

APPENDIX 1 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OBJECTIVES AND SUB-CRITERIA

POPULATION, HEALTH AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

Objective 1: To cater for the needs of an ageing population.

Objective 2: To reduce Borough-wide inequalities with regard to learning, skills, educational attainment, and employability.

Objective 3: To improve health and well-being and reduce inequalities

- Will the plan / policy facilitate the provision of accommodation suitable for (designed or adaptable for) the elderly?
- Will the plan / policy facilitate the provision of infrastructure / services for the elderly?
- Will the plan / policy make it easier for the elderly to find appropriate employment or activities in which to participate?
- Will the plan / policy increase the levels of participation and attainment in education?
- Will the plan / policy address skills gaps and enable skills progression?
- Will the plan / policy help develop the Borough's knowledge base?
- Will the plan / policy improve people's chances of success in applying for jobs?
- Will the plan / policy improve economic, environmental and social conditions (quality of life) in deprived areas and for deprived groups?
- Will the plan / policy reduce isolation in the community?
- Will the plan / policy reduce levels of crime and / or the fear of crime?
- Will the plan / policy reduce health inequalities?
- Will the plan / policy provide opportunities to protect or enhance areas of public open and recreational space, and Green Infrastructure, so to support opportunities for physical and mental health improvement?
- Will the plan / policy facilitate or encourage healthier lifestyles? Will the plan / policy improve the quantity and quality of, and access to, areas of open and recreational space, and to Green Infrastructure in general?
- Will the plan / policy increase opportunities for active travel (cycling/walking)?

HOUSING

Objective 7. To seek to meet the housing needs of all sections of society.

- Will the plan / policy provide for an appropriate mix of housing to meet all needs including affordable housing and / or housing for the elderly?
- Will the plan / policy support the creation of sustainable settlements with an appropriate balance of residents?
- Will the plan / policy support the provision of 'non-mainstream' housing e.g. gypsy and traveller sites, other caravan dwellers, houseboats, student accommodation?

LOCAL ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT

Objective 4: To reduce economic inactivity and disparities in employment.

Objective 5. To encourage sustainable economic growth.

Objective 6. To facilitate diversification of the rural economy.

- Will the plan / policy provide job opportunities in all areas, including most needy areas?
- Will the plan / policy encourage business start-ups, especially from under-represented groups?
- Will the plan / policy provide a broad range of jobs and employment opportunities?
- Will the plan / policy provide higher skilled jobs?
- Will the plan / policy improve accessibility to jobs via the location of employment sites?
- Will the plan / policy help attract workers, residents, businesses and / or investors to the Borough?
- Will the plan / policy improve the range of sustainable employment sites?
- Will the plan / policy promote growth in the key sectors of the Borough's economy?
- Will the plan / policy enable the Borough to take advantage of major investment nearby?
- Will the plan / policy deliver regeneration to / promote the economic growth of urban areas and the vitality / viability of town centres?
- Will the plan / policy increase the economic benefit derived from the Borough's natural environment?
- Will the plan / policy support sustainable rural diversification?
- Will the plan / policy encourage and support the growth of sustainable rural businesses?
- Will the plan / policy retain or promote access to and provision of services in rural areas?
- Will the plan / policy promote the sustainable economic growth of villages and smaller settlements?

TRANSPORT

Objective 8. To contribute towards an efficient, equitable, safe, and environmentally 'sustainable' transport system / network.

- Will the plan / policy improve the efficiency of the transport network?
- Will the plan / policy help reduce vehicular traffic and congestion?
- Will the plan / policy increase access to and opportunities for walking, cycling ('active travel') and use of public transport?
- Will the plan / policy reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured on the roads?
- Will the plan / policy reduce or minimise emissions of greenhouse gases?
- Will the plan / policy help improve air quality?
- Will the plan / policy promote the use of locally produced or sourced goods and materials?

LAND RESOURCES

Objective 9. To preserve and enhance the Borough's land resources.

- Will the plan / policy reduce the amount of vacant, derelict, and contaminated land?
- Will the plan / policy encourage the use of brownfield land in preference to greenfield land?
- Will the plan / policy minimise or reduce the loss of high quality (best and most versatile) agricultural land and / or soil in general?
- Will the plan / policy achieve the efficient use of land via appropriate density of development?
- Will the plan / policy reduce the amount of waste generated by development?
- Will the plan / policy promote the use of recycled, reclaimed and secondary materials?

CULTURAL HERITAGE AND LANDSCAPE

Objective 10. To conserve, and, where possible, enhance, and to recognise the added value of, the built and cultural heritage and environment of the Borough.

- Will the plan / policy improve the quality of the built and historic environment?
- Will the plan / policy support the conservation and enhancement of high quality built, natural and historic environments within the Borough (whether designated or not)?
- Will the plan / policy protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's landscape, strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place?
- Will the plan / policy improve access to / understanding of buildings and other assets of historic and cultural value?

CLIMATE CHANGE / CLIMATE EMERGENCY, ENERGY AND FLOODING

Objective 11. To minimise contributions towards, and mitigate and be resilient to the impacts of climate change, and protect against flood risk.

- Will the plan / policy minimise the need for carbon-based energy generation / use?
- Will the plan / policy maximise the production / deployment of renewable energy?
- Will the plan / policy encourage new developments to achieve zero carbon?
- Will the plan / policy help reduce or manage flood risk?
- Will the plan / policy help improve resilience to the likely effects of climate change?

WATER QUALITY AND RESOURCES

Objective 12. To protect ‘water assets’ and ensure an adequate supply of water and means of disposing of wastewater

- Will the plan / policy help improve the quality of water resources in the area?
- Will the plan / policy maintain / enhance ground water (incl. aquifer) quality?
- Will the plan / policy help, or minimise effects upon, water supply?
- Will the plan / policy minimise / reduce the amount of wastewater generated by development?

AIR QUALITY

Objective 8. To contribute towards an efficient, equitable, safe, and environmentally ‘sustainable’ transport system / network.

- Will the plan / policy help reduce vehicular traffic and congestion (in so far as it relates to air quality)?
- Will the plan / policy reduce or minimise emissions of greenhouse gases?
- Will the plan / policy help improve air quality?

BIODIVERSITY

Objective 13. To protect, maintain and enhance the biodiversity assets of the Borough.

- Will the plan / policy protect and / or enhance the biodiversity or geodiversity of the Borough?
- Will the plan / policy protect and / or enhance habitats, species and damaged sites?
- Will the plan / policy provide opportunities for new habitat creation?
- Will the plan / policy protect and / or extend habitat connectivity and landscape permeability, suitable for species migration?

LOCAL SERVICES AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

Objective 3: To improve health and well-being and reduce inequalities

Objective 8. To contribute towards an efficient, equitable, safe, and environmentally ‘sustainable’ transport system / network.

- Will the plan / policy reduce isolation in the community?
- Will the plan / policy facilitate or encourage healthier lifestyles?
- Will the plan / policy reduce health inequalities?
- Will the plan / policy improve the quantity and quality of, and access to, areas of open and recreational space, and to Green Infrastructure in general?
- Will the plan / policy improve the efficiency of the transport network?
- Will the plan / policy increase access to and opportunities for walking, cycling (‘active travel’) and use of public transport?

APPENDIX 2 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISALS OF INDIVIDUAL POLICIES AND THEIR ALTERNATIVES

- **Strategic Policies**

- ST01 - Sustainable Development
- *ST02a - Housing requirements**
- *ST02b - Employment land requirements**
- *ST02c - Spatial Distribution**
- ST03 - Climate change & env. sustainability
- ST04 - Settlement boundaries
- *ST05 - Strategic sites**

- **Housing and Communities**

- HC01a – Where housing can be located
- HC01bi – Brownfield & greenfield development
- HC01bii – Density
- HC01c – Dwelling sizes
- HC01d – Affordable housing
- HC01e – Housing for older people
- HC01f – Custom and self-build housing
- HC01g – Accommodation for students
- HC01h – Caravan and houseboat dwellers
- HC01i – Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
- HC01j – Temporary agricultural workers' accommodation
- HC02 – Place-making
- HC03 – Heritage
- HC04 – Community Facilities

- **Economy and Employment**

- EE01 – Employment Areas
- EE02 – Rural economy

- EE03 – Town Centres
- EE04a – Education / Edge Hill University
- EE04b – Education / Skills and training

- **Environment and Health**

- EH01 – Preserving and enhancing nature & biodiversity
- EC02 – Landscape and land resources
- EH03 – Flood risk and water resources
- EH04 – Contamination and pollution
- EH05 – Air quality
- EH06 – Green infrastructure and open spaces (*4 approaches*)
- EH07 – Healthy eating and drinking

- **Transport and Infrastructure**

- TI01 – Transport network and access
- TI02 – Parking standards & electric vehicle charging points
- TI03 – Digital connectivity
- TI04 – Low carbon and renewable energy
- TI05 – Energy efficiency in new developments
- TI06 – Water efficiency in new residential developments

- **Other**

- OT01 – Sequential tests
- OT02 – Viability
- OT03 – Developer contributions

** No assessments provided at this stage for these policies*

STRATEGIC POLICIES / ST01 – Delivering Sustainable Development

- Summary of 'options':**
1. **'Standard' settlement hierarchy and NPPF presumption** – this sets out a settlement hierarchy based on the findings of the West Lancashire Sustainable Settlement Study 2021, essentially the same as the 'baseline' hierarchy (summarised below). Most new development would be directed to the settlements at or towards the top of the hierarchy, as these tend to be the most sustainable locations for new development. The policy would also include the NPPF 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' as this is at the centre of national planning policy and is required to play a key role in local plans.
 2. **Variation to settlement hierarchy** – this alternative option varies the settlement hierarchy from the 2021 Study, putting some settlements with fewer services towards the top levels of the hierarchy, and some settlements with more services lower in the hierarchy.

Overview of current baseline: The current WLLP has a settlement hierarchy based on a previous version of the West Lancashire Sustainable Settlement Study, with Skelmersdale with Up Holland, Ormskirk with Aughton, and Burscough at the top, then Key Sustainable Villages (Tarleton with Hesketh Bank, Parbold, Banks), Rural Sustainable Villages, and Small Rural Villages at the bottom.

The main differences between the WLLP settlement hierarchy and the 2021 Sustainable Settlement Study is that Ormskirk is in the top tier (previously second), Tarleton is in the second tier (previously third), and Banks in the fourth tier (previously third).

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences in the amount of development going to two or three settlements (more in Tarleton, less in Banks). Overall, it would be expected that there would be no, or insignificant, effects relative to the baseline position, although there could be minor positive effects (e.g. a chance of more accommodation for the elderly, or improved local job prospects) for settlements with more development, and minor negative effects for settlements with less development than under the baseline position. The likelihood of these effects will be determined primarily by policy ST02 (distribution of development) rather than by this policy, so the overall effect is recorded as neutral above, similarly for the other topic areas under this option.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">–</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy as set out in the West Lancashire Sustainable Settlement Study 2021 is based on the 'sustainability' of each settlement in the Borough – number, and ease of access to, services and facilities, also taking into account interlinkages between nearby settlements. To vary the settlement hierarchy so that some settlements with fewer services were higher in the hierarchy, and some settlements with more services were lower, would most likely result in more development in the less sustainable settlements compared to the baseline position. Therefore, overall, it would be expected that the effects under this topic area (and all other topic areas) would be negative relative to the baseline.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">–</p> <p>Whilst overall numbers of dwellings may be the same, distributing housing to less sustainable settlements will most likely have a negative effect compared to the baseline in terms of the creation of sustainable settlements.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">–</p> <p>As per the 'Population, Health and Social Inclusion' topic area, to use a settlement hierarchy that does not correspond to the 'sustainability' of each settlement (in terms of numbers of, and access to, services and facilities) would lead to negative effects relative to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p>–</p> <p>This option would most likely lead to negative effects relative to the baseline – please see comments above (Topic Area 1) for an explanation.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline are likely to be insignificant. Their exact nature depends exactly where development would be located.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline depend exactly where development would be located. Whilst one settlement may be more sustainable than another in terms of services, this may not necessarily be the case in terms of landscape and cultural heritage.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline are likely to be insignificant. Their exact nature depends where development would be located. There would be a similar level of development overall.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline are likely to be insignificant. Their exact nature depends where development would be located. There would be a similar level of development overall.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p>–</p> <p>This option would most likely lead to negative effects relative to the baseline as people are likely to need to travel further overall, adding to air pollution. Please also see comments above (Topic Area 1) for an explanation.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline are likely to be insignificant. Their exact nature depends where development would be located. Whilst one settlement may be more sustainable than another in terms of services, this is not necessarily the case in terms of biodiversity value.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position, although with the potential for minor differences – please see comments above for an explanation.</p>	<p>–</p> <p>This option would most likely lead to negative effects relative to the baseline as more people are likely to be living in places with relatively fewer services, and therefore less good access to services overall.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is very similar to the baseline position. Overall, it would be expected that there would be no, or insignificant, effects relative to the baseline position, and whilst there could be minor positive or negative effects, the likelihood of these effects will be determined primarily by policy ST02 (distribution of development) rather than by this policy, so the overall effect is considered to be neutral relative to the baseline.

