any detrimental effects on land resources.	Allocating the site as a Travelling Showpeople site would mean an incursion into a "new" area of Green Belt; land does not appear to be in agricultural use.	Allocation of site would not create any detrimental effects on land resources.	Site is on Grade 1 agricultural land although site is not in active use for farming, containing hardstanding and buildings. Site would be unlikely to have a detrimental effect on land resources.	Site is brownfield, containing hardstanding. Site would be unlikely to have a detrimental effect on land resources.
40	Within or adjacent to a Principal Aquifer or Source Protection Zone 1 or 2?	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
41	Effects on the sustainability of water quality and resources locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.
<b>Climatic factors and flooding</b>						
42	Is the site within Zones 2 or 3 of the floodplain?	No	No	No	Site is wholly within Flood Zone 2; parts of the site are less than 50m from Flood Zone 3.	The part of the site fronting the A570 is not in Flood Zone 2; south-eastern part of the site is in Flood Zone 2.
43	Effects on the sustainability of climatic factors and flooding locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Site would be located in an area of flood risk.	Part of the site would be located in an area of flood risk.
<b>Heritage and Landscape</b>						
44	Within or within 5km of and / or likely to impact on an AONB or Heritage Coast?	No	No	No	No	No
45	Within or within 1km of any area designated for its local landscape importance or is it likely to have adverse impacts on the landscape?	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site.	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site. Openness of the site in the surrounding landscape means that screening would be required.	Site lies within an Area of Landscape History of County Importance, and is directly adjacent to the Martin Mere Mosslands Biological Heritage Site.	The site is directly adjacent to an Area of Landscape History of County Importance.	No - Site is just over 100m from the edge of an area designated as Area of Landscape History of County Importance.
46	Is the site in the Green Belt? If so, would development on this site cause harm to the objectives of Green Belt designation?	No	Yes. Site would also result in weaker GB boundaries, or the need to redefine boundaries.	Yes	Yes. Part in GB.	Front part of the site is within Brown Edge settlement area; rear of site is within Green Belt.
47	Within 250m of a site or building with a nationally recognized heritage designation?	Yes	No	No	No	No

Q	Site Name	6. Land west of the Quays, Burscough	7. Land west of Tollgate Road, Burscough	8. Pool Hey Caravan Park, Scarisbrick	9. High Brow Farm, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	10. Land at 1-3 Southport Road, Kew, Scarisbrick
48	Effects on the sustainability of heritage and landscape locally and in the wider Borough and sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Site is already authorised and so would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage and landscape. Any issues could be mitigated through screening.	Site would be likely to have an impact on the openness of Green Belt and require new Green Belt boundaries to be redefined as the allocation of the site would encroach.	The site is largely screened on the south western side by the railway, and on the north eastern side by hedging; the front is screened by substantial wooden gates. Any issues could be mitigated through further screening.	Development of this site would impact upon the local landscape, especially views from neighbouring properties, although their current view is somewhat interrupted by derelict poultry sheds. Fencing or screening between the site and the currently open countryside to the North east would have a visual impact and could affect an area of landscape history importance. No effect on heritage.	Site would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage. The north western boundary has trees / bushes. Land at the back of the site is overgrown / scrubland. Introduction of visual screening at the back of the site should not lead to an unacceptable visual impact on the site's surroundings.
	<b>Social equality and community services</b>					
49	Will development of the site harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses)?	Site is less than 100m from Burscough Centre and its facilities, approx. 200m from bus stops and 500m from Burscough Bridge Station. Site is within walking distance of most services and facilities. WLBC is unaware of any evidence that the existing site is harming and nearby sensitive community receptors.	The use of this site as a Travelling Showpeople yard should not place undue [extra] pressure on local roads or services, assuming its occupants relocate from elsewhere in Burscough.	The Council is unaware of this site's occupation over recent years harming any nearby sensitive community receptors.	It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses). There are no such receptors nearby, apart from the Crematorium, but there is no reason this should be harmed were the site to be occupied.	It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses).
50	How close [how many minutes walk at 5km/h average walking speed] is this site to a public transport facility (bus stop / station on regular route)? (Please note that this walking time is taken into account in the questions below referring to X minutes public transport journey from various facilities.)	230m (3 minutes walk) from bus stops; 500m (6 minutes walk from Burscough Bridge Station).	Site is 850m (10 minutes walk) from bus stops on A59.	Site is 1.2km (15 minutes walk) from bus stops on A570.	Site is 350m (4 minutes walk) from bus stops on A570.	Site is within 100m of bus stops on A570.
51	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a Primary School?	Yes	Yes	Yes (Kew)	Yes	Yes
52	Is the site within 40 minutes public transport journey of a Secondary School?	Yes	Yes	Yes (Kew)	Yes	Yes
53	Is the site within 60 minutes public transport journey of a Further Education Institution?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
54	Is the site within 60 minutes public transport journey of a Hospital?	Yes - at Ormskirk (although would involve a walk or a second bus journey from Ormskirk Centre)	Yes - at Ormskirk (although would involve a walk or a second bus journey from Ormskirk Centre)	Yes	Yes	Yes
55	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a GP Practice?	Yes	Yes	GP practice at Ormskirk may be reachable in 30 minutes, depending on traffic. New GP practice being developed at Kew, which is comfortably within 30 minute public transport travel time.	Yes	Yes
56	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a Major Centre?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
57	Is the site within 10 minutes walk (800m) of a district or local centre?	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
58	Is the site within 15 minutes walk (1200m) of a Public Open Space of at least 5ha in size?	No	Yes (Abbey Lane)	No	No	No
59	Is the site within 10 minutes walk (800m) of a natural green space (e.g. Local Nature Reserve) of at least 2ha in size?	No	No	No	No	No
60	Is the site within 40 minutes public transport journey of a Leisure / Recreation / Sports Facility?	Yes - Leisure Centre, Burscough	Yes - Leisure Centre, Burscough	Yes - facilities in Ormskirk / Southport	Yes - facilities in Ormskirk / Southport	Yes - facilities in Southport

Q	Site Name	6. Land west of the Quays, Burscough	7. Land west of Tollgate Road, Burscough	8. Pool Hey Caravan Park, Scarisbrick	9. High Brow Farm, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	10. Land at 1-3 Southport Road, Kew, Scarisbrick
61	What could the effects of development on this site be on the sustainability of community health and equality, leisure and education locally and wider over time ; temporary / permanent effects?	Site is located in the centre of Burscough and so within good accessible distance of services and facilities.	Site is within reasonable accessible distance of services and facilities if occupants had access to motorised vehicles. Given its size, its development should not have any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.	Site has poor accessibility to community and social facilities, particularly if accessed by foot. There is no evidence of this longstanding site having any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.	Site is within reasonable accessible distance of services and facilities. Given the site's size, its development should not have any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.	Site is within reasonable accessible distance of services and facilities. Given the site's size, its development should not have any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.
<b>Local economy and employment</b>						
62	Is the site within 250m of any sensitive commercial receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. sensitive business uses and tourist / visitor attractions)?	No	No	No	No	No
63	Effects on the sustainability of the local economy and employment locally / Borough / sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)
<b>Housing</b>						
64	Is the site within 250m of residential dwellings (including individual houses)?	Yes. Residential properties lie immediately east of the site.	No. Some existing properties on Lordsgate Lane nearby are less than 50m from similar industrial uses.	Some existing residential properties are within 250m of the site.	Yes. Site's proximity to residential properties is likely to lead to difficulties in ensuring peaceful co-existence between the settled and travelling community.	Yes. One property directly adjacent to site.
65	Effects on the sustainability of housing provision locally / Borough / sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible
<b>Transportation and air quality</b>						
66	In or adjacent to an existing Air Quality Management Area?	No	No	No.	No	No
67	Are there any sensitive receptors nearby (e.g. residential, community facilities) that may be impacted by dust, fumes and emissions caused by the development and end-use of the site?	No. Residential and community facilities are nearby, as well as a school. However site is already in use and so further impacts would be unlikely.	Site may be impacted by noise and traffic from the adjacent industrial estates.	No. Site is already in use (although unauthorised) so few impacts would be expected.	No	No
68	Effects on the sustainability of air quality locally and in the wider Borough and sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality
69	How suitable is the road network to accommodate expected levels of traffic to and from the site?	WLBC is unaware of any evidence that the existing site is placing undue pressure on local infrastructure, services and roads. Site is close to A59 but accessed via a narrow road between the site and the A59. The site has functioned as a Travelling Showpeople site for several years using the existing access.	Site under consideration as a Travelling Showpeople site; this involves storage and manoeuvring of large vehicles. Site lies on Tollgate Road, the "spine" road for the industrial estate, and thus appears suitable to accommodate the use of the site for Travelling Showpeople.	This lane has accommodated typical Traveller traffic for a number of years, but Pool Hey Lane includes a narrow stretch of road with a passing place and is not an ideal access road to a Traveller site.	The site is close to the A570. Access would involve using a 250m stretch of Pool Hey Lane which is an unclassified residential road. However, commercial vehicles associated with the Kershaw's Foods business, as well as farm traffic, use this part of Pool Hey Lane.	Site is directly off the A570 so has good access to the site and local road networks.
70	Would traffic from the site onto Primary Road Network cause adverse impacts on amenity of sensitive receptors on the route (residential, schools etc.)?	No; site already in use as a Traveller site.	Unlikely due to the location of the site meaning that such amenities need not be passed by traffic travelling from the site to the primary road network.	This lane has accommodated typical Traveller traffic for a number of years. No evidence of unacceptable impact of traffic from site on the amenity of sensitive receptors.	Traffic to the site would be unlikely to create any significant further impacts, other than that which exists currently from farm / commercial / other traffic using Pool Hey Lane.	No; site has direct access onto primary road network.
71	Is the site within 800m of an existing or proposed Cycle Route?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

Q	Site Name	6. Land west of the Quays, Burscough	7. Land west of Tollgate Road, Burscough	8. Pool Hey Caravan Park, Scarisbrick	9. High Brow Farm, Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick	10. Land at 1-3 Southport Road, Kew, Scarisbrick
72	Is the site within 800m of a bus stop for a high frequency bus service?	Yes	Site is 850m (10 minutes walk) from bus stops on A59.	No	Yes	Yes
73	Is the site within 1200m of a Rail Station?	Yes	No	No	No	No
74	Does the site have public footpaths, rights of way or any other type of footpath on it or near to it?	No	No	No	No	No
75	What could the effects of development on this site be on the sustainability of transportation locally / wider over time; temporary / permanent effects?	Site already in existence and in a sustainable location.	Site can be accessed from the road network, although may not be that accessible by public transport. Site would not have detrimental impacts on the road network. Good location and site access.	This lane has accommodated typical Traveller traffic for a number of years, but Pool Hey Lane includes a narrow stretch of road with a passing place and is not an ideal access road to a Traveller site.	The site is close to the A570 and public transport services. Access would involve using a 250m stretch of Pool Hey Lane which is an unclassified residential road, but used by commercial vehicles. Site traffic unlikely to create any significant further impacts.	Site is sustainable in terms of road transport links and accessibility to bus services.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>						
76	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, have an adverse impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area?	Longstanding authorised site.	Site would have an impact on the openness of Green Belt and require new Green Belt boundaries to be redefined as the allocation of the site would encroach. As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	Longstanding site, although unauthorised. As with any Traveller site, its allocation will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area	As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.
77	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote social cohesion or inclusion in nearby communities?	Longstanding site, already used and authorised as a Travelling Showpeople site. WLBC is unaware of any issues between the site occupants and the local settled community.	The site is separated from the settled community by (currently) undeveloped countryside and / or industrial development.	Generally well screened site over 700m from the nearest residential area (although there are two properties close to the site). Site has been occupied by Travellers since the 1990s and the Council has no evidence of issues between the occupants of the site and the local settled community.	Site's proximity to residential properties is likely to lead to difficulties in ensuring peaceful co-existence between the settled and travelling community.	Site's proximity to residential properties may lead to difficulties in ensuring peaceful co-existence between the settled and travelling community.
78	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote the economic potential of the area?	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Travelling Showpeople site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area (the storage of fairground equipment, typically on trailers, is not out of keeping with the general industrial nature of the adjacent employment area).	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.