Option 2 uses a settlement hierarchy that departs from the findings of the Sustainable Settlement Study and is most likely to have negative effects under a number of Topic Areas relative to the baseline on account of less good links to services and facilities.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the more sustainable.

STRATEGIC POLICIES / ST03 – Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. A new strategic policy. This approach would see the introduction of a new strategic policy governing climate change and environmental sustainability, in response to the climate emergency declaration made by the Council. It would support ambitions to achieve net zero by embedding such climate and environmental sustainability considerations at the heart of all development proposals.
 2. Have no strategic policy. This approach would be similar to the current Local Plan, and would have no strategic policy governing climate change and environmental sustainability.
 3. Introduce a more prescriptive policy. This approach would set detailed requirements through the strategic policy.
- Overview of current baseline:** The baseline position comprises a range of adopted Local Plan Policies, the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance, Building Regulations Approved Document L (Conservation of Fuel and Power) and national legislation e.g. the Climate Change Act 2008. Relevant adopted Local Plan policies are: GN3: Criteria for Sustainable Development, IF2: Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice, EN2: Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment, EN3: Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space and EN1: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0 / +</p> <p>As a strategic policy, this option would have minimal effect (slightly positive) in relation to this topic as it would closely reflect the baseline position. Whilst the following matters relating to this topic are of relevance, they are unlikely to be addressed in more detail than existing policy by a strategic policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing opportunities to protect or enhance areas of public open and recreational space, and Green Infrastructure, so to support opportunities for physical and mental health improvement. 2. Facilitating or encouraging healthier lifestyles and improving the quantity and quality of, and access to, areas of open and recreational space, and to Green Infrastructure in general. 3. Increase opportunities for active travel (cycling/walking). 	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. A detailed prescriptive policy may increase opportunities for active travel (cycling/walking). Existing policy is likely to address the following matters to the same level of detail:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing opportunities to protect or enhance areas of public open and recreational space, and Green Infrastructure, so to support opportunities for physical and mental health improvement 2. Facilitating or encouraging healthier lifestyles? Will the plan / policy improve the quantity and quality of, and access to, areas of open and recreational space, and to Green Infrastructure in general.
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. There should be opportunities to increase the economic benefit derived from the Borough's natural environment compared to existing policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. There should be opportunities to increase the economic benefit derived from the Borough's natural environment compared to existing policy.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. A strategic policy should help to reduce or minimise emissions of greenhouse gases and therefore help improve air quality. It is less likely to help reduce vehicular traffic and congestion or increase access to and opportunities for walking, cycling ('active travel') and use of public transport compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. A detailed prescriptive policy may increase access to and opportunities for walking, cycling ('active travel') and use of public transport and should help to reduce or minimise emissions of greenhouse gases and therefore help improve air quality.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. By seeking to improve energy and water efficiencies in new buildings it should assist in reducing the amount of waste generated by development.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. By seeking to improve energy and water efficiencies in new buildings it should assist in reducing the amount of waste generated by development.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. A strategic policy could set a framework to minimise the need for carbon-based energy generation / use maximise the production / deployment of renewable energy and encourage new developments to achieve zero carbon. Flood risk and resilience to climate change are addressed by other policy documents that form part of the baseline; indeed the option would have presented more favourably except for the existing baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. A detailed prescriptive policy could set a framework to minimise the need for carbon-based energy generation / use maximise the production / deployment of renewable energy and encourage new developments to achieve zero carbon. Flood risk and resilience to climate change are addressed by other policy documents that form part of the baseline; indeed the option would have presented more favourably except for the existing baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>As a strategic policy, this option would have minimal effect in relation to this topic as it would closely reflect the baseline position. A strategic policy is unlikely to address the following in more detail than existing policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimising effects upon, water supply. 2. Minimising / reducing the amount of wastewater generated by development. 	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. A detailed prescriptive policy could help to minimise effects upon, water supply and could help to minimise / reduce the amount of wastewater generated by development.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. A strategic policy should help to reduce or minimise emissions of greenhouse gases and therefore help improve air quality.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. A detailed prescriptive policy will help to reduce or minimise emissions of greenhouse gases and therefore help improve air quality.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. The inclusion of a requirement in relation to biodiversity net gain (BNG) should protect and / or enhance the biodiversity of the Borough and provide opportunities for new habitat creation. BNG is not presently a legal requirement of development and does not therefore currently represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. The inclusion of a requirement in relation to BNG should protect and / or enhance the biodiversity of the Borough and provide opportunities for new habitat creation. BNG is not presently a legal requirement of development and does not therefore currently represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>As a strategic policy, this option would have minimal effect in relation to this topic as it would closely reflect the baseline position. Whilst several matters relating to this topic are of relevance, they are unlikely to be addressed in more detail than existing policy by a strategic policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. A detailed prescriptive policy may increase access to and opportunities for walking, cycling ('active travel') and use of public transport.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would have positive small positive effects in sustainability terms in relation to 6 topics (local economy and employment, transport, land resources, climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding, air quality and biodiversity).

Option 2 has neutral effects in terms of sustainability because it represents the baseline position.

Option 3 would have positive sustainability effects in relation to 3 topics (transport, climate change / the climate emergency and air quality) and small positive effects in relation to 6 topics (population, health and social inclusion, local economy and employment, land resources, water quality, biodiversity and local services and community infrastructure).

None of the assessed options would have negative effects upon any topic and the quantity of positive effects are a reflection of the wide ranging nature of the policy approach and the fact that no strategic local plan policy currently exists which covers these matters.

Overall, option 3 would be the most sustainable. However, it should be noted that, given the detailed requirements of option 3 across a range of policy areas, it would be very likely to result in a very long and complex policy. Local Plans are to be read as a whole so there would be practical advantages in providing a less detailed strategic policy, supported by a selection of more detailed policies (option 1).

STRATEGIC POLICIES / ST04 – Settlement Boundaries

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. **A continuation of the WLLP policy GN1 approach with a slight relaxation to Protected Land policy** – Within settlement boundaries, development will be permitted, subject to compliance with other Local Plan policies. Outside settlement boundaries, land will either be designated as Protected Land or Green Belt. Protected Land policy would be similar to that in WLLP GN1(b), except that more types of housing will be permitted (so that the designation is not more restrictive than a Green Belt designation). Green Belt policy would follow national policy.
 2. **Do away with the Protected Land designation** – treat the land as greenfield sites within settlements or redesignate as Green Belt where the land is shown to fulfil at least one of the five Green Belt purposes.
 3. **Stronger protection for greenfield land within settlement boundaries** – within settlement boundaries (on unallocated sites), a much stronger presumption in favour of brownfield land development over greenfield.
- Overview of current baseline:** The current WLLP allows for development within settlement boundaries, with a preference for brownfield development over greenfield. Protected Land is subject to restrictions on development (only affordable housing, up to 10 units), and Green Belt follows national policy.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>It is assumed that the removal of the Protected Land designation will result in some current Protected Land being redesignated as greenfield land within the settlement boundary where it is more likely it would be developed for housing. (The remainder would become Green Belt with very similar prospects for development to current prospects.)</p> <p>This could result in minor positive benefits under this Topic Area relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / - / +</p> <p>This option is likely to result in less housing than the baseline position, which could lead to less accommodation able to address specific needs, for example the elderly. However, it could also lead to more Green Infrastructure which creates health benefits to a wide number of people. So, overall, minor positive and negative effects relative to the baseline.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0 / +</p> <p>The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy may result in a small number of extra dwellings, so a minor positive effect relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option could result in higher numbers of additional dwellings compared to the baseline, resulting in positive effects under this topic area.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option is most likely to result in less housing than the baseline position, so negative effects relative to the baseline for this topic area.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>- / 0 / +</p> <p>This option would most likely lead to housing growth (positive indirect effects relative to the baseline) but potentially also loss of employment if horticultural sites are replaced by housing (therefore negative effects relative to the baseline).</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>Provision of less housing on greenfield sites could have indirect minor negative effects on the economy in relation to the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>–</p> <p>This option would lead to negative effects relative to the baseline – extra housing is likely to lead to extra traffic.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option is likely to lead to positive effects relative to the baseline – less housing generally means less traffic / congestion / emissions / accidents.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy (e.g. allowing redevelopment of brownfield land) is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>–</p> <p>This option would lead to negative effects relative to the baseline – a policy that allows for housing on Protected Land is most likely to mean loss of greenfield land on such sites.</p>	<p>+ / –</p> <p>This option is likely to lead to positive effects relative to the baseline on terms of the stronger protection for greenfield land. There is a danger, however, of greater pressure for development on greenfield land (new site allocations) outside of settlements.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>? / –</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline depend exactly where development would be located and whether it replaces derelict buildings. Allowing housing on sites where current policy (the baseline) does not allow housing would most likely lead to negative effects landscape-wise.</p>	<p>+ / –</p> <p>This option is likely to lead to positive effects relative to the baseline on terms of the quality of the built / historic environment within settlements. However, there is a danger of greater pressure for development on greenfield land (new site allocations) outside of settlements, which could lead to negative effects on landscape.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline. The effects of this option will instead depend on whether new development is energy-efficient and low carbon</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline are uncertain and depend on whether new development is energy-efficient and low carbon. Development of greenfield land could increase flood risk unless runoff rates were kept to greenfield rates.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Effects under this topic area of greater protection for greenfield land are uncertain. Less housing means fewer opportunities for low carbon development, but fewer emissions from occupants of less energy-efficient homes.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would most likely lead to negative effects relative to the baseline as more homes would be built in areas which have had protected land designations, leading to greater demands on water, more wastewater, and possible restricting of access to groundwater supply in the Northern Parishes area.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option should lead to positive effects relative to the baseline as fewer homes would be built, leading to less demands on water supply, and less wastewater. However, if the houses were resultantly built elsewhere, overall effects would be neutral compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>- / 0</p> <p>This option would most likely lead to negative effects relative to the baseline as more homes means more car journeys and more emissions of greenhouse gases. However, if the houses were resultantly built elsewhere, overall effects would be neutral compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option would most likely lead to positive effects relative to the baseline as fewer homes means fewer car journeys and less emissions of greenhouse gases. However, if the houses were resultantly built elsewhere, overall effects would be neutral compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / ? / +</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline are likely to be insignificant. Their exact nature depends where development would be located. The application of biodiversity net gain (BNG) could actually enhance biodiversity relative to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / ? / +</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline are unclear. Their exact nature depends where development would be located, and which greenfield sites were developed or not developed. BNG could mean new housing actually benefits biodiversity, so less new housing could mean less benefits.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is essentially the same as the baseline position. The slight relaxation of Protected Land policy is unlikely to have any material effect on this Topic Area compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option is unlikely to have anything other than insignificant effects relative to the baseline. It should not result in the creation of extra services, but extra residents could help sustain services.</p>	<p>0 / + / –</p> <p>This option may have no effect relative to the baseline, as greenfield land is protected primarily from housing under this option. But protecting greenfield land could constrain provision of new services and having fewer new residents in settlements could lead to services declining and being lost.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is very similar to the baseline position. Overall, it would be expected that there would be no, or insignificant, effects relative to the baseline position, with one positive in relation to housing provision as a result of the slight relaxation of Protected Land policy.

Option 2 would probably result in more housing development, so positive effects relative to the baseline in terms of housing provision, but negative effects in terms of land resources, landscape, water, and air quality.