Q	Site Name	11. Land to the rear of 281 Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick	12. Land at Southport New Road, Mere Brow	13. White Moss Road South (A), Skelmersdale	14. White Moss Road South (B), Skelmersdale	15. White Moss Road South (C), Skelmersdale
1	Other site references / SHLAA site reference?	No	SHLAA TA.26 (not whole site)	No	No	No
2	Site Address	Land rear of 281 Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick	Former LCC depot, Southport New Road, Mere Brow	White Moss Road South (A), Skelmersdale	White Moss Road South (B), Skelmersdale	White Moss Road South (C), Skelmersdale
3	Post Code	L40 8HL		WN8	WN8	WN8
4	OS Grid Ref - E	340384	341715	347632	346489	346332
5	OS Grid Ref - North	411675	418986	405134	405299	405190
6	Site Area (ha)	1.01	3.26	0.81	0.92	2.75
7	Description of Site	Site lies to the rear of a number of residential properties within a semi-rural area.	Site is triangular in shape, the 'eastern apex' of the triangle being a former depot, with a number of derelict buildings, hardstanding and a row of trees forming a robust 'inner western boundary'. Beyond this 'inner western boundary' is an open area in agricultural use, in separate ownership. 'Tarleton Runner' watercourse runs along the Northern perimeter of the site.	Site is a former Highways Agency depot, no longer in use and derelict, with buildings and hardstanding.	Site is in the hands of Travellers. Land is Green Belt / agricultural land which is unkempt. Deposits of hardcore and concrete appear to have been dumped on the site.	Site is currently open Green Belt, enclosed by a small fence, hedgerows and trees. Sites runs adjacent to the M58 and Liverpool Road South. Site is adjacent to White Moss Road South (B) site.
8	Description of Surrounding Area	Site lies to the rear of a number of residential properties within a semi-rural area. There are a number of commercial properties nearby. The surrounding area is open Green Belt / agricultural land.	To the south of the site lies Southport New Road (A565), beyond which is the small residential settlement of Mere Brow. To the Northern part of the site is open flat Green Belt, agricultural land with some residential properties nearby to the site.	Site is surrounded by land designated as Green Belt. To the North east of the site there is a narrow access road (White Moss Road South) and beyond that the M58 motorway. J4 of the M58 is to the east of the site. To the south / south east is an office business park.	Site is adjacent to the M58 (North) and White Moss Road South (south). To the east of the site lies Green Belt and agricultural land. A (hazardous) waste site is nearby. There is one residential property approximately 300m along White Moss Road South; residential properties on White Moss Road are closer as the crow flies, and whilst separated by the M58, there is a footbridge close to the site.	Site is currently open Green Belt, enclosed by a small fence, hedgerows and trees. Sites runs adjacent to the M58 and Liverpool Road South. Site is adjacent to White Moss Road South (B) site.
9	Brief Site History	Garden / land behind dwelling; no relevant site history.	Former LCC highways depot, but since sold off.	Site is a former Highways Agency depot, no longer in use and now vacant, with buildings and hardstanding.	Site owned by Travellers 2013, but has since changed. Submitted as a potential Traveller site in 2015 Call for Sites.	None
10	Relevant planning history	No planning history relating to Gypsy/ Traveller use	Recent planning applications have been for change of use of site to home engineering contractors or to convert to motorcycle workshop and sales depot. No planning history directly related to Travellers.	2007/1381/FUL - Construction of garage to store winter maintenance plant (granted)	Application 2013/1040 for use of site for keeping horses granted December 2013 but not implemented.	None
11	Land Ownership Details	Private	Private	Private	Private	Private
12	Source of Site Suggestion	Submitted in Call for Sites 2013	Site identified by planning officers. The willingness of the owner of the eastern section of the site is unknown. The owners of the open, western section of the site have stated that they are not willing for this part of the site to be considered as a Traveller site.	Site suggested by a member of the Travelling Community.	Planning application for Traveller-related development.	Site identified by Council officers.
13	Date of Appraisal	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)
<b>Deliverability Issues</b>						
14	Are there any issues of land ownership that could prevent development on the site being delivered?	Yes - owner indicated in 2014 that the site is no longer available for consideration as a Traveller site.	The willingness of the owner of the eastern section of the site to sell as a Traveller site is unknown. The owner of the open, western section of the site has stated that they are not willing for this part of the site to be considered as a Traveller site.	Site owner has informed the Council that the site is not available for sale at present.	Site in the hands of Travellers.	Yes - owner indicated in 2014 that the site is no longer available for consideration as a Traveller site.
15	Is the site potentially available for development?	No	No / unlikely	No	Yes	No
16	Does the planning history of the site caution against its allocation?	No planning history specific to Traveller uses.	Recent planning applications have been for change of use of site to home engineering contractors or to convert to motorcycle workshop and sales depot. Most applications for change of use have been refused.	No planning history	Recent application for stables approved Dec 2013.	No planning history.

Q	Site Name	11. Land to the rear of 281 Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick	12. Land at Southport New Road, Mere Brow	13. White Moss Road South (A), Skelmersdale	14. White Moss Road South (B), Skelmersdale	15. White Moss Road South (C), Skelmersdale
17	Potential land use conflicts with nearby sites that could prevent development?	The only nearby use that could be considered to have negative impacts is a mushroom farm (150m away), but there are several residential properties as close, or closer, to this use.	Site is adjacent to the small settlement of Mere Brow, but is separated from residential properties by the A565 Dual Carriageway. This physical barrier may increase the possibility of peaceful co-existence, but not integrated co-existence. With the exception of power cables (although not high tension power lines) over the site, none of the stated uses are next or near to the site. Part of site at risk of flooding.	Site is nearby to the M58 (north) and a business park (South). Site is also in close proximity to a landfill (hazardous waste) - within 500m of the waste facility.	Site is Green Belt. Site is also in close proximity to a landfill (hazardous waste) and adjacent to the M58. High pressure gas pipelines running to the west of the site are considered Major Hazardous Installations by HSE, which rule out caravan development on a substantial proportion of the site.	Site is Green Belt. Site is also in close proximity to a landfill (hazardous waste) and adjacent to the M58. High pressure gas pipelines running below and to the west of the site are considered Major Hazardous Installations by HSE, which rule out caravan development on a substantial proportion of the site; pylons over part of site.
18	Is the site directly accessible from the highway network or could it reasonably become so?	Site is close to the B-classified Heaton's Bridge Road, although has less than ideal access onto Smithy Lane, especially for larger vehicles associated with Travellers. Access to the site would be directly beside a residential property (283 Heaton's Bridge Road)	Site lies directly on the A565; it has previously been used as a highways depot, so access has been used in the past, but may not be supported at present due to the need for vehicles to slow to almost a standstill on a 50mph stretch of dual carriageway.	Yes. Site is easily accessed from the M58 J4.	White Moss Road South is generally narrow and the surface is of sub-optimal quality. However, a significant stretch of the road is used by landfill HGVs.	White Moss Road South is generally narrow and the surface is of sub-optimal quality. However, a significant stretch of the road is used by landfill HGVs.
19	Any known land contamination or remediation issues?	None known	None known, although minor contamination may be present on account of site's previous use as a County Council depot.	No contamination known of, although minor contamination may be possible on account of site's previous use as a Highways Agency depot.	None known.	None known
20	Any known ground instability?	None known	None known	None known.	None known.	None known
21	Can adequate provision be made to supply all major utilities?	The site is within an area with several residential and a small number of commercial properties, and thus it is expected that there is adequate utility infrastructure provision in the area to also serve this site.	Presumably the previous depot had mains water and electricity; given the proximity to Mere Brow village, connection to these services should be feasible in future.	It is expected that these services exist as a result of the site's previous use, or if not, they should be readily achievable given the business park nearby.	The site does not currently have these utilities / drainage given its separation from other built development. It is unclear how easy it would be to provide mains water / electricity / drainage.	The site does not currently have these utilities / drainage given its separation from other built development. It is unclear how easy it would be to provide mains water / electricity / drainage.
22	Is the site within Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b)?	No	Land beside Tarleton Runner is in Flood Zones 2 (typically 20-25m from the watercourse) and 3 (typically 15-20m from the watercourse).	No	No.	No
23	Is the site within the Green Belt?	Yes.	Site is within the Green Belt, but adjacent to the Mere Brow settlement.	Yes - Site abuts the Non-Green Belt White Moss Business Park.	Yes	Yes
24	Would development of the site affect any flight paths?	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site
25	Is there interest in site for development?	Site submitted in "Call for Sites" as a potential Traveller site.	Unknown.	Unknown	Site submitted by owners in Call for Sites, but no evidence of it being marketed / sold for Traveller development.	None known
<b>Biodiversity</b>						
26	Within 5km of and / or likely to impact on internationally designated sites?	No	No	No	No	No
27	Within 1km of and / or likely to impact on a SSSI?	No	No	No	No	No
28	Within 100m of designated local nature conservation sites?	No	No	No	No	No
29	Protected species and / or habitats?	No	No	No	No	No
30	Within 100m of woodlands, or trees with Tree Preservation Orders?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
31	Effects on the sustainability of biodiversity, locally & wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have a significant impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have a significant impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have a significant impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Development of site may have an impact on biodiversity given the proximity of the M58 wildlife corridor. This impact is likely to be minor.	Site appears to be active farmland, and likely to support some biodiversity.
<b>Water and Land Resources</b>						
32	Is the site subject to any known stability issues?	None known	None known	None known	None known, although land may be undermined.	None known, although land may be undermined.