Option 3 would result in less housing development within settlements, but possibly more elsewhere. Its effects relative to the baseline tend to be the opposite of option 2.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01a – Where housing can be located

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. A general policy on where housing should (and should not) be built. This would link to the first Strategic Development Policy ('Delivering Sustainable Development') but refer to residential development only.
 2. Continue with the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 ('WLLP') current approach set out by Policy GN1 and supported by Policies SP1 and RS1.
 3. Be more restrictive than under current WLLP policy set out by GN1 and supported by Policies SP1 and RS1.
 4. Be less restrictive than under current WLLP policy set out by GN1 and supported by Policies SP1 and RS1.
- Overview of current baseline:** The baseline position comprises adopted Local Plan Policy GN1: Settlement Boundaries, supported by Policies SP1: A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire and RS1: Residential Development. It also includes the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance, particularly in terms of how this relates to Green Belt. Option 2 therefore represents the baseline position.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect compared to the baseline in relation to this topic. Limiting the numbers and / or types of housing in smaller settlements, would not assist in reducing isolation and would not improve economic, environmental and social conditions (quality of life) for deprived groups.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic. By having no limits to housing types and numbers permissible within settlements, it would assist in reducing isolation in the community and would improve economic, environmental and social conditions (quality of life) for deprived groups.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect in relation to this topic. By limiting the numbers and / or types of housing in smaller settlements the option is less likely to provide for an appropriate mix of housing to meet all needs including affordable housing and / or housing for the elderly.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic. By having no limits to housing types and numbers permissible within settlements it would assist in providing for an appropriate mix of housing to meet all needs including affordable housing and / or housing for the elderly.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>By explicitly identifying Rural Exception Sites, it may not minimise the loss of best quality agricultural land.. However, this would be dependent on the chosen sites. Much of the approach would follow national policy (the baseline).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic. It may assist in minimising or reducing the loss of high quality (best and most versatile) agricultural land.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect in relation to this topic. It would not assist in minimising or reducing the loss of high quality (best and most versatile) agricultural land.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic. It may assist in protecting the character and appearance of the Borough's landscape.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect in relation to this topic. It would be less likely to assist in protecting and enhancing the character and appearance of the Borough's landscape.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. The protection and enhancement of biodiversity is subject to its own policies and emerging national requirements.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. The protection and enhancement of biodiversity is subject to its own policies and emerging national requirements.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. The protection and enhancement of biodiversity is subject to its own policies and emerging national requirements.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect in relation to this topic. By limiting the numbers and / or types of housing in smaller settlements, it would not assist in reducing isolation in the community.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic. By having no limits to housing types and numbers permissible within settlements, it would assist in reducing isolation in the community. However, less control could also mean greater burdens are placed on local services.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is likely to be slightly better in terms of sustainability compared to the baseline position as it would have a positive effect in relation to the housing topic although an uncertain negative effect upon land resources.

Option 2 represents the baseline situation so has a neutral effect in sustainability terms.

Option 3 would have positive sustainability effects upon two topics (land resources and cultural heritage and landscape) but would have negative effects upon 3 topics (Population, Health and Social Inclusion, Housing and Local services and community infrastructure). As such, if each topic is given equal weigh this option would be a little less sustainable than the baseline.

Option 4 would be a less restrictive approach, but in doing so, could result in more housing on Protected land, and could have more negative effects on the sustainability of land resources and landscape.

As such, Option 1 would be the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01b(i) – Using land efficiently: brownfield and greenfield development

- Summary of 'options':**
1. To broadly follow national policy, encouraging the residential development of brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites wherever possible, subject to viability. A minimum density standard would be set (expected to be 30 dwellings per hectare).
 2. Have no preference for brownfield land over greenfield land development.
 3. A more rigorous 'sequential' or 'phased' approach towards brownfield land development, requiring all suitable brownfield sites within a settlement to be considered for development first before development of greenfield sites, subject to viability.

Overview of current baseline: The baseline position comprises the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance (Effective use of land in particular) and the adopted Local Plan. In terms of the latter, relevant policies are primarily GN1: Settlement Boundaries and RS1: Residential Development; the former indicates when it may be appropriate to develop on brownfield and greenfield sites and the latter indicates appropriate densities for residential development.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect on this topic compared to the baseline. By choosing not to prioritise brownfield land over greenfield, it could increase the risk to certain 'undeveloped' areas of land, including public open and recreational space, and Green Infrastructure, that support opportunities for physical and mental health improvement.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect as it closely resembles the baseline position in relation to this topic. However, requiring all brownfield sites in a settlement to be developed, before considering greenfield sites, would help to protect areas of undeveloped land that are often 'greener' and can aid health and wellbeing.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>The option would have a negative effect on this topic because it may not support the creation of sustainable settlements. By not having a policy preference for brownfield over greenfield land there could be a loss of open space and Green Infrastructure.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect as it closely resembles the baseline position in relation to this topic.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>The option would have a negative effect on this topic. By not prioritising the development of brownfield land over greenfield it would not assist in reducing the amount of vacant, derelict, and contaminated land and, conversely, could encourage the loss of high quality (best and most versatile) agricultural land. It would not encourage the use of brownfield land in preference to greenfield land.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>The option would have a positive effect on this topic. By firmly prioritising the development of brownfield land over greenfield it should assist in reducing the amount of vacant, derelict, and contaminated land and minimising and reducing the loss of high quality (best and most versatile) agricultural land. It would also require (rather than encourage) the use of brownfield land in preference to greenfield land.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>The option would have a negative effect on this topic. By not prioritising the development of brownfield land over greenfield the option would be less likely to support the conservation and enhancement of high quality built, natural and historic environments within the Borough (whether designated or not). It would also be less likely to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's landscape.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>The option would have a positive effect on this topic. By requiring the development of brownfield land over greenfield the option would be more likely to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's landscape.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. However, some of the greenfield land in the Borough is peat-based. As peat acts as a 'carbon sink', the removal of peat through development could release carbon into the atmosphere, contributing to climate change. If there was no preference for brownfield land over greenfield, then there is a greater risk that development of more greenfield land could contribute to climate change, although this would be dependent on the sites allocated.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. However, some of the greenfield land in the Borough is peat-based. As peat acts as a 'carbon sink', the removal of peat through development could release carbon into the atmosphere, contributing to climate change. Requiring brownfield sites to be developed first, could help minimise the development of peat-based land and, in turn, environmental damage, although this would be dependent on the sites allocated.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position. Brownfield sites can have as much biodiversity value as greenfield sites.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. Brownfield sites can have as much biodiversity value as greenfield sites.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. Brownfield sites can have as much biodiversity value as greenfield sites.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would have neutral effects in terms of sustainability as it closely resembles the baseline position.

Option 2 would have negative effects in relation to the population, health and social inclusion, housing, land resources and cultural heritage and landscape topics and is therefore less sustainable compared to the baseline position.

Option 3 would have positive effects compared to the baseline in relation to the land resources and cultural heritage and landscape topics

Overall, Option 3 would be the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01b(ii) – Using land efficiently: Housing Density

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Require the same housing density for all areas, using the 'standard' minimum 30 dwellings per hectare cited in WLLP Policy RS1: Residential Development.
 2. Higher densities on all sites (say a minimum site density of 35 dwellings per hectare) in order to reduce the amount of land needed for building new homes.
 3. Allow / require lower density development on all sites in order to give people larger garden areas and / or more publicly accessible open space / space for nature.

Overview of current baseline: The baseline position comprises the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance (Effective use of land) and adopted Local Plan Policy RS1: Residential Development which indicates appropriate densities for residential development.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect on this topic compared to the baseline. By developing dwellings at higher densities, it would reduce the amount of land needed and so provide opportunities to protect areas of public open & recreational space, and Green Infrastructure, to support opportunities for physical and mental health improvement. However, it could lead to smaller 'private spaces' (i.e gardens) and denser developments could feel more 'enclosed', affecting health and mental wellbeing. Design would be important.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect on this topic compared to the baseline. By developing dwellings at lower densities, it would increase the amount of development land needed and so would not provide opportunities to protect areas of public open and recreational space, and Green Infrastructure, to support opportunities for physical and mental health improvement. The larger garden areas and / or more publicly accessible open space / space for nature provided by developing at lower density would not offset this situation.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect on this topic compared to the baseline. By developing dwellings at higher densities, it would minimise the amount of development land required. Where greenfield land is needed to meet identified needs, a higher density could mean less high quality (best and most versatile) agricultural land is required to be released. The option would also achieve a more efficient use of land via a higher density of development.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect on this topic compared to the baseline. By developing dwellings at lower densities, it would increase the amount of development land required. Where greenfield land is needed to meet identified needs, a lower density could mean more high quality (best and most versatile) agricultural land is required to be released. The option would also achieve a less efficient use of land via a lower density of development.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect on this topic compared to the baseline. By developing dwellings at higher densities there would be greater opportunities to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's landscape.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect on this topic compared to the baseline. By developing dwellings at lower densities there would be less opportunity to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's landscape.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. Higher density developments could mean less space is provided 'on site' to provide biodiversity improvements. However, good design should be able to find creative solutions to delivering improvements.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. Lower density developments could mean more space is provided 'on site' to provide biodiversity improvements. Conversely, it could lead to more 'biodiverse' land being developed in the first place, although the requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain should compensate for this.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would have neutral effects in terms of sustainability as it closely resembles the baseline position.

Option 2 would have positive effects in relation to the population, health and social inclusion, land resources and cultural heritage and landscape topics and is therefore more sustainable compared to the baseline position.

Option 3 would have negative effects compared to the baseline in relation to the same population, health and social inclusion, land resources and cultural heritage and landscape topics and is therefore less sustainable compared to the baseline.

Overall, option 2 would be the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01c – Dwelling Sizes

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Require a mix of dwelling sizes for new developments, based on the Council's evidence base
 2. Exercise no control over dwelling sizes – let the developers build what they want
 3. Exercise strict control over dwelling sizes – setting out the required proportions and not allowing variation apart from in exceptional circumstances

Current baseline: There is no policy in the current WLLP governing dwelling sizes. The NPPF states that, in considering housing supply, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. Most new dwellings built in the Borough are 3 or 4 bedroomed (AMR 2021). Option 2 is therefore most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of dwelling sizes

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+</p> <p>There is no current policy governing dwelling sizes. Most new dwellings built in the Borough are 3- or 4-bedroom houses, but not everyone wants a dwelling of this size. Requiring a mix of dwelling sizes, informed by the Council's evidence base, may better provide housing to meet the needs of the Borough's population, support affordability and enable wider social inclusion.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of dwelling sizes. It lets developers, and the market, dictate what sizes are provided, but can fail to provide for the needs of parts of the Borough's population, perhaps leading to unbalanced settlements (e.g. fewer young people can afford, or need, larger dwellings).</p>	<p>+</p> <p>Exercising strict control over dwelling sizes, informed by the Council's evidence base, would help to provide housing to meet the needs of the Borough's population, support affordability and enable wider social inclusion. . However, it would be less flexible to changing market demands.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>+</p> <p>There is no current policy governing dwelling sizes. Requiring a mix of dwelling sizes, informed by the Council's evidence base, may better provide an appropriate housing mix to meet the needs of the Borough's population, support affordability and aid sustainability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of dwelling sizes. It lets developers, and the market, dictate what sizes are provided, but can fail to provide for the needs of parts of the Borough's population.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>Exercising strict control over dwelling sizes, informed by the Council's evidence base, would help to provide housing to meet the needs of the Borough's population. However, it would be less flexible to changing market demands.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>Larger houses tend to take up more land, and therefore requiring a mix of dwelling sizes, including smaller homes, could help increase the densities of developments. However, it would be expected that this would be a minimal effect.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of dwelling sizes. This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>Larger houses tend to take up more land, and therefore requiring a mix of dwelling sizes, including smaller homes, could help increase the densities of developments. However, it would be expected that such a tighter control would still only be a minimal effect.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no direct effect on this objective. Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, in response to the climate emergency, then dwelling size should not create any impact on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of dwelling sizes. This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no direct effect on this objective. Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, in response to the climate emergency, then dwelling size should not create any impact on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no direct effect on this objective. Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, with water efficiencies, then dwelling size should not create any impact on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no direct effect on this objective. Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, with water efficiencies, then dwelling size should not create any impact on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no direct effect on this objective. Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, with water efficiencies, then dwelling size should not create any impact on this objective.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would provide greater control over dwelling sizes, supporting the provision of housing in relation to identified need. As a starting point for negotiation, it could help to address identified needs whilst also providing sufficient flexibility if there were other local, relevant considerations proffered by the developer. It would help provide more balanced communities by providing a greater mix of housing to address the needs of all.

Option 2 is most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of dwelling sizes and therefore provides no control over dwelling sizes in relation to identified need. It would be expected that there would still remain an unbalanced distribution of new dwelling sizes.