Q	Site Name	11. Land to the rear of 281 Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick	12. Land at Southport New Road, Mere Brow	13. White Moss Road South (A), Skelmersdale	14. White Moss Road South (B), Skelmersdale	15. White Moss Road South (C), Skelmersdale
33	Geological or geomorphological importance?	No	No	No	No	No
34	Does the site have any adverse gradients on it?	No	No	No	No	No
35	Best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a)?	Yes. Grade 1	Eastern part of site is brownfield. Western part of site is mix of grade 1 and grade 2 agricultural land.	Site is brownfield. Falls under Grade 1 classification	Yes. Grade 1, although not farmed	Yes, Grade 1 land, currently being farmed.
36	Active mineral working site?	No	No	No	No	No
37	Contaminated or derelict land?	No	Derelict buildings and hardstanding	Derelict buildings and hardstanding.	No.	No
38	Previously developed land (brownfield)?	No	Yes, former LCC depot.	Yes, former depot	No.	No
39	Effects on the sustainability of land resources locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	The use of this site for Traveller development would lead to the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land.	Development of the eastern part of the site would reuse brownfield derelict land. Development of the western part would impact on agricultural land and Green Belt.	Development of the site would re-use vacant land	Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and potential harm to the wildlife corridor.	Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and potential harm to the wildlife corridor.
40	Within or adjacent to a Principal Aquifer or Source Protection Zone 1 or 2?	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
41	Effects on the sustainability of water quality and resources locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, provided utilities were incorporated on the site. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site is adjacent to Tarleton Runner. Development would need to not contaminate or detrimentally affect the Runner.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources, given that utilities are presumed available on the site already. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.
<b>Climatic factors and flooding</b>						
42	Is the site within Zones 2 or 3 of the floodplain?	No	A substantial part of the site is within Flood Zone 2 / 3.	No	No	No
43	Effects on the sustainability of climatic factors and flooding locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Land beside Tarleton Runner is in Flood Zones 2 (typically 20-25m from the watercourse) and 3 (typically 15-20m from the watercourse). This would not preclude the use of a site as a Traveller site, but would require caravans to be located away from the Flood Risk area, decreasing the net developable area and the site capacity.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.
<b>Heritage and Landscape</b>						
44	Within or within 5km of and / or likely to impact on an AONB or Heritage Coast?	No	No	No	No	No
45	Within or within 1km of any area designated for its local landscape importance or is it likely to have adverse impacts on the landscape?	Site is within an Area of Landscape History of Local Importance.	No	No - No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site.	No - No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site, apart from M58 'wildlife corridor'.	No - No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site.
46	Is the site in the Green Belt? If so, would development on this site cause harm to the objectives of Green Belt designation?	Yes	Yes.	Yes, but previously developed site.	Yes. Development would have visual impact as well as affecting openness.	Yes. Development would have visual impact as well as affecting openness.
47	Within 250m of a site or building with a nationally recognized heritage designation?	Yes	No	No	No	No

Q	Site Name	11. Land to the rear of 281 Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick	12. Land at Southport New Road, Mere Brow	13. White Moss Road South (A), Skelmersdale	14. White Moss Road South (B), Skelmersdale	15. White Moss Road South (C), Skelmersdale
48	Effects on the sustainability of heritage and landscape locally and in the wider Borough and sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage. The site's development would have a local impact on landscape, especially for neighbouring properties.	Eastern part of site is screened partially by hedgerows. The site is mostly screened from the adjacent A565 by hedging. Vegetation along the Tarleton Runner watercourse screens the majority of the site from the east, and vegetation along the 'inner western boundary' screens the site from the west. Development of the western part of the site would have a much greater impact, but this part of the site is not being considered for development.	Site would be unlikely to have an impact on sustainability of heritage or landscape. Use of this site as a transit site should have no greater visual impact than the site's previous highways-related use. Site is surrounded by an existing security fence and is screened by a belt of (deciduous) trees from the neighbouring business park and motorway junction uses.	Site has no immediate neighbours. Site is reasonably screened (provided existing trees, etc. are retained), and the adjacent motorway already has significant visual and acoustic impact, so the impact of the site should be limited and can be mitigated.	Site is open and in agricultural use; its use as a Traveller site would have visual impact and lead to loss of Grade 1 agricultural land. Screening by appropriate planting possible in theory, but would take several years to become established. This rectangular site is currently open on its "long sides".
	<b>Social equality and community services</b>					
49	Will development of the site harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses)?	It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses). However, site is directly adjacent to a number of residential properties and would be likely to impact negatively upon these properties.	It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses).	It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses).	No. Site is detached from main residential areas of settled communities. It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses).	No. Site is detached from main residential areas of settled communities. It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses).
50	How close [how many minutes walk at 5km/h average walking speed] is this site to a public transport facility (bus stop / station on regular route)? (Please note that this walking time is taken into account in the questions below referring to X minutes public transport journey from various facilities.)	Site is within 150m (2 minutes walk) of bus stops on Heatons Bridge Road.	Site is within 550m (7 minutes walk) of bus stops on A565, and within 300m (4 minutes walk) of less frequent bus services on Mere Brow Lane.	Site is approximately 1000-1100m (13 minutes walk) from bus stops on Railway Road; this journey involves crossing a motorway junction.	650m / 750m (8 / 9 minutes walk) from bus stops; journey involves crossing M58 motorway via a footbridge.	700m / 800m (8 / 10 minutes walk from bus stops; journey involves crossing M58 motorway via a footbridge.
51	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a Primary School?	Yes (Scarisbrick)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (although this would entail a walk of more than 10 minutes to the nearest bus stop, as per the other criteria below).
52	Is the site within 40 minutes public transport journey of a Secondary School?	Yes (Ormskirk)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
53	Is the site within 60 minutes public transport journey of a Further Education Institution?	Yes	Yes (Southport)	Yes	Yes	Yes
54	Is the site within 60 minutes public transport journey of a Hospital?	Yes	Yes (change at Southport Lord Street)	Yes	Yes (change required, or a longer walk to 375 / 385 / 395 route)	Yes (change required, or a longer walk to 375 / 385 / 395 route)
55	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a GP Practice?	Yes (Ormskirk)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
56	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a Major Centre?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
57	Is the site within 10 minutes walk (800m) of a district or local centre?	No	No	No	No	No
58	Is the site within 15 minutes walk (1200m) of a Public Open Space of at least 5ha in size?	No	No	No	Yes (Blaguegate)	Yes (Blaguegate)
59	Is the site within 10 minutes walk (800m) of a natural green space (e.g. Local Nature Reserve) of at least 2ha in size?	No, although site is within easy reach of the Leeds Liverpool Canal.	No	No	No	No
60	Is the site within 40 minutes public transport journey of a Leisure / Recreation / Sports Facility?	Yes - facilities in Ormskirk / Southport	Yes - Banks Leisure Centre	Site is a short public transport journey from Skelmersdale Town Centre, where leisure facilities are planned, and to Blaguegate Lane football pitches.	Site is a short public transport journey from Skelmersdale Town Centre, where leisure facilities are planned, and to Blaguegate Lane football pitches.	Site is a short public transport journey from Skelmersdale Town Centre, where leisure facilities are planned, and to Blaguegate Lane football pitches.

Q	Site Name	11. Land to the rear of 281 Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick	12. Land at Southport New Road, Mere Brow	13. White Moss Road South (A), Skelmersdale	14. White Moss Road South (B), Skelmersdale	15. White Moss Road South (C), Skelmersdale
61	What could the effects of development on this site be on the sustainability of community health and equality, leisure and education locally and wider over time ; temporary / permanent effects?	Site is within reasonable accessible distance of services and facilities, or public transport to them. Given the site's size, its development should not have any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.	Site should not place undue pressure on community services, and as local services are limited it is likely site occupants will travel to access services in Banks or Tarleton.	Site is away from "typical residential" infrastructure and services. Given the site's size, its development should not have any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.	Site is away from "typical residential" infrastructure and services. Given the site's size, its development should not have any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.	Community services cannot be easily accessed by public transport or on foot. Given the site's size, its development should not have any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.
<b>Local economy and employment</b>						
62	Is the site within 250m of any sensitive commercial receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. sensitive business uses and tourist / visitor attractions)?	No	No	No	No	No
63	Effects on the sustainability of the local economy and employment locally / Borough / sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)
<b>Housing</b>						
64	Is the site within 250m of residential dwellings (including individual houses)?	Yes	Yes - Mere Brow settlement to the south, and nearby residential properties to the east and west Lane.	Not close to any residential properties, although some residential properties exist along Moss Lane.	There is just one residential property approximately 300m along White Moss Road South; residential properties on White Moss Road are closer as the crow flies; whilst separated by the M58, there is a footbridge close to the site.	There is a residential property approximately 400m along White Moss Road South; residential properties on White Moss Road are closer as the crow flies; whilst separated by the M58, there is a footbridge close to the site.
65	Effects on the sustainability of housing provision locally / Borough / sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible
<b>Transportation and air quality</b>						
66	In or adjacent to an existing Air Quality Management Area?	No	No	No	No	No
67	Are there any sensitive receptors nearby (e.g. residential, community facilities) that may be impacted by dust, fumes and emissions caused by the development and end-use of the site?	Site is directly adjacent to a number of residential properties.	No	No. Although the site may be impacted by noise and fumes from the M58, and is close to a hazardous waste site.	No, although the site may be impacted by noise and fumes from the M58, and is close to a hazardous waste site.	No. Although the site may be impacted by noise and fumes from the M58, overhead pylons, and is close to a hazardous waste site.
68	Effects on the sustainability of air quality locally and in the wider Borough and sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	None. Although the site may be impacted by Noise and fumes from the M58, and the waste site.	None, although the site may be impacted by noise and fumes from the M58, and the waste site.	None. Although the site may be impacted by noise and fumes from the M58, and the waste site.
69	How suitable is the road network to accommodate expected levels of traffic to and from the site?	Site is close to the B-classified Heaton's Bridge Road, although has less than ideal access onto Smithy Lane, especially for larger vehicles associated with Travellers. Access to the site would be directly beside a residential property (283 Heaton's Bridge Road).	Site lies directly on the A565 which would be able to accommodate any increased levels of traffic to/from the site, but access to the site directly from a dual carriageway is likely to be problematic, notwithstanding the previous depot use.	Site lies within easy reach of the M58 (J4) which could accommodate traffic.	White Moss Road South between the site and M58 junction 4 is narrow and of sub-optimal quality. However, a significant stretch of the road is used by landfill HGVs. Access to the motorway and elsewhere could be taken in the other direction (towards junction 3). The road is relatively quiet; it should thus be able to accommodate typical Traveller vehicles.	White Moss Road South between the site and M58 junction 4 is narrow and of sub-optimal quality. However, a significant stretch of the road is used by landfill HGVs. Access to the motorway and elsewhere could be taken in the other direction (towards junction 3). The road is relatively quiet; it should thus be able to accommodate typical Traveller vehicles.
70	Would traffic from the site onto Primary Road Network cause adverse impacts on amenity of sensitive receptors on the route (residential, schools etc.)?	Site is close to the B-classified Heaton's Bridge Road; access to this uses a short stretch of Smithy Lane, although this road is also used by commercial traffic and traffic accessing the nearby large Shaw Hall Caravan Park.	Site is directly on the A565 so would not cause adverse impacts	No; site very close to primary road network.	Traffic would pass a small number of residential properties on the way to the M58, but the increase in traffic levels over the traffic that already uses White Moss Road South should not be significant.	Traffic would pass a small number of residential properties on the way to the M58, but the increase in traffic levels over the traffic that already uses White Moss Road South should not be significant.
71	Is the site within 800m of an existing or proposed Cycle Route?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

Q	Site Name	11. Land to the rear of 281 Smithy Lane, Scarisbrick	12. Land at Southport New Road, Mere Brow	13. White Moss Road South (A), Skelmersdale	14. White Moss Road South (B), Skelmersdale	15. White Moss Road South (C), Skelmersdale
72	Is the site within 800m of a bus stop for a high frequency bus service?	Yes	Yes. Site is within 550m of bus stops on A565 (and within 300m of bus stop on Mere Brow Lane).	Site is just over 1km on foot from bus stops on Railway Road; this involves crossing a motorway junction. Access to facilities is thus likely to require private motorised transport.	Site is 650m / 750m from bus stops on Liverpool Road (using the footbridge over the M58).	Site is 700m / 800m from bus stops on Liverpool Road (using the footbridge over the M58).
73	Is the site within 1200m of a Rail Station?	No	No	No	No	No
74	Does the site have public footpaths, rights of way or any other type of footpath on it or near to it?	No	Yes on the site	No	Yes	Yes
75	What could the effects of development on this site be on the sustainability of transportation locally wider over time; temporary / permanent effects?	Site is close to the B-classified Heaton's Bridge Road with reasonable public transport links. Traffic would be unlikely to cause any additional adverse impacts than those already created by local traffic.	Site is a reasonably sustainable location, supported by bus stops on the A565 and in the Mere Brow settlement.	Site adjacent to a business area, but poor access to public transport, thus relatively unsustainable.	Site relatively unsustainable in location, although bus services can be reached on foot using footbridge over M58.	Site relatively unsustainable in location, although bus services can be reached on foot using footbridge over M58.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>						
76	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, have an adverse impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area?	As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	Site has been previously developed and is now derelict so development of the site would bring the site into reuse. Green Belt site, and as with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	Site has been previously developed and is already well screened. As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	Site is reasonably screened (provided existing trees, etc. are retained), and the adjacent motorway already has significant visual and acoustic impact, so the visual impact of the site should be limited. However, as with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.
77	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote social cohesion or inclusion in nearby communities?	If site is kept relatively small, it should not dominate the settled community as a whole, although impacts on a number of neighbouring properties are likely to be more significant.	Site is adjacent to the small settlement of Mere Brow, but is separated from residential properties by the A565 Dual Carriageway. This physical barrier may increase the possibility of peaceful co-existence, but not integrated co-existence.	Site is physically separate from the nearest settled communities.	Site is physically separate from the nearest settled communities.	Site is physically separate from the nearest settled communities.
78	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote the economic potential of the area?	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	There is a possibility that the use of this site as a Traveller site could impact negatively on the nearby business park.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.