Option 3 would exercise the strictest control over dwelling sizes, which would make it difficult to respond to changing needs. For example, during COVID-19, demand for larger houses increased because people wanted additional rooms as home-office space.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01d – Affordable housing

- Summary of 'options':**
1. To continue to support 100% affordable housing (AH) schemes, and require a percentage of homes in developments of 10 or more dwellings be affordable
 2. Go for the minimum amount of affordable housing (as national policy) so to deliver other 'benefits', e.g. green-housing, biodiversity or infrastructure
 3. Go for the greatest possible amount of affordable housing at the expense of other 'good to have's'

Current baseline: WLLP Policy RS2: To support 100% affordable housing (AH) schemes and require a percentage of homes in developments of 10 or more dwellings be affordable. Option 1 generally continues the current baseline.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
	0	+ / -	- / +
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	This is the option most aligned to current policy. It supports the provision of affordable housing, in line with national policy, and so enabling people to access stable and affordable housing which can help support health and wellbeing. A greater range of housing opportunities better supports wider social inclusion and caters to the needs of the population.	This option would provide a minimum amount of AH, as national policy, so to provide other benefits. These other benefits could extend to 'green housing' or improved biodiversity, which, in turn, can create their own improvements to health and wellbeing, providing cheaper running costs and improved environments. However, by pursuing the minimum amounts of AH, fewer people will be given opportunities to access AH.	This option would pursue the greatest amount of AH, which would be at the expense of other 'benefits'. More people would be able to access AH opportunities, but it would be harder to deliver 'green' housing or improve the local environment.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to current policy. It supports the provision of affordable housing, in line with national policy, and would be set in conjunction with the Council's evidence base.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would provide a minimum amount of AH, as national policy, so to provide other benefits. However, by pursuing the minimum amounts of AH, fewer people will be given opportunities to access AH.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would pursue the greatest amount of AH, which would be at the expense of other 'benefits'. More people would be able to access AH opportunities.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. Impact on land resources would largely be subject to how the policy would operate but AH would form part of the LPA's housing supply – which will prescribe a set figure of new homes.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. Impact on land resources would largely be subject to how the policy would operate but AH would form part of the LPA's housing supply – which will prescribe a set figure of new homes.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. Impact on land resources would largely be subject to how the policy would operate but AH would form part of the LPA's housing supply – which will prescribe a set figure of new homes.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, in response to the climate emergency, then affordable housing should not create any impact on this objective.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, in response to the climate emergency, then affordable housing should not create any impact on this objective. However, delivering minimum amounts of AH, to enable the 'savings' to be used elsewhere, could support 'green' housing features, such as net zero carbon, energy efficiency, or improved biodiversity, which could mitigate the climate emergency.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, in response to the climate emergency, then affordable housing should not create any impact on this objective. However, requiring maximum amounts of AH, would prevent the 'savings' to be used elsewhere, such as providing net zero carbon and energy efficient homes, or improved biodiversity, which could mitigate the climate emergency.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. A policy positive towards AH could help ensure that suitable plots/sites are available in sustainable areas, thereby helping to support local services and community infrastructure.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. A policy positive towards AH could help ensure that suitable plots/sites are available in sustainable areas, thereby helping to support local services and community infrastructure.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. A policy positive towards AH could help ensure that suitable plots/sites are available in sustainable areas, thereby helping to support local services and community infrastructure.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is the option most aligned to current policy. It supports the provision of affordable housing, in line with national policy, so enabling people to access affordable housing which can help provide stability and support health and wellbeing. A greater range of housing opportunities better caters to the needs of the population and supports wider social inclusion.

Option 2 would provide a minimum amount of affordable housing, which would enable fewer people to access affordable housing, but could financially open up greater opportunities for other improvements, including those to tackle the climate emergency – such as net zero homes, or energy efficiencies.

Option 3 would pursue a maximum amount of affordable housing but at the likely expense of those other improvement opportunities, including those to tackle the climate emergency

Overall, option(s) 1 and 2 are considered the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01e – Housing for Older People

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Support the provision of accommodation for older people in appropriate and sustainable locations within settlements, requiring that new properties are accessible and adaptable, and supporting the development of care home / extra care home bedspace to meet identified needs, allocating specific sites for them where necessary.
 2. Have no prescriptive policies and let the market deliver housing as it sees fit.
 3. Have a more prescriptive policy to seek to achieve as much housing as possible for older people, with requirements for adaptable homes, and that a percentage of homes on large development sites be designed for older people.

Current baseline: Policy RS2 of the current Local Plan sets that specialist housing for the elderly will be provided in sustainable locations via specific schemes for elderly accommodation (e.g. Extra care and sheltered accommodation) and through the requirement in Policy RS1 that, in schemes of 15 dwellings or more, 20% of new residential units should be designed specifically as accommodation suitable for the elderly. Policy RS1 also states that development proposals for elderly accommodation will be encouraged within new settlements, provided that they are accessible, and that all new homes will be expected to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard (although this standard is now redundant, having been replaced by Building Regulations M4(2) for accessible and adaptable homes).

Option 1 and 3 are therefore most aligned to the current baseline position.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This approach is closely aligned to the existing baseline. This option would continue to support the provision of older people's accommodation in appropriate locations within settlements to help aid independent living. It would provide flexibility and management of new development to ensure older peoples' accommodation is appropriately designed and sustainably located, supporting social inclusion and physical and mental health. In addition, the allocation of specific sites to provide care homes would mean greater numbers of people could be supported with health care or assisted living.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have no prescriptive policies on older persons housing but would instead let the market deliver housing as it sees fit. This could mean that larger numbers of older person's housing come to the market, if led by demand, but conversely could give the Council less control over its location and design which could, in turn, have negative impacts on health and social inclusion.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option would require that a percentage of homes on new, large housing sites be designed specifically for older people to M4(2) standards and so is also closely aligned to the current baseline. It would also allocate sites for care homes / extra care developments. Consequently, it could result in slightly positive improvements compared to the current baseline by supporting the provision of more accommodation types to support ageing needs. With an increasingly ageing population it would be expected a greater number of care homes would be needed to support health and assisted living.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This approach is closely aligned to the existing baseline. This option would continue to support the provision of older people's accommodation in appropriate locations within settlements and promote good design. In addition, it would also allocate sites for care homes / extra care developments and therefore would help support a greater supply of older person's housing supply.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This option would have no prescriptive policies on older persons housing but would let the market deliver housing as it sees fit. This could mean that larger numbers of older person's housing come to the market, subject to demand, but conversely could give the Council less control over its location and design.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option would require that a percentage of homes on new, large housing sites be designed specifically for older people to M4(2) standards and so is also closely aligned to the current baseline. In addition, it would also allocate sites for care homes / extra care developments and so would represent a positive effect on the existing baseline in relation to older person's housing supply. This approach would seek to achieve as much housing as possible for older people and therefore would have the greatest positive effect on older persons housing provision.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective, compared to the existing baseline which already supports older persons housing being located in the most sustainable areas so to ensure that developments are within good access of transport links.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Allowing the market to deliver as it sees fit, could result in less control over the location of that development, which may mean that developments are not within good access of transport links.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective, compared to the existing baseline which already supports (major developments and) older persons housing being located in the most sustainable areas so to ensure that developments are within good access of transport links.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>?</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective, compared to the existing baseline. However, the need to allocate land for care homes could have an impact on land resources, dependent on the identified need and the sites selected.</p>	<p>- / ?</p> <p>Allowing the market to deliver as it sees fit, could result in less control over the location of that development with an unknown impact on land resources.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective, compared to the existing baseline. However, the need to allocate land for care homes could have an impact on land resources, dependent on the identified need and the sites selected.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective, compared to the existing baseline which already supports older persons housing being located in the most sustainable areas so to ensure that developments are within good access of services.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Allowing the market to deliver as it sees fit, could result in less control over the location of that development, which may mean that developments are not within good access of services.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective, compared to the existing baseline which already supports (major developments and) older persons housing being located in the most sustainable areas so to ensure that developments are within good access of services.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would continue to support the provision of older people's accommodation in line with the existing baseline, but would also go further to allocate sites for care homes / extra care developments which would have a more positive effect on the provision of older peoples' housing supply.

Option 2 would allow the market to deliver older persons housing as it sees fit, which, given the Borough's increasingly ageing population, could result in a greater amount of provision, flexible and responsive to demand. However, it could also result in less control over the amount, nature and location of that development which could have negative impacts on sustainability, accessibility and appropriate design.

Option 3 would follow much of Option 1, but the approach would additionally seek to achieve as much housing as possible for older people. Whilst this would have the greatest positive effect on older persons housing supply, it may be too prescriptive and inflexible.

Overall, option 1 is considered the most sustainable. A hybrid with option 3 may be the most sustainable approach.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01f – Custom and Self-Build Housing

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. A specific policy on custom and self-build (C&SB) housing
 2. Have no local policy on custom and self-build housing, leaving it to the market to deliver

Current baseline: There is no policy in the current WLLP governing custom and self-build housing and so option 2 represents the current baseline. LPAs have a duty to give enough suitable development permissions to meet identified demand (NPPF footnote 26)

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+</p> <p>A policy requiring C&SB housing, would provide greater opportunities for people to build and own their house, and so access stable housing (market or affordable) which can support health and wellbeing. A greater range of housing opportunities better supports wider social inclusion and caters to the needs of the population.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of C&SB housing. It lets the market deliver, but in doing so, could mean there are insufficient plots (or permissions) available to meet identified need. A greater range of housing opportunities better supports wider social inclusion and caters to the needs of the population.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>+</p> <p>A policy requiring C&SB housing, would provide greater opportunities for people to build and own their house, and so access stable housing (market or affordable). A policy supporting C&SB housing would help the LPA meet national obligations to ensure there is enough development opportunities for C&SB housing.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of C&SB housing. It lets the market deliver, but in doing so, could mean there are insufficient plots (or permissions) available to meet identified need. It would also make it harder for the LPA to meet national obligations to ensure there is enough development opportunities for C&SB housing.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>?</p> <p>Impact on land resources would largely be subject to how the policy would operate – whether by distinct allocations or requiring a percentage of plots on larger developments to be set aside, for C&SB housing. C&SB housing would form part of the LPA's housing supply – which will prescribe a set figure of new homes.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. This is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of C&SB housing.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have minimal effect on this objective. The impact on landscape would be more affected by the location of development.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, in response to the climate emergency, then C&SB housing should not create any impact on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. This is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of C&SB housing.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. Should all new dwellings be appropriately designed, in response to the water efficiencies, then C&SB housing should not create any impact on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. This is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of C&SB housing.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective..</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is more positive towards supporting C&SB housing, enabling the LPA to meet national requirements and to provide wider housing opportunities that better supports wider social inclusion and caters to the needs of the population, whilst also facilitating better planning / use of land resources and encouraging plots to be located in the most sustainable areas close to existing services.

Option 2 is the option most aligned to current policy (or the absence of it) which sets no requirements in respect of C&SB housing. It would not specifically help to provide C&SB housing.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01g – Accommodation for students

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. Continue the current approach to student HMOs. This option would involve minor alterations, including reducing the percentages of permitted HMOs permissible on most streets, with some streets set at 0% HMOs.
 2. Have a more relaxed policy approach towards student accommodation than the present WLLP.
 3. Have a tighter policy approach compared with the current WLLP, to allow no more HMOs within the Article 4 Direction area of Ormskirk / Aughton and Westhead. It would also restrict purpose-built student accommodation development on the university campus.
- Overview of current baseline:** WLLP Policy RS3 sets limits on the percentage of properties that can be HMOs in different streets and supports purpose-built student accommodation within the University Campus. The Policy is applicable in conjunction with an Article 4 Direction relating to HMOs and covering Ormskirk and Aughton. Option 1 most closely aligns with the current baseline.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+</p> <p>By continuing the current Local plan policy with some minor amendments to the percentage of HMOs in certain streets, there will be a minor positive change. It would ensure that the balance of students and residents is not further eroded by conversions of dwellings to HMOs, but that the student population remains socially included within the town.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>By relaxing the rules regarding Student Accommodation, this option would result in a negative impact on the non-student population of the town, by virtue of resulting in streets which may only be predominantly occupied during term time, and also by eroding the sense of community within streets. The conversion of houses to HMOs can also have an impact on the availability of market homes, and, in doing, so can push up prices leading to affordability issues.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>A tighter approach, to restrict Student Accommodation (HMOs) in Ormskirk and the surrounding area, and to restrict student accommodation development to the University campus only (non-Green Belt), would more tightly control the amount of new student accommodation that would be provided. This could protect the availability/affordability of market homes, but force students to live on campus, away from the town and so have a negative effect on social inclusivity.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive impact on housing as it would ensure the retention of sufficient market housing within the town and surrounding areas. It would also appropriately plan for student accommodation provision.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>The relaxation of the rules could lead to a significant number of dwellings being converted to HMOs therefore reducing the available market housing in the town and surrounding area, and, in conjunction, affecting housing affordability.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive impact on housing as it would ensure the retention of sufficient market housing within the town and surrounding areas. Student accommodation would be planned for but restricted to the University campus only.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is closely aligned to the current baseline position and therefore would have a neutral effect.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This option could result in more students living in HMOs in the town and could therefore support the local economy, particularly leisure and hospitality. However, an increase in students may result in the reduction of residents of employment age which could have a negative impact on the employment within the area.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would restrict future growth of the student population to on-campus only which may have a negative impact on the local economy, as fewer students may be expected to visit and support the town centre by remaining on-campus, and therefore this option may have a negative impact when compared to the baseline position.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no direct effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no direct effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no direct effect on this objective</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. Requiring new student accommodation to be on -campus only, but on non-Green belt parts of the campus, would help maximise the use of the existing site, reducing demands on other land resources</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any noticeable effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any noticeable effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any noticeable effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option may have a minor negative impact, as the increased number of students within the town and surrounding area would add pressure to local services and community infrastructure.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any noticeable effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is most aligned to current policy (the baseline position), however it proposes minor alterations, including changes to HMO quotas. It is considered these changes would positively improve the sustainability of the policy.

Option 2 would allow a more relaxed policy approach towards student accommodation than the current WLLP. However, it is considered that this would in negative effects with regard to services, infrastructure, housing and population when compared to the baseline.

Option 3 restricts off campus accommodation and restricts purpose-built student accommodation to the University campus only, which would likely create a mix of positive and negative effects across the objectives.

Overall, Option1 is considered the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01h – Caravan & houseboat dwellers

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. Continue with the current WLLP policy approach. i.e., support the rural economy in general, and treat proposals for expansion or enhancement of facilities on their merits, in accordance with ‘the usual’ policies (e.g., on Green Belt).
 2. Plan positively for houseboat and residential caravan developments.
 3. Plan less positively for caravan / houseboat development, restricting such uses in the Green Belt in order to preserve its openness.

Overview of current baseline: The existing baseline is the current WLLP policy approach. This seeks to support the rural economy in general and treat proposal for expansion or enhancement of facilities on their merits, in accordance with ‘the usual’ policies (e.g. on Green Belt).

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>To plan positively for caravan and house-boat dwellers would improve the social inclusion of this demographic and would therefore have a positive effect on this objective.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option would likely have a negative impact on site provision if a more restrictive approach was to be taken, for example by restricting such uses in the Green Belt. This policy option would therefore be expected to have a negative effect compared to the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>To plan positively for caravan and houseboat dwellers would result in better provision of land/space for these homes and thereby have a positive effect when compared to the baseline. .</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This approach would see a more restrictive approach, potentially resulting in fewer housing opportunities these communities. This policy option would therefore be expected to have a negative effect compared to the baseline position.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>Positively planning for houseboat and residential caravan sites could help support the rural economy as these tend to be the areas in which such uses naturally fall. Allocating specific areas of land for such uses could help promote and support links to those local, rural economies and would therefore be a positive effect compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>A more restrictive approach would limit such uses in the Green Belt and/or only permit development where a good number of facilities are close by. This may result in weaker support for the rural economy where these uses tend to be naturally based.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This policy option would likely have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective. However, positive planning for houseboats and caravans could ensure that they are sited in the most sustainable locations, thereby limiting the need for private vehicular use (more relevant to caravans than houseboats).</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This policy option would likely have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective. However, less positive planning for houseboats and caravans could mean that they are sited in the least sustainable locations, thereby increasing the need for private vehicular use (more relevant to caravans than houseboats).</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>Planning positively for caravan and houseboat developments would mean that land would be allocated specifically for such uses. These allocations may include green belt, and so this approach could have a negative effect on land resources. Conversely, allocations could better proactively protect land resources rather than dealing with applications for these uses 'reactively'.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A more restrictive approach, for example restricting such uses from the Green Belt, could help protect land resources and direct development to the most appropriate sites / areas. This policy option would therefore be expected to have a positive effect compared to the baseline position.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective. Impacts on landscape would be dependent on any sites chosen.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective. However, restricting such uses in the Green Belt could help protect the openness of that landscape.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2 (the baseline position) and therefore will have a neutral effect on the baseline</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy approach would result in the LPA being able to plan positively in terms of where local services and community infrastructure would be required to serve this community. This policy option would therefore be expected to have a positive effect compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This approach could only permit development where a good number of facilities are close by, which could place additional pressures on local services and community infrastructure, although this impact would be expected to be limited owing to the relatively small number of residential caravan sites / houseboat marinas. The policy could help direct these types of development to the most sustainable areas. This policy option would therefore be expected to have a neutral or positive effect compared to the baseline position.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would seek to continue with the current WLLP policy and therefore would have a neutral effect on the existing baseline position.

Option 2 would pro-actively ensure that there is sufficient land within close proximity to services and transport links, although this could result in a loss of land resources or impact on the landscape.

Option 3 is a more restrictive approach and would result in a negative effect when compared to the baseline in terms of housing, the local economy and social inclusion. As a result, this is the least sustainable of the options.

Overall, Option 1 would be the most sustainable option as it continues with the existing current baseline would help support the rural economy and treats proposals for the expansion or enhancement of facilities on their merits, in accordance with other policies.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01i – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show people (GTTS)

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Allocate sites in which Travellers currently occupy, or own.
 2. Allocate suitable sites (including through CPO) to meet Traveller needs in areas where Traveller needs exist
 3. Set aside part of new housing / employment site allocations as Traveller sites
 4. Leave the matter of a Traveller site allocation to a future DPD
 5. A hybrid of options 1-3

Current baseline: There is no GTTS policy in the current Local Plan, and so guidance 'defaults' to national policy. The NPPF should be read in conjunction with the Government's planning policy for traveller sites, and sets that plans should reflect the different types of housing needed for different groups including travellers.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This approach would formalise the existing baseline position, which, in the absence of policy, presently allows travellers to stay on unauthorised sites. Some of those existing sites are in areas at high flood risk.</p> <p>Accommodation for the elderly (GTTS) would be provided by virtue of overall provision but not beyond the existing baseline.</p> <p>It may improve quality of life by giving GTTS more certainty in residing in a settled location, with similar access to schools and health services.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>Use of Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs) of more suitable sites could improve access to services and improve quality of life by allowing GTTS more certainty in residing in a settled location, with similar access to schools and health services. It could also reduce isolation in the community.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This approach would set aside part of new site allocations for GTTS. As these allocations would most likely be in the most sustainable areas of the Borough, it would improve quality of life for GTTS by giving GTTS more certainty in residing in a settled location, with access to schools and health services. This approach would also be more likely to reduce isolation in the GTTS communities.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This approach would not immediately address the obligation for the LPA to find GTTS sites, as required by national policy. It would continue the existing position, with travellers allowed to stay on unauthorised sites. Longer term, without a separate, immediate DPD, quality of life may be affected as the GTTS community would not have a settled location available. This approach effectively 'kicks the can down the road', and the issues would be better wholly addressed through the Local Plan.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A hybrid option of 1,2 and 3 would allocate some existing GTTS sites, allocate additional sites to meet current needs, potentially using CPO, and set aside parts of new allocations for GTTS needs. Subsequently, this approach would formalise (some of) the existing baseline position and provide additional sites in sustainable areas. It would improve quality of life for GTTS by giving GTTS more certainty in residing in a settled location, with access to schools and health services. This approach would also be more likely to reduce isolation in the GTTS communities.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This approach would support the provision of non-mainstream housing by giving formal permanence to some existing GTTS sites and therefore would be most consistent with the baseline. However, some existing sites are in areas of high flood risk and so may not be suitable for allocation, meaning that there could be an insufficient supply of suitable sites</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>The provision of non-mainstream housing would be supported and give greater opportunity for the needs of GTTS to be met. There would be an opportunity to support the creation of more sustainable settlements through CPO'ing of suitable sites. However, in practice, this approach could possibly lead to a 'Catch 22' situation where the site could not be allocated unless the CPO were guaranteed to succeed (the site must be 'deliverable'), and the CPO would not be granted unless the site were allocated.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>The provision of non-mainstream housing would be supported and give greater opportunity for the needs of GTTS to be met. However, there would be a strong possibility that the allocation of part of a site for GTTS could affect market demand / delivery of the remainder of the site.</p>	<p>- / 0</p> <p>This approach would not immediately address the obligation for the LPA to find GTTS sites, as required by national policy. It would, in the interim, continue the existing position, with travellers allowed to stay on unauthorised sites. As a GTTS DPD would likely follow the Local Plan DPD, this would create further delay to identifying GTTS sites.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A hybrid option of 1,2 and 3 would do the most to ensure that GTTS could be flexibly delivered in accordance with need, and in the most sustainable locations – including away from flood risk areas.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. It would, in the interim, continue the existing position, with travellers allowed to stay on unauthorised sites.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Dependent on the location of any site allocations, this could increase opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use. Further assessment would be needed alongside such considerations of sites.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Dependent on the location of any site allocations, this could increase opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use. Further assessment would be needed alongside such considerations of sites.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>As a GTTS DPD would likely follow the Local Plan DPD, this would create further delay to identifying GTTS sites. It would, in the interim, continue the existing position, with travellers allowed to stay on unauthorised sites.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A hybrid option of 1,2 and 3 would do the most to ensure that GTTS could be flexibly delivered in accordance with need, and in the most sustainable locations. Dependent on the location of any site allocations, this could increase opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>This is the option most closely aligned to the current baseline position. Dependent on the sites allocated, this option may encourage the use of brownfield land. Some existing GTTS sites are in areas of high flood risk and so may not be suitable for allocation..</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Dependent on the sites CPO'd / allocated, this option may encourage the use of brownfield land. Further assessment would be needed alongside such considerations of sites.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Dependent on the sites allocated, this option may encourage the use of brownfield land. Further assessment would be needed alongside such considerations of sites.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>As a GTTS DPD would likely follow the Local Plan DPD, this would create further delay to identifying GTTS sites. It would, in the interim, continue the existing position, with travellers allowed to stay on unauthorised sites.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A hybrid option of 1,2 and 3 would do the most to ensure that GTTS could be flexibly delivered in accordance with need, and in the most sustainable locations. Dependent on the sites chosen, this option may encourage the use of brownfield land. Further assessment would be needed alongside such considerations of sites.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This is most closely aligned to the current baseline position. Dependent on the sites allocated, this option may have some impact on landscape; for example, if sites located in the Green Belt were selected there could be an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>Dependent on the sites allocated, this option may have some impact on landscape; for example, if sites located in the Green Belt were selected there could be an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt. It could also protect and enhance landscape by relocating travellers from current locations in the Green Belt to more policy compliant locations. Further assessment would be needed alongside such considerations of sites.</p>	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>Dependent on the sites allocated, this option may have some impact on landscape; for example, if sites located in the Green Belt were selected there could be an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt. It could also protect and enhance landscape by relocating travellers from current locations in the Green Belt to more policy compliant locations. Further assessment would be needed alongside such considerations of sites.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>As a GTTS DPD would likely follow the Local Plan DPD, this would create further delay to identifying GTTS sites. It would, in the interim, continue the existing position, with travellers allowed to stay on unauthorised sites.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>A hybrid option of 1,2 and 3 would do the most to ensure that GTTS could be flexibly delivered in accordance with need, and in the most sustainable locations. Dependent on the sites chosen, this option may have some impact on landscape; for example, if sites located in the Green Belt were selected there could be an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt. It could also protect and enhance landscape by relocating travellers from current locations in the Green Belt to more policy compliant locations. Further assessment would be needed alongside such considerations of sites.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>A number of existing sites are already located in areas at high risk of flooding (FZ3). Formalising these sites as allocations would not manage or reduce their flood risk. However, this is most closely aligned to the current baseline position and so would only prolong the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This approach would help to reduce flood risk by compulsory purchase of sites for a vulnerable type of development in areas at lower risk. It would improve the baseline situation by potentially re-locating a proportion of needs away from areas at high flood risk. This would require further assessment once actual sites were known.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This approach would seek to allocate GTTS sites away from areas of flood risk, so improving the current baseline position. Further assessment would be needed alongside such considerations of sites.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>As a GTTS DPD would likely follow the Local Plan DPD, this would create further delay to identifying GTTS sites. It would, in the interim, continue the existing position, with travellers allowed to stay on unauthorised sites, some of which are located in areas at high risk of flooding.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A hybrid option of 1,2 and 3 would do the most to ensure that GTTS could be flexibly delivered in accordance with need, and in the most sustainable locations – including away from areas of high flood risk.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>?</p> <p>It is not certain that this approach could meet needs where they arise and therefore could result in longer journeys, hence more emissions compared to the baseline situation. Further assessment would be needed alongside the considerations of sites.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>It is not certain that this approach could meet needs where they arise and, therefore, could result in longer journeys, hence more emissions compared to the baseline situation. Further assessment would be needed alongside the considerations of sites.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>A hybrid option of 1,2 and 3 would do the most to ensure that GTTS could be flexibly delivered in the most sustainable locations. The location of sites may have an impact on journeys and air quality. Further assessment would be needed alongside the considerations of sites.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>?</p> <p>The effects of this option depend on the location of sites. Authorised (allocated) sites rather than unauthorised sites are less likely to mean harm to biodiversity or habitats. This is not guaranteed, however and further assessment would be needed alongside the considerations of sites.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>The effects of this option depend on the location of sites. Authorised (allocated) sites rather than unauthorised sites are less likely to mean harm to biodiversity or habitats. This is not guaranteed, however and further assessment would be needed alongside the considerations of sites.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>?</p> <p>The effects of this option depend on the location of sites. Authorised (allocated) sites rather than unauthorised sites are less likely to mean harm to biodiversity or habitats. This is not guaranteed, however and further assessment would be needed alongside the considerations of sites.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
	0	+ / ?	+ / ?	0 / -	+ / ?
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	This is most closely aligned to the current baseline position. Formalising the sites would be unlikely to affect local services and community infrastructure.	This approach would CPO sites for GTTS, likely co-locating them with the settled community. As these allocations would most likely be in the most sustainable areas of the Borough, it would improve quality of life for GTTS by giving GTTS more certainty in residing in a settled location, with access to schools and health services. Further assessment would be needed alongside the considerations of sites.	This approach would set aside part of new site allocations for GTTS, co-locating them with the settled community. As these allocations would most likely be in the most sustainable areas of the Borough, it would improve quality of life for GTTS by giving GTTS more certainty in residing in a settled location, with access to schools and health services. Further assessment would be needed alongside the considerations of sites.	As a GTTS DPD would likely follow the Local Plan DPD, this would create further delay to identifying GTTS sites. It would, in the interim, continue the existing position, with travellers allowed to stay on unauthorised sites, which may not be close to local services and community infrastructure.	A hybrid option of 1,2 and 3 would do the most to ensure that GTTS could be flexibly delivered in accordance with need, and in the most sustainable locations. It would improve quality of life for GTTS by giving GTTS more certainty in residing in a settled location, with access to schools and health services. Further assessment would be needed alongside the considerations of sites.