Q	Site Name	16. Blackacre Lane, Ormskirk	17. Land south of Butchers Lane, Aughton	18. Land east of Brookfield Lane, Aughton	19. Land east of Middlewood Drive, Aughton	20. Bickerstaffe Colliery, Bickerstaffe
1	Other site references / SHLAA site reference?	No	SHLAA OA.053	SHLAA OA.054	SHLAA OA.061	SHLAA BK.01
2	Site Address	Land at Blackacre Lane, Ormskirk	Land south of Butchers Lane, Aughton	Land east of Brookfield Lane, Aughton	Land east of Middlewood Drive, Aughton	Land at Jubilee Wood, Bickerstaffe Colliery, Bickerstaffe
3	Post Code					
4	OS Grid Ref - E	341478	339897	339373	340444	345220
5	OS Grid Ref - North	410031	403288	403881	405319	404595
6	Site Area (ha)	1.68	0.76	6.74	11.36	2.82
7	Description of Site	Site is currently open Green Belt, enclosed by a small fence, hedgerows and trees. Site contains a number of trees.	Site is an open field, in Green Belt, that is located in between two residential properties. Butchers Lane runs along the northern perimeter of the site. To the south of the site is a small wooded area.	Site is agricultural land, in Green Belt. Site is located between Brookfield Lane (to the west) and the railway line (to the east). In addition, the site contains natural boundaries of trees and hedgerows.	Site is agricultural land, in Green Belt, located to the south of the Aughton residential area.	Site is a wooded area, off Junction 3 of the M58 and Rainford Road (A570). Whilst predominantly wooded, the site contains some disused mine shafts, and some hardstanding areas.
8	Description of Surrounding Area	Surrounding area is mainly Green Belt and agricultural land. There are a small number of residential properties nearby. The settlement of Ormskirk lies to the south.	The west of the site is a linear development of residential properties, with an additional residential property to the eastern side of the site. Further east, and to the North of the site is open Green Belt land used for agriculture. Ashworth Security Prison lies due south of the site, beyond the wooded area. A small watercourse lies to the south of the site also.	Scattered residential properties are located in proximity to the site (to the North, west and south). Railway line / embankment lies to the east of the site.	Residential properties are located to the North, east and west of the site.	To the north of the site is the M58, to the east the Rainford Bypass and some built development. To the west and south the site is adjacent to further woodland and agricultural land.
9	Brief Site History	-	-	-	-	1998/1090, 1994/0209 - both for a hotel and leisure development (approved but lapsed).
10	Relevant planning history	2013/0068/COU - retention of change of use from agricultural land to use of land for keeping of horses, and retention of stable block and portable horse shelters	None	None	None	1998/1090, 1994/0209 - hotel & leisure development (approved but never implemented). 2015/0067 County Matter - COU to storage and blending of soils, sand/minerals and composting plus building, parking, access. WLBC raised objection August 2015
11	Land Ownership Details	Owned by Travellers	Private	Private	Private	Private
12	Source of Site Suggestion	Site suggested in Call for Sites 2013	Owner	Owner	Owner	Site identified by Council officers.
13	Date of Appraisal	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)	16/12/2013 (updated 09/2015)
<b>Deliverability Issues</b>						
14	Are there any issues of land ownership that could prevent development on the site being delivered?	Owned by Travellers	No. Site is not in the hands of Travellers but the owner has expressed willingness for the site to be considered as a Traveller site.	No. Site is not in the hands of Travellers but the owner has expressed willingness for the site to be considered as a Traveller site.	Yes - owner indicated in 2015 that the site is no longer available for consideration as a Traveller site.	Yes - owner indicated in 2014 that the site is no longer available for consideration as a Traveller site.
15	Is the site potentially available for development?	Yes	Owner has expressed a willingness for the site to be considered.	Owner has expressed a willingness for the site to be considered.	No	No.
16	Does the planning history of the site caution against its allocation?	No. Planning permission for change of use for keeping horses has been granted.	No planning history.	No planning history	No planning history	No.

Q	Site Name	16. Blackacre Lane, Ormskirk	17. Land south of Butchers Lane, Aughton	18. Land east of Brookfield Lane, Aughton	19. Land east of Middlewood Drive, Aughton	20. Bickerstaffe Colliery, Bickerstaffe
17	Potential land use conflicts with nearby sites that could prevent development?	Site is physically separate from the built-up area of Ormskirk, although relatively close by (350m to the nearest housing). Provided the site were not large-scale, it should not dominate the settled community. Former sewage works nearby, but this use ceased several years ago and not considered to have any significant impact on the site.	Site is in a rural area but lies between a collection of residential properties in a linear development. Surrounding landscape is open Green Belt and agricultural land. Site is within 100m of Ashworth Hospital.	Site is in a rural area and in close proximity to existing residential properties. Site and the surrounding landscape is open Green Belt and agricultural land. Site is within 100m of railway embankment; this is not considered a constraint in terms of impact upon the residents of the site but the site is highly visible from the railway.	Site is adjacent to a significant number of residential properties; access to the site would be such that wherever it was taken from (all options involve using quiet residential streets), it would be likely to not promote peaceful and integrated co-existence.	Site is within 100m of M58 motorway, although screened by woodland. Cycle facility in adjacent woodland to the south, although it is considered that, with appropriate fencing, etc, this need not prevent the use of the northern part of the site as a Traveller site and vice versa.
18	Is the site directly accessible from the highway network or could it reasonably become so?	Blackacre Lane is a narrow lane (not much wider than single track) and not suitable for the larger vehicles typically associated with Travellers. Site lies on a bend on the lane, although at present has two gated accesses.	Site can be directly accessed from Butchers Lane. Whilst Butchers Lane is unclassified, it is wide enough to accommodate typical Traveller vehicles. The site is large enough for adequate access to be achieved.	Brookfield Lane is narrow and not ideal for typical Traveller vehicles.	Likely access would be Middlewood Road or Middlewood Drive, both narrow cul-de-sacs with significant on-street parking. Access by emergency vehicles would be likely to be difficult.	Site is accessible from A570 Rainford Bypass and close to M58, although access is not ideal (dual carriageway, less than 100m from motorway junction roundabout).
19	Any known land contamination or remediation issues?	None known	None known	None known	None known	No specific contamination known about, although site has been used as a colliery in the past.
20	Any known ground instability?	None known	None known	None known	None known	Site has disused mineshafts in places.
21	Can adequate provision be made to supply all major utilities?	Site does not currently appear to have these services. It is unclear whether they could easily be provided, but it is noted that the site is within 400m of the urban area of Ormskirk with its services / utilities.	Site does not currently have these services, but it is assumed that they can be provided given residential properties either side of the site.	Site does not currently have these services; there are some residential properties nearby, so it is assumed that services can be provided, although it is unclear how easy it would be to provide them.	Site has no known services, but it is probable these could readily be provided given the proximity to an urban area.	It is unclear how easy it would be to provide services, although it is noted that there are commercial and residential buildings within 100m of the site, so it is assumed that services exist in the vicinity of the site.
22	Is the site within Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b)?	No	Rear of site (about 15% of site) is within Flood Zone 2, by virtue of the adjacent watercourse.	No	No	No
23	Is the site within the Green Belt?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes. Green Belt adjacent to settlement area.	Yes
24	Would development of the site affect any flight paths?	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site	Site is within the consultation zone for Blackpool Airport Plan C and St Anne's Radar Technical Site
25	Is there interest in site for development?	Yes	Owner has expressed a willingness for the site to be developed for Travellers but no evidence of any actual interest in the site being purchased for possible Traveller use.	Owner has expressed a willingness for the site to be developed for Travellers but no evidence of any actual interest in the site being purchased for possible Traveller use.	None known of	None known of at present.
<b>Biodiversity</b>						
26	Within 5km of and / or likely to impact on internationally designated sites?	No	No	No	No	No
27	Within 1km of and / or likely to impact on a SSSI?	No	No	No	No	No
28	Within 100m of designated local nature conservation sites?	No	No	No	No	No
29	Protected species and / or habitats?	No	No	No	No	None known of at present.
30	Within 100m of woodlands, or trees with Tree Preservation Orders?	No	No	No	No	Yes
31	Effects on the sustainability of biodiversity, locally & wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have a significant impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site would be unlikely to have a significant impact on local, or international, biodiversity.	Site appears to be active farmland, and likely to support some biodiversity.	Site appears to be active farmland, and likely to support some biodiversity.	Potentially some adverse effects: if woodland needed to be removed to provide the site, then this could have an effect on biodiversity.
<b>Water and Land Resources</b>						
32	Is the site subject to any known stability issues?	None known	None known	None known	None known	Unknown. Site likely to have disused mineshafts in places.