Summary

Option 1 is closest aligned to the current baseline position but would serve to authorise those sites – a positive effect relative to the baseline.

Option 2 is potentially more sustainable than the baseline and GTTS site allocations would create some positive effects in relation to health, social inclusion, housing and flooding. However, much of the outcomes are linked to the location of sites, which is not known at this time. Further assessment would be needed alongside the consideration of sites.

Option 3 compares positively to the baseline and would create some positive effects in relation to health, social inclusion, housing and flooding. However, much of the outcomes are linked to the location of sites, which is not known at this time. Further assessment would be needed alongside the consideration of sites.

Option 4 effectively delays the identification of GTTS sites, preventing them from being considered holistically within the Local Plan. It would fail to immediately address GTTS needs and effectively 'kicks the can' further down the road.

Option 5, a hybrid of options 1,2 and 3, is considered the most sustainable and would do the most to ensure that GTTS sites could be flexibly delivered in accordance with need, and in the most sustainable locations, creating positive effects across many of the objectives. As before, many of the outcomes are linked to the location of sites, which is not known at this time, but this option enables the most flexible approach. Further assessment would be needed alongside the consideration of sites.

Overall, Option 5 is considered the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC01j – Accommodation for Temporary Agricultural Workers

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. Continue with a similar policy to current approach, which allows for the re-use of existing buildings, and for non-permanent accommodation (subject to certain criteria).
 2. Have a more relaxed policy, allowing it in the countryside and Green Belt with minimal criteria to satisfy.
 3. Have no policy at all on accommodation for temporary agricultural workers, but simply rely on national Green Belt/Countryside policy in general.

Overview of current baseline: WLLP Policy RS5 supports the re-use of existing buildings (in settlements and in the countryside, including the Green Belt) to accommodate temporary agricultural workers, provided it complies with other policy. It also allows for non-permanent accommodation subject to certain criteria, e.g., there exists a need, there are no existing buildings that could be used, the site is the most suitable in the area, and the impact is minimised / mitigated. Option 1 is therefore most closely aligned to the current baseline position.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option could have a minor negative impact on this objective as it may result in a larger number of agricultural workers living within the countryside, away from services which could affect health and wellbeing and social inclusion</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This approach would rely on national policy and consequently give less local control over accommodation for temporary agricultural workers. It may have a minor negative effect on this objective when compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A more relaxed policy could help deliver greater amounts of temporary agricultural workers accommodation.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This approach would rely on national policy and consequently give less local control over accommodation for temporary agricultural workers. A more relaxed approach could help deliver greater amounts of temporary agricultural workers accommodation.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option could result in an increase in temporary workers in the area supporting employment needs and local rural economies.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This approach would rely on national policy and consequently give less local control over accommodation for temporary agricultural workers. This policy option could result in an increase in temporary workers in the area supporting employment needs and local rural economies.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. A more relaxed policy would give the Council less control over the location of this accommodation in Green Belt, potentially meaning it would be sited away from services and therefore there could be greater demand for transportation.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Relying on national policy would give the Council less control over the location of this accommodation in Green Belt, potentially meaning it would be sited away from services and therefore there could be greater demand for transportation.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would have a negative impact on the green belt and potentially agricultural land, as it could result in more accommodation being sited in these locations.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option could have a negative impact on the green belt, and potentially agricultural land, as it would rely on national policy and consequently give less local control over accommodation for temporary agricultural workers by requiring any area specific criteria to be met.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would be expected to have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. However, a more relaxed policy could impact on the openness of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would be expected to have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. However, relying on national policy could impact on the openness of the Green Belt.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy RS5 and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is a continuation of current policy and therefore would have a neutral effect on the baseline position.

Option 2 would seek to relax the existing policy on Temporary Agricultural workers accommodation which could lead to weaker control and have negative impacts on a number of the objectives .

Option 3 would rely on National Green Belt / Countryside policy and give the Council less local control over accommodation for temporary agricultural workers, which would likely create negative effects on sustainability when compared to the current baseline.

Overall, Option 1 is considered to be the most sustainable approach.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC02 – Place-Making

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. A set of principles for good 'place-making' that should be followed wherever possible, both for new ('greenfield / large empty site) development, and for schemes within existing built-up areas or settlements.
 2. Have no Place Making policy.
 3. Have site-specific development briefs.
 4. Have a stronger policy.

Overview of current baseline: In the absence of an existing WLLP Policy, the current baseline is the NPPF, Chapter 12- Achieving well-designed places. It places the onus on the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places being fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. It should create better places in which to live and work and help make development acceptable to communities.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>++</p> <p>This policy approach will result in additional principles, including considering the health of residents / occupiers / visitors , along with dementia-friendly layouts, 'greener' places and promoting active travel which would all help further improve health and wellbeing., whilst pursuing '20 minute neighbourhoods' would help promote social inclusion., . This will go beyond the guidance within the NPPF and will therefore have a positive impact when considered against the existing baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents little or no effect compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy approach would only apply place-making principles to specific development sites through site-specific development briefs. It would bring positive benefits to those sites but would fail to influence place-making on non-allocated sites. It would be expected to have a positive impact when considered against the baseline of National policy.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach would help support the creation of healthier places, and therefore would have a positive effect compared to the baseline. However, a stronger policy may stifle development where a single proposed principle is not achieved. This is considered to be less sustainable and would not encourage new and sustainable development in the borough.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>+</p> <p>This approach would help support the creation of sustainable settlements, that can better address the needs of its residents, and therefore would have a positive effect compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents little or no effect compared to the baseline</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would assist in the development of specific sites within the borough and therefore would contribute to the delivery of well-designed and sustainable housing. However, by limiting the development briefs to specific sites, consistent development styles may be difficult to achieve across the borough. As such it is a minor positive impact when considered against the baseline.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach would help support the creation of sustainable settlements, that can better address the needs of its residents, and therefore would have a positive effect compared to the baseline. However, a stronger policy may stifle development where a single proposed principle is not achieved and may result in reduced delivery of housing sites.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents little or no effect compared to the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would seek to encourage active travel within the borough and would also promote the '20-minute neighbourhood' concept. Therefore, this option would have a positive impact on active transport within the borough when compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents little or no effect compared to the baseline</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy approach would make a positive improvement to promoting active travel, however this would be only around the specific development sites listed. As such a minor positive impact would be seen.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach would help promote active travel, and seek to reduce car usage, and therefore would have a positive effect compared to the baseline. However, a stronger policy may stifle development where a single proposed principle is not achieved and may result in reduced delivery of housing sites.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no effect compared to the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option may make a positive contribution to new development maintaining or enhancing the local heritage and landscape of the borough through design principles. As such it is considered to make a positive impact when considered against the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no effect compared to the baseline</p>	<p>+</p> <p>As this policy option would only relate to a number of specific sites, the potential for good design would be site specific. As such a minor positive impact would be seen when compared to the existing baseline.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach could help enhance the local heritage and landscape of the borough through design principles, and therefore would have a positive effect compared to the baseline. However, a stronger policy may stifle development where a single proposed principle is not achieved and may result in reduced delivery of housing sites.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would include principles promoting active travel, to reduce private vehicular use, and making 'greener' places. Such design improvements would have a positive impact on the Boroughs adaptation to and mitigation of climate change. As such it is considered to have a positive impact when compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no effect compared to the baseline).</p>	<p>+</p> <p>As this policy option would only relate to a number of specific sites, the potential for climate mitigation would be site specific. As such a minor positive impact would be seen when compared to the existing baseline.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach could help the Borough better adapt and mitigate to climate change through a variety of design principles, and therefore would have a positive effect compared to the baseline .A stricter policy may stifle development, which in turn may result in the loss of climate mitigation opportunities for the borough.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would include a principle which would relate to 'nature' which includes reference to water resources. As such it is considered to have a positive impact when compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no effect compared to the baseline</p>	<p>+</p> <p>As this policy option would only relate to a number of specific sites, the potential to protect water resources would be site specific and not borough wide. As such a minor positive impact would be seen when compared to the existing baseline.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach could help the Borough better adapt and mitigate to climate change through a variety of design principles, and therefore would have a positive effect compared to the baseline. However, a stricter policy may stifle development, which in turn may result in the loss of water resource protection opportunities for the borough.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would include principles promoting active travel, to reduce private vehicular use, and making 'greener' places which would, in turn, help improve air quality.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no effect compared to the baseline</p>	<p>+</p> <p>As this policy option would only relate to a number of specific sites, the potential to improve air quality would be site specific and not borough wide. As such a minor positive impact would be seen when compared to the existing baseline.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach could help the Borough improve air quality and therefore would have a positive effect compared to the baseline. However, a stronger policy may stifle development where a single proposed principle is not achieved and may result in reduced delivery of housing sites.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would include a principle which would relate to 'nature' which includes reference to biodiversity. As such it is considered to have a positive impact when compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no effect compared to the baseline</p>	<p>+</p> <p>As this policy option would only relate to a number of specific sites, the potential for biodiversity mitigation and ecological network improvements would be site specific. As such a minor positive impact would be seen when compared to the existing baseline.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach could help the Borough better enhance biodiversity, through a variety of design principles, and therefore would have a positive effect compared to the baseline. However, a stricter policy may stifle development, which in turn may result in the loss biodiversity improvement opportunities for the borough</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. It would promote improved accessibility to services, through '20-minute neighbourhoods' but delivery of services are in the control of other policies.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would rely on national policy. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no effect compared to the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. It would promote improved accessibility to services, through '20-minute neighbourhoods' but delivery of services are in the control of other policies.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. It would promote improved accessibility to services, through '20-minute neighbourhoods' but delivery of services are in the control of other policies.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would be the most sustainable option as it would promote good, sustainable design for development across the borough and would result in positive impacts for the majority of the objectives.

Option 2 would seek to continue to follow the existing National Policy approach and therefore would have a neutral effect on the existing baseline position.

Option 3 would be delivered in a site-specific manner therefore the positive benefits would not be felt borough wide, and so it is not the most sustainable of the options.

Option 4 is a stronger policy and so in principle could deliver the largest benefits to sustainability. However, a stricter policy could potentially stifle development due to being overly restrictive.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC03 – Preserving and utilising our heritage

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. A policy to preserve and enhance the Borough's cultural and heritage assets
 2. Do not have a heritage policy (rely on national policy)
 3. Have a very prescriptive policy

Current baseline: The NPPF sets out the importance of conserving the historic environment. WLLP Policy EN4 then locally guides the preservation and enhancement West Lancashire's cultural and heritage assets.

Option 1 therefore represents the current baseline position.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to the baseline / current policy. This option would have little or no effect on this objective, except to say that cultural and heritage assets can help create attractive environments which enhance health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would remove a local policy relating to culture and heritage assets and result in the Council having a weaker control over their management. As these assets can help create attractive environments that can enhance health and wellbeing, less control could negatively affect quality of life.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would lead to tighter control over cultural and heritage assets compared to the current baseline but would lead to a more inflexible approach. This can often make it harder to protect cultural and heritage assets, which can often enhance health and wellbeing.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to the current policy. This option would continue the current approach, so, in comparison with the current baseline, it would be unlikely to affect this objective.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This approach would rely solely on national policy to protect the historic environment from inappropriate development. It would mean more varied development would be allowed, which could affect the Borough's historic and cultural environment.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce significantly greater control over the design of development affecting the Borough's heritage assets, going beyond national policy. Whilst it would provide tighter, more prescriptive control over cultural and heritage assets, this inflexibility can make it harder to preserve and enhance those assets.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>

Summary

Option 1 is the option most aligned to the current policy, and would just continue the baseline approach to preserve and enhance the Borough's cultural and heritage assets

Option 2 would remove a local policy to rely solely on national policy to protect the historic environment from inappropriate development. This may allow more varied development, which could detrimentally affect the Borough's historic and cultural environment.

Option 3 would lead to tighter, more prescriptive control over cultural and heritage assets, compared to the current baseline, but would lead to a more inflexible approach. This can often make it harder to preserve or enhance cultural and heritage assets.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES / HC04 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. A flexible approach to maintain some control over community facilities. This would let the market and community decide what facilities should be delivered and where but would have measures to help control the unnecessary loss of services.
 2. Guide development in relation to specific development sites or infrastructure types. This would set out in detail which community facilities should be provided or protected in different locations across the Borough.
 3. Do nothing to control the provision or loss of community facilities and rely on national policy instead.

Overview of current baseline: The baseline is represented by two Local Plan policies and the NPPF. Local Plan Policies IF1 and IF3 deal with community facilities. IF1 indicates that the loss of such facilities within centres will be resisted unless the facility is no longer needed, or the services provided by it can be served in a suitably accessible alternative location. Policy IF3 deals with community facilities more generally in terms of both new provision and their loss (including open space). Loss will be resisted unless it can be shown that the facility is no longer needed or can be relocated to an equally accessible location. The NPPF is also relevant and indicates that community facilities should be positively planned for and their unnecessary loss resisted. It also states that they should be retained to support the rural economy.

Whilst none of the policy options exactly reflect the baseline position, option 1 represents the closest to it.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have minimal effect in relation to this topic as it would closely reflect the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. By guiding development and setting out in detail which community infrastructure facilities should be provided and protected it could better facilitate the provision of services for the elderly and potentially reduce health inequalities. It would provide focussed opportunities to protect or enhance areas of public open and recreational space thus supporting physical and mental health improvement and encouraging healthier lifestyles. This prescriptive approach could better ensure that specific services are located in the most accessible areas. However, it would be less responsive to changing needs and local demands.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative effect on the topic compared to the baseline. It would not facilitate the provision of services for the elderly, would not improve quality of life in deprived areas and for deprived groups and would potentially increase health inequalities. These matters could be addressed, to some extent, by national planning advice but in a more piecemeal manner.</p> <p>This option would not provide opportunities to enhance areas of public open and recreational space, and Green Infrastructure, so to support opportunities for physical and mental health improvement and therefore encourage healthier lifestyles. Nevertheless, this matter would be addressed by other policy options within the Plan. Additionally, national planning advice seeks to protect such open space.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have minimal effect in relation to this topic as it would closely reflect the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic compared to the baseline. The option's focussed approach could be used to retain or promote access to, and provision of, services in rural areas.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative effect on the topic compared to the baseline, primarily because it would not promote access to, and provision of, services in rural areas. Whilst national policy would seek to retain accessible local services and community facilities in order to support the rural economy, this could be expected to be on more of a piecemeal basis.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option may have some effects on this topic compared to the baseline, potentially in terms of encouraging the use of brownfield land in preference to greenfield land. However, this is likely to be limited to when other Plan policies on development sites are taken into account.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option could help reduce or manage flood risk by guiding development to specific sites. However, this is likely to be limited when other Plan policies dealing with development sites are also taken into account.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have minimal effect in relation to this topic as it would closely reflect the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive effect on the topic compared to the baseline. It would potentially improve the quantity and quality of, and access to, areas of open and recreational space, and to Green Infrastructure and would therefore encourage healthier lifestyles and assist in reducing health inequalities. This prescriptive approach could better ensure that specific services are located in the most accessible areas. However, it would be less responsive to changing needs and local demands.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative effect on the topic compared to the baseline. It would not improve the quantity and quality of, and access to, areas of open and recreational space, and to Green Infrastructure and would therefore not encourage healthier lifestyles. It would also not assist in reducing health inequalities.</p>

Summary

Option 1 closely resembles the baseline situation so would have a neutral effect overall in relation to sustainability.

Option 2 is more detailed and geographically focused, and would have positive effects in relation to population, health and social inclusion, local economy and employment and local services and community infrastructure topics. However, it would be more inflexible to changing / future needs of communities and market demand.

Option 3 proposes no policy, instead relying upon national planning advice and market forces, so is inferior to the baseline as it could be expected to act on a more piecemeal basis. As such, negative effects have been identified in relation to the population, health and social inclusion, local economy and employment and local services and community infrastructure topics.

On balance, Options 1 is considered the most sustainable because of its flexibility to future changing demands.

ECONOMY & EMPLOYMENT / EE01 – EMPLOYMENT AREAS

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Update and amend the existing policy. Reduce the number of existing 'core / traditional' employment areas. Identify business sectors that it would be desirable for the Borough to diversify towards. Outside the 'core' employment areas, allow a wider range of commercial uses in line with changes to the national Use Classes Order, e.g. shops. Set out when these areas could be redeveloped for non-commercial uses e.g. housing. (Additional employment areas for the new Local Plan period would be allocated under a different policy.)
 2. Update the existing policy in a limited way to reflect the new amount of land needed for employment uses over the Local Plan period, as well as changes to the Use Classes Order.
 3. Zone areas for a wide range of economic activities. Within these zones, there would be limited planning controls in order to encourage business growth akin to the former national Enterprise Zones.

Current baseline: WLLP Policy EC1 sets out how much employment land is to be provided and designates three types of employment land around West Lancashire, affording to each varying levels of protection. National policy is set out in the NPPF and the recently revised Use Classes Order, allowing more flexibility in changing between certain employment uses and other commercial uses.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>Whilst it could be argued that allowing for a greater diversity of uses on some employment sites under the preferred new policy could lead to additional jobs / better prospects when applying for jobs, this change comes as a result of changes to national policy, which is part of the baseline position. As such, this option represents no net change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>As for Option 1, whilst it could be argued that allowing for a greater diversity of uses on some employment sites under this policy option could lead to additional jobs / better prospects when applying for jobs, this change comes as a result of changes to national policy, part of the baseline position. As such, this option represents no net change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>Setting up 'Zones' with limited planning controls in order to encourage business growth should in theory result in more jobs and better prospects for those applying for jobs. It would remain to be seen whether this growth would come at the expense of other employment areas in the Borough or whether it is additional investment compared to the baseline. No change / net positive change.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>As for the Population, Health and Social Inclusion objective (above), it could be argued that allowing for a greater diversity of uses on employment sites could lead to additional jobs and / or a wider range of jobs under the preferred new policy, but this change stems from national policy which is part of the baseline position. Reducing the number of 'core' employment areas that are protected for 'traditional' employment uses may lead to fewer such jobs, but these would most likely be replaced with more diverse jobs. Allowing changes from employment uses to housing could lead to a loss in jobs, but again this stems from national policy, part of the baseline position.</p> <p>Overall, this option represents no net change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>As for Option 1, it could be argued that allowing for a greater diversity of uses on employment sites could lead to additional jobs and / or a wider range of jobs under the preferred new policy, but this change stems from national policy which is part of the baseline position.</p> <p>No change relative to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / + / ?</p> <p>Setting up 'Zones' in which there would be limited planning controls in order to encourage business growth should in theory result in more jobs and better employment opportunities compared to the baseline position. Whether other benefits under this objective would be achieved depends on the location of the 'Zones' and how they relate to deprived areas, town centres, etc. It would remain to be seen whether this growth would come at the expense of other employment areas (e.g. business relocating from elsewhere in West Lancashire as opposed to moving into the Borough).</p> <p>No change or net positive change relative to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option should have little or no effect compared to the baseline position. Improved transport networks / improvements for opportunities for sustainable and active travel to employment areas would be achieved through transport and health policies rather than through this policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should have little or no effect compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should have little or no effect compared to the baseline position. Effects on travel patterns, etc. will depend on the location of the specific 'Zones'.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>Overall, there should be little or no change under this SA objective relative to the baseline. Allowing for a greater diversity of uses on some employment areas may lead to less vacant or derelict land, and may encourage brownfield redevelopment, but these changes are as a result of national policy which forms part of the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>Overall, there should be little or no change under this SA objective relative to the baseline. Allowing for a greater diversity of uses on some employment areas may lead to less vacant or derelict land, and may encourage brownfield redevelopment, but, as for Option 1, these changes are as a result of national policy which forms part of the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / - / +</p> <p>Overall, there should be little or no change under this SA objective relative to the baseline. Whether it leads to less derelict land and greater or lesser take-up of brownfield land depends on the location of the 'Zones' and whether these sites are brownfield or greenfield.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in no, or negligible, change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in no, or negligible, change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in no, or negligible, change relative to the baseline. Presumably any 'Zones' would not be located in areas where they harm the landscape or historic environment.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy & flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in no, or negligible, change relative to the baseline. Whilst different new employment uses could lessen the need for carbon-based energy generation or use, and could have improved resilience to the likely effects of climate change, this would be achieved through other Local Plan policies, not this one.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in no, or negligible, change relative to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in no, or negligible, change relative to the baseline position. There is the possibility that new buildings could be energy-efficient and / or zero carbon, but the same could be said for new development under Options 1 and 2.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in little or no change relative to the baseline for this objective. Improvements in relation to water quality and resources would be achieved through other policies.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in little or no change relative to the baseline position for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in little or no change relative to the baseline position for this objective.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in no, or negligible, change relative to the baseline for this objective. Whilst new, different employment uses could change levels or patterns of congestion, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions, these would come as a result of national policy (which is part of the baseline position), regardless of whether or not this policy option were pursued.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should result in no, or negligible, change relative to the baseline position for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>As for Options 1 and 2, this policy option should result in no, or negligible, change relative to the baseline position for this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would be expected to result in minimal or no change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would be expected to result in minimal or no change relative to the baseline position for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would be expected to result in minimal or no change relative to the baseline position for this objective.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>Allowing for a wider variety of uses on certain employment sites could improve people's access to certain services (equally, it could make access less good), but once again the policy that allows such changes is a national policy that forms part of the baseline position. Therefore no overall change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>As for Option 1, allowing for a wider variety of uses on certain employment sites could improve people's access to certain services (or could make access less good for other services), but the policy that allows such changes is a national policy that forms part of the baseline position. No change overall relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>Whether or not this option results in easier access to services compared to the baseline position depends on the location of any 'Zones' and how easily accessible they are by active and sustainable transport modes.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is judged to have no net effect relative to the baseline position. This is because it either carries on with the current Local Plan approach, or else makes changes that are in line with national policy. The current Local Plan and national policy represent the baseline.

Option 2 is also judged to have no net effect relative to the baseline position for similar reasons to Option 1.

Option 3 could have positive effects relative to the baseline position on three of the sustainability appraisal 'topic areas' but these depend on the location of the 'Zones' being in appropriate places and the occupants of the 'Zones' moving into the Borough from outside, rather than relocating within the Borough.

Overall, if these criteria were met, Option 3 could be considered the most sustainable; otherwise all options are similar to the baseline position.

ECONOMY & EMPLOYMENT / EE02 – RURAL ECONOMY

- Summary of 'options':**
1. This option would be a little less restrictive than existing Local Plan policy. It would promote the protection of the countryside; would seek to protect viable existing rural employment, agricultural, tourist and visitor uses; 'employment uses' definition would include all job-creating uses. There would be specific rural development site allocation(s). Expansion / diversification of rural businesses would be encouraged at an appropriate scale. Development of best quality agricultural land would only be permitted where absolutely necessary.
 2. Continue with existing Local Plan policy, i.e. protect the best quality agricultural land, protect existing rural employment sites and re-use existing buildings where they would be left vacant; allow rural business growth in certain circumstances; promote tourism of an appropriate scale.
 3. Increased development in rural areas. This would entail the allocation of a greater quantity of land in rural areas for employment purposes. This may provide new opportunities for agricultural produce packing and distribution facilities and / or for rural technology hubs. It would support visitor attractions and larger scale commercial uses, for example larger farm shops.
- Overview of current baseline:** As per Option 2 above, WLLP policy EC2 protects the best quality agricultural land and existing rural employment sites; it allows for re-use of existing buildings where they would be left vacant; it allows for rural business growth in certain circumstances; it promotes tourism of an appropriate scale. National policy is set out in the NPPF and further clarification provided in Planning Practice Guidance.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>By allowing a greater variety of job-creating / job-sustaining uses in rural areas, this option could result in a minor positive change compared to the baseline in terms of improving people's chances of success in applying for jobs (as there would be the potential for a greater number of jobs).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>By allocating more land in rural areas for employment, this option could result in a minor positive change compared to the baseline in terms of improving people's chances of success in applying for jobs (as there would be the potential for a greater number of jobs).</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>+</p> <p>By allowing for a wider variety of employment uses in rural areas (and therefore more job opportunities, access to jobs, economic benefits, rural diversification, economic growth of villages and smaller settlements), this policy option should have a positive effect compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option allocates more land for rural employment and therefore should result in more job opportunities, better access to jobs in rural area, more rural economic benefits, rural diversification and economic growth of villages and smaller settlements. This policy option would therefore be expected to have a positive effect compared to the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any noticeable effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any significant effect compared to the baseline. There could be small improvements to the transport network (e.g. from Section 106 agreements); equally there could be disbenefits e.g. more rural traffic and more greenhouse gas emissions.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option seeks to protect best and most versatile agricultural land, but so does the baseline policy position. No net effect.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>An increased amount of land allocated for rural employment could result in the loss of agricultural land and / or soil, and therefore a negative effect compared to the baseline, but this depends on where sites are allocated. If vacant, derelict and / or brownfield land were used, there could be no net effect, or even a positive effect.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any effect compared to the baseline for this objective, given the baseline position is a very similar policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any effect compared to the baseline for this objective, unless a site were allocated in an incongruous or sensitive location (which is unlikely).</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy & flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any effect compared to the baseline for this objective, given the baseline position is a very similar policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any significant net effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any effect compared to the baseline for this objective, given the baseline position is a very similar policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any significant net effect compared to the baseline for this objective. Any effects depend on the details of where sites are allocated and how their occupiers use water.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any effect compared to the baseline for this objective, given the baseline position is a very similar policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any effect compared to the baseline for this objective; effects would depend on the occupiers and the nature of their business(es).</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any effect compared to the baseline for this objective, as the baseline position is a very similar policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is unlikely to have any significant net effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>Whilst allowing for a greater variety of employment uses in rural areas and therefore, in theory, easier access to services for some rural residents, this policy option is unlikely to have any significant effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline (see comment on first Topic above).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in a greater amount of employment in rural areas and therefore, in theory, easier access to services for some rural residents. However, overall, this policy option is unlikely to have any significant effect compared to the baseline for this particular objective.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is similar to current policy (and therefore the baseline position), although it allows for a wider variety of employment uses in rural areas which could result in more jobs and an improvement in the rural economy.