Q	Site Name	16. Blackacre Lane, Ormskirk	17. Land south of Butchers Lane, Aughton	18. Land east of Brookfield Lane, Aughton	19. Land east of Middlewood Drive, Aughton	20. Bickerstaffe Colliery, Bickerstaffe
33	Geological or geomorphological importance?	No	No	No	No	No
34	Does the site have any adverse gradients on it?	No; short gentle slope towards road.	No - rear of site slopes gently towards a watercourse	No	No. site slopes gently in parts	Site slopes gently at access point, but majority of site does not slope to any great extent.
35	Best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a)?	Yes, Grade 1	Yes, Grade 1	Yes, Grade 1	Yes, Grade 1	Yes: officially classed as Grade 1 although the site is not agricultural land.
36	Active mineral working site?	No	No	No	No	No
37	Contaminated or derelict land?	No	No	No	No	Former colliery so there is a possibility of localised contamination
38	Previously developed land (brownfield)?	No	No	No	No	Yes: former colliery
39	Effects on the sustainability of land resources locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site is on Grade 1 agricultural land although site is not in active use for farming. Site would be unlikely to have a detrimental effect on land resources. Site is on the line of the proposed Ormskirk Bypass. Site subject to a financial "clawback" clause which could impact upon deliverability.	Site is on Grade 1 agricultural land although site is not in active use for farming. Site would be unlikely to have a detrimental effect on land resources.	Site is on Grade 1 agricultural land and actively farmed. Use of site would have an impact on land resources.	Site is on Grade 1 agricultural land and actively farmed. Use of site would have an impact on land resources.	Colliery is no longer mined and so redevelopment of the site for Traveller use would be unlikely to have any significant effects on land resources.
40	Within or adjacent to a Principal Aquifer or Source Protection Zone 1 or 2?	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
41	Effects on the sustainability of water quality and resources locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.	Site would be unlikely to detrimentally affect water quality and resources. As with any development, consideration would need to be given to managing waste water / surface water on the site.
<b>Climatic factors and flooding</b>						
42	Is the site within Zones 2 or 3 of the floodplain?	No	Rear of site (about 15% of site) is within Flood Zone 2, by virtue of the adjacent watercourse.	No	No	No
43	Effects on the sustainability of climatic factors and flooding locally / wider over time? Temporary or permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.	Site would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts on climate and flooding.
<b>Heritage and Landscape</b>						
44	Within or within 5km of and / or likely to impact on an AONB or Heritage Coast?	No	No	No	No	No
45	Within or within 1km of any area designated for its local landscape importance or is it likely to have adverse impacts on the landscape?	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site. Site is a metre or so higher than Blackacre Lane; there is no natural screening between the site and Blackacre Lane at present.	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site.	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site.	No historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation in vicinity of site.	Site is not subject to any historic environment, landscape or nature conservation designation.
46	Is the site in the Green Belt? If so, would development on this site cause harm to the objectives of Green Belt designation?	Yes. Development would have visual impact as well as affecting openness.	Yes. Development would have visual impact as well as affecting openness.	Yes. Development would have visual impact as well as affecting openness.	Yes. Development would have visual impact as well as affecting openness.	Yes. Development of site could be encroachment into the countryside.
47	Within 250m of a site or building with a nationally recognized heritage designation?	No	No	No	Yes	No

Q	Site Name	16. Blackacre Lane, Ormskirk	17. Land south of Butchers Lane, Aughton	18. Land east of Brookfield Lane, Aughton	19. Land east of Middlewood Drive, Aughton	20. Bickerstaffe Colliery, Bickerstaffe
48	Effects on the sustainability of heritage and landscape locally and in the wider Borough and sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage. The site's development would impact on the open countryside. Screening may help mitigate the visual impact of the site should development occur. There is no natural screening between the site and Blackacre Lane at present.	Site would be unlikely to have impacts on heritage. Screening may help mitigate the visual impact of the site should development occur. Site is located in a gap between residential properties.	Site is within open countryside. Whilst it is screened to an extent by existing trees / hedging, to achieve visual and acoustic privacy for the whole site would mean visual impact on this Green Belt area. The visual impact of the site from the adjacent railway embankment would be very difficult to mitigate in the short-medium term.	Site comprises open countryside on the edge of an urban area. Its development would have a significant impact on the local landscape.	Much of site is wooded, providing natural screening; development / use of the site (or part of the site) as a Traveller site may impact upon the woodland, although this could be mitigated through appropriate fencing / planning conditions.
	<b>Social equality and community services</b>					
49	Will development of the site harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses)?	Provided the site were not large-scale, it should not dominate the settled community. It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses).	It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses).	It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses).	It is not considered that development of the site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses).	It is not considered that development of site should harm any nearby sensitive community receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals and public / outdoor recreation uses), although concern has been expressed about the impact of the use of the site for Travellers on a new cycle route facility in the adjacent woodland.
50	How close [how many minutes walk at 5km/h average walking speed] is this site to a public transport facility (bus stop / station on regular route)? (Please note that this walking time is taken into account in the questions below referring to X minutes public transport journey from various facilities.)	600 - 650m (7-8 minutes walk) from bus stops on Grimshaw Lane.	1.8km (22 minutes walk) from bus stop on Springfield Road, Aughton.	1km (12 minutes walk) from bus stop on Springfield Road, Aughton	Site within walking distance of Town Green station (280m or 3 minutes walk at best - distance depends on access point).	Site is 450m (5-6 minutes walk) from bus stops on the A570, although walking to these bus stops entails crossing Junction 3 of the M58 (roundabout / under a flyover).
51	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a Primary School?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
52	Is the site within 40 minutes public transport journey of a Secondary School?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
53	Is the site within 60 minutes public transport journey of a Further Education Institution?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
54	Is the site within 60 minutes public transport journey of a Hospital?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
55	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a GP Practice?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
56	Is the site within 30 minutes public transport journey of a Major Centre?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
57	Is the site within 10 minutes walk (800m) of a district or local centre?	No	No	No	Yes	No
58	Is the site within 15 minutes walk (1200m) of a Public Open Space of at least 5ha in size?	No	No	No	Yes	No
59	Is the site within 10 minutes walk (800m) of a natural green space (e.g. Local Nature Reserve) of at least 2ha in size?	No	No	No	No	No
60	Is the site within 40 minutes public transport journey of a Leisure / Recreation / Sports Facility?	Yes - facilities in Ormskirk	Coronation Park / Park Pool probably reachable in 18 minutes public transport ride time from Springfield Road bus stop (22 minutes walk away).	Yes	Yes - site within reasonable distance of Town Green Station, from which leisure facilities at Ormskirk (or Liverpool) can be accessed.	Yes - via bus routes on A570.

Q	Site Name	16. Blackacre Lane, Ormskirk	17. Land south of Butchers Lane, Aughton	18. Land east of Brookfield Lane, Aughton	19. Land east of Middlewood Drive, Aughton	20. Bickerstaffe Colliery, Bickerstaffe
61	What could the effects of development on this site be on the sustainability of community health and equality, leisure and education locally and wider over time ; temporary / permanent effects?	Site should not place undue pressure on community services.	Site is not in a sustainable location from which to access community services.	Site is not in a sustainable location from which to access community services.	Site is within an accessible distance from services, but has poor access to/from the site.	Site is not in a sustainable location in terms of proximity to services, but is reasonably close to bus stops. Given the site's size, its development should not have any significant effect on the sustainability of community health, etc.
<b>Local economy and employment</b>						
62	Is the site within 250m of any sensitive commercial receptors, existing or proposed (e.g. sensitive business uses and tourist / visitor attractions)?	No	No	No	No	Restaurant close to the site (other side of A570).
63	Effects on the sustainability of the local economy and employment locally / Borough / sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)	Effects likely to be negligible. (Travellers are often self-employed, and thus unlikely either to utilise employment sites nearby, or to offer employment on their site to local residents.)
<b>Housing</b>						
64	Is the site within 250m of residential dwellings (including individual houses)?	Site is physically separate from the built-up area of Ormskirk, although relatively close by (350m to the nearest housing).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Small number of properties close to the site, but site is generally away from residential areas.
65	Effects on the sustainability of housing provision locally / Borough / sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible	Effects of the development of this site on the sustainability of housing provision locally are likely to be negligible
<b>Transportation and air quality</b>						
66	In or adjacent to an existing Air Quality Management Area?	No	No	No	No	No
67	Are there any sensitive receptors nearby (e.g. residential, community facilities) that may be impacted by dust, fumes and emissions caused by the development and end-use of the site?	No	No	No	No	No. Although the site may be impacted by noise and fumes from the M58. Other residential uses already exist alongside the M58 however.
68	Effects on the sustainability of air quality locally and in the wider Borough and sub-region over time? Temporary / permanent?	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality	Site would be unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on air quality, although the site itself may be impacted by noise and fumes from the M58. Other residential uses already exist alongside the M58 however.
69	How suitable is the road network to accommodate expected levels of traffic to and from the site?	Blackacre Lane is a narrow lane (not much wider than single track) and probably unsuitable for the larger vehicles typically associated with Travellers. Access from Ormskirk (A570 via Heskin Lane, or A59 via Grimshaw Lane) would be easier than access from Burscough (A59 / B5242 Pippin Street) as this would entail less distance along Blackacre Lane.	Whilst Butchers Lane is unclassified, it is wide enough to accommodate typical Traveller vehicles and should have capacity to cope with traffic associated with this site, were it to be allocated.	Brookfield Lane is narrow and not ideal for typical Traveller vehicles.	Likely access would be Middlewood Road or Middlewood Drive, both narrow cul-de-sacs with significant on-street parking. Extra through traffic likely to prove problematic.	Site is accessible from A570 Rainford Bypass and close to M58, both of which could take extra vehicles, although access to the site is not ideal (dual carriageway, less than 100m from motorway junction roundabout).
70	Would traffic from the site onto Primary Road Network cause adverse impacts on amenity of sensitive receptors on the route (residential, schools etc.)?	Traffic would pass residential properties on the way to the primary road network, but the increase in traffic levels for the overwhelming majority of these properties, over what already uses the local roads (Grimshaw Lane, etc.), should not be significant.	No; site would be small, and traffic generated by it would be unlikely to cause any significant adverse impact.	Possibly: Brookfield Lane is narrow and not suitable for typical Traveller vehicles.	Yes, given the narrow and "heavily parked" roads close to the site, one of which would need to be used for access.	No; site has direct access to primary road network.
71	Is the site within 800m of an existing or proposed Cycle Route?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cycle lanes exist on A570; cycle facility being developed in Jubilee Wood.

Q	Site Name	16. Blackacre Lane, Ormskirk	17. Land south of Butchers Lane, Aughton	18. Land east of Brookfield Lane, Aughton	19. Land east of Middlewood Drive, Aughton	20. Bickerstaffe Colliery, Bickerstaffe
72	Is the site within 800m of a bus stop for a high frequency bus service?	Site is 600-650m from nearest bus stops.	No. Site lies on a school bus route, but is over 1km from any "public" bus stop.	A "custom bus stop" exists adjacent to the site, but the nearest "mainstream" service to Ormskirk is over 1km from the site. Few local accessible services.	Site is close to Town Green Station (distance depends on access point) plus bus routes on Town Green Lane.	Site is 450m from bus stops on the A570, although walking to these bus stops entails crossing Junction 3 of the M58 (roundabout / under a flyover).
73	Is the site within 1200m of a Rail Station?	No	No	No	Yes	No
74	Does the site have public footpaths, rights of way or any other type of footpath on it or near to it?	Yes	No	Yes on the site	Yes on the site	Yes
75	What could the effects of development on this site be on the sustainability of transportation locally wider over time; temporary / permanent effects?	Road access to the site is not suitable for larger vehicles. Green Belt site, but within easy walking distance of public transport facilities; reasonably close to Ormskirk and its facilities.	Relatively unsustainable location, although access by road is reasonable.	Relatively unsustainable location.	Reasonably sustainable location, but access by motor vehicle likely to have adverse impact on nearby streets.	Site is accessible from A570 Rainford Bypass and close to M58, although access is not ideal. Within reasonable walking distance of public transport facilities, but involves crossing a motorway junction underpass.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>						
76	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, have an adverse impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area?	As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	Yes. Would affect the openness of the Green Belt. Site is within open countryside. As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	Development would affect the openness of the Green Belt. As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.	As with any Traveller site, its allocation or development will be likely to have an impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area.
77	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote social cohesion or inclusion in nearby communities?	Site is physically separate from the built-up area of Ormskirk, although relatively close by (350m to the nearest housing). Provided the site were not large-scale, it should not dominate the settled community.	Site's proximity to residential properties is likely to lead to difficulties in ensuring peaceful co-existence between the settled and travelling community.	Site is physically separate from the nearest settled communities. Site's location near a number of residential properties may lead to difficulties in ensuring peaceful co-existence between the settled and travelling community.	Site's proximity to residential properties is likely to lead to difficulties in ensuring peaceful co-existence between the settled and travelling community.	Site is generally separate from settled community and is well screened by trees.
78	Will locating a new development on this site, including in conjunction with other existing and proposed development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote the economic potential of the area?	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.	The overall impact of this site being allocated as a Traveller site is unlikely to have any significant impact on the economic potential of the area.