Option 2 represents a continuation of current policy, and thus a continuation of the baseline position.

Option 3 allocates more land for rural employment and should have economic and possibly minor (social) benefits compared to the baseline but could also result in environmental disbenefits.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable given its expected positive effects and lack of negative effects compared to the baseline position, although option 3 could also be considered sustainable if negative effects are avoided (e.g. by allocating the extra sites on non-sensitive brownfield land).

ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT / EE03 – TOWN CENTRES

Summary of 'options':

1. **One overarching policy for centres, with additional supporting policies / strategies for Burscough, Ormskirk and Skelmersdale centres.** *The overarching policy would include the centre hierarchy, the requirements for sequential and impact assessments, the approach towards deciding uses that would be permitted in centres, and when new stand-alone local convenience stores would be permitted. Development will need to be of an appropriate scale to the centre to which they relate and there would be a focus upon Skelmersdale to support the regeneration of the town. The policy would have local interpretations of the sequential approach and retail impact with minor variations from the national norm.*
Proposals for new uses within centres would be considered in relation to their contribution towards commercial activity including having a pedestrian level shop front, being open for at least part of the day and whether the use would be one typically found in a town centre, etc.
A healthy eating and drinking policy would be separate from this policy.
2. **Minimal changes to WLLP policy IF1:** a single policy for all town centres; minimum amendments to IF1, i.e. the removal of the requirement for a minimum of 70% retail uses within primary shopping areas of town centres due to changes to the Use Classes Order. The policy would deal with the centre hierarchy, the requirements for sequential and impact assessments, and permitted uses in centres.
3. **One single general policy (similar to the preferred approach) in relation to centres and appropriate uses but no additional and separate policies for Burscough, Ormskirk, and Skelmersdale town centres.**
4. **One overarching policy in relation to centres and appropriate uses with additional supporting policies** for Burscough, Ormskirk and Skelmersdale town centres, but without a separate healthy eating and drinking policy - these matters (as much as they could be) would be dealt with through this town centre policy (meaning that matters such as distance of takeaways from schools wouldn't be dealt with).

Overview of current baseline:

The baseline policy position comprises WLLP policy IF1: Maintaining Vibrant Town and Local Centres, and national policy, which includes recent amendments to the Use Classes Order and permitted development rights. The general situation has been affected by Covid and the accelerated growth in online retailing.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This option, whilst indirectly contributing towards some of the sub-criteria for this topic area, would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position (which comprises national policy and a not significantly dissimilar current Local Plan policy). The healthy eating policy is assessed separately.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>As with option 1, this option, whilst indirectly contributing towards some of the sub-criteria for this topic area, would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position (which includes an almost identical current Local Plan policy). The healthy eating policy is assessed separately.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>As with option 1, this option, whilst indirectly contributing towards some of the sub-criteria for this topic area, would not be expected to represent any material change compared to the baseline position. Including the healthy eating policy may improve matters in town centres but having no policy for take-aways near schools would be a negative consequence, although this is the current baseline position (no policy at present). Thus no significant change overall.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>As with option 1, this option, whilst indirectly contributing towards some of the sub-criteria for this topic area, would not be expected to represent any material change compared to the baseline position. Including the healthy eating policy may improve matters in town centres but having no policy for take-aways near schools would be a negative consequence, although this is the current baseline position (no policy at present). Thus no significant change overall.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>As above, this option could contribute towards the sub-criteria for this topic area as some housing would be permitted in town centres, but would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position given its similarity to the current Local Plan policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option could contribute towards the sub-criteria for this topic area as some housing would be permitted in town centres, but would not be expected to represent any material change compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option could contribute towards the sub-criteria for this topic area as some housing would be permitted in town centres, but would not be expected to represent any material change compared to the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option could contribute indirectly towards some of the sub-criteria for this topic area (for example a separate policy focus upon Skelmersdale should help economic regeneration there), but would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position given its similarity to the current Local Plan policy. The removal of the '70% retail units' requirement could have both positive and negative effects, but is necessary given current policy / circumstances.</p>	<p>0 / –</p> <p>Lack of a Skelmersdale-focused policy may result in negative effects for the town, so less tackling of inequalities compared to the baseline. Otherwise, this option would not be expected to represent any material change compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option could contribute indirectly towards some of the sub-criteria for this topic area (for example a policy focus upon Skelmersdale should help economic regeneration there), but would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal direct effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position given its similarity to the current Local Plan policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal direct effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal direct effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy framework for town centre proposals could help support brownfield redevelopment and reduce vacant 'land'. Overall, however, this option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position given its similarity to the current Local Plan policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal overall effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal overall effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>Contributions towards built environment quality would come from design policies. Thus this option would have minimal effects compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position given its similarity to the current Local Plan policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>
Climate change / climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position given its similarity to the current Local Plan policy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal, if any, effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>Whilst a town centre policy should help maintain or increase people's access to services, this option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position as the baseline policy is similar.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would not represent any material change compared to the baseline position given its similarity to the current Local Plan policy.</p>	<p>0 / –</p> <p>Not having a specific Burscough, Ormskirk or Skelmersdale focus may possibly in theory lead to fewer services there compared to the baseline, but these differences would be expected to be minor.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>Whilst a town centre policy should help maintain or increase people's access to services, this option would be expected to have minimal effects under this topic area compared to the baseline position, which has a similar policy approach.</p>

Summary

Option 1, which covers similar matters to current Local Plan policy IF1 and which is consistent with national policy (i.e. the baseline position), represents no change overall with regard to the baseline position. It scores positively against some sub-criteria, as does the baseline position.

Option 2 also represents no change overall with regard to the baseline position, given its similarity to current WLLP policy IF1.

Option 3 has a couple of minor negative effects compared to the baseline on account of there being no Skelmersdale, Ormskirk or Burscough-specific policy, which could result in less regeneration of Skelmersdale town centre, or a narrower distribution of services.

Options 3 and 4 have no policy for distance of take-away from schools (outside town centres), which would represent a negative effect relative to the baseline as far as health is concerned for areas outside of town centres, but a positive effect for town centre areas.

Overall, option 1 is considered the most sustainable, having no negative effects relative to the baseline position, followed by option 2.

ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT / EE04A – SKILLS & EDUCATION

- Summary of 'options':**
1. **Support the continued development and improvement of Edge Hill University campus** and its facilities, including new purpose built student residential accommodation. Any growth beyond the existing campus would be either close by to the south of St Helens Road or within Ormskirk town centre. Require travel plans and parking strategies. to encourage sustainable travel, improve access to the campus and alleviate existing or new traffic impacts. Encourage links between the University and local businesses (information sharing and learning programmes) and seek benefits to more deprived local communities.

(HMOs and off-campus student accommodation would be dealt with separately under the Housing topic.)
 2. **Have no policy for the University campus.** The future development of the University would not be guided by a site specific policy meaning that such development may be more likely to take place away from the existing campus. Future development on campus may also be less able to be managed in terms of mix and quality.
 3. **A more detailed policy or masterplan for the University campus.** This would tightly control what is developed on-campus and where. This may reduce the flexibility for the University to respond to changing demands within the higher education sector.
 4. **A different location for the expansion of the University campus** - a satellite campus elsewhere in Ormskirk or further afield in West Lancashire rather than expanding within or close to the existing campus. It would create additional movement of students between the main campus and satellite campus and would be less likely to provide as much purpose built student accommodation thus resulting in student housing pressures in Ormskirk.
 5. **A policy to deal with the future of Edge Hill University and other education sites** (schools, higher / further education). The policy would expand to provide a broad policy framework for their future development. This would be challenging both in terms of the scope of which education facilities to include or exclude and the flexibility a policy framework would require in order to deal with a range of different sites effectively.
- Overview of current baseline:** The current Local Plan has a policy on Edge Hill University ('EHU'), supporting its growth within the Campus and allocating former Green Belt land for expansion (now developed). It seeks 'where possible' to ensure the University's benefits are future growth are directed to communities where educational attainment is lower.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option may have some positive effects in terms of participation in education through EHU linking with local businesses, although these would be minor relative to the baseline as existing policy is similar. Students would remain located close to health services and the town centre, supporting social inclusion.</p>	<p>? / –</p> <p>It is unclear what the effect of having no EHU policy would be. It is likely that effects for this topic area would be negative relative to the baseline (e.g. which encourages EHU linking with and benefitting the community).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should be similar to the baseline position in that any EHU development would be required to benefit the local area. However, constraints on future EHU growth and flexibility could limit these benefits longer-term.</p>	<p>+ / – (?)</p> <p>A satellite campus could spread economic benefits beyond Ormskirk and, if policy requires benefits to be shared with the community, this could result in positive social inclusion effects relative to the baseline. However, student housing pressures in Ormskirk could increase, which could possibly lead to negative effects.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option should have positive effects relative to the baseline in terms of participation in education, enabling skills progression, and developing the Borough's knowledge base.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>No change relative to the baseline as off-campus student accommodation would be dealt with under a separate [housing] policy. Presumably, on-campus accommodation would cater for extra students resulting from EHU expansion, so would not exacerbate or help meet <i>existing</i> needs.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change relative to the baseline as off-campus student accommodation would be dealt with under a separate [housing] policy. Presumably, on-campus accommodation would cater for extra students resulting from EHU expansion, so would not exacerbate or help meet <i>existing</i> needs.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>Off-campus student accommodation would be dealt with under a separate [housing] policy. This option may result in less accommodation provided on campus, but this meets the needs of the student population only rather than general housing needs, so no change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>–</p> <p>This option would be less likely to provide as much purpose-built student accommodation which could result in extra student housing pressures compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option should have no effect relative to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>+</p> <p>This option could result in minor positive effects compared to the baseline as it allows for the expansion of EHU so there would be some extra direct and knock-on economic growth as a result.</p>	<p>0 / –</p> <p>Overall, no change / minor negative change relative to the baseline. EHU may expand and provide economic growth, but there would be no requirement to seek to benefit the local community / businesses, etc as under current policy.</p>	<p>0 / –</p> <p>Overall, no change or minor negative change relative to the baseline. EHU may not expand to the same extent as under option 1, which limits the possibility of knock-on benefits to the local community / businesses.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A satellite campus could bring economic benefits to other parts of the Borough. If it is required for benefits to be shared with the community (as with baseline policy), this could result in positive effects relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option should have minor positive effects relative to the baseline as a positive framework for development of education facilities should result in knock-on economic benefits. Given the effects are indirect, they are not expected to be significant with regard to this topic area.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0 / –</p> <p>An expanded EHU would presumably generate more traffic relative to the baseline, but travel plans would be designed to encourage sustainable travel. No change, or minor negative change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>–</p> <p>An expanded EHU would presumably generate more traffic relative to the baseline. There would be no requirement for travel plans under this policy to mitigate negative effects, therefore negative relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / –</p> <p>An expanded EHU would presumably generate more traffic relative to the baseline, but travel plans would be designed to encourage sustainable travel. No change, or minor negative change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>–</p> <p>Having a satellite campus could create additional movement of students between campuses, so more journeys relative to the baseline. These could be mitigated to an extent through sustainable travel plans.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>It is unclear what effects this option would have on transport. For schools and colleges, it is most likely there would be no net effects relative to the baseline. For EHU, effects would depend on the framework for future growth and where this would be.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>– (/+?)</p> <p>Expanding the EHU campus south of St Helens Road would lead to loss of greenfield / agricultural land. Alternatively, land used in Ormskirk Town Centre could be brownfield. Overall, effects are more likely to be negative compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>– / ?</p> <p>If EHU were to expand under this option, it is not known where the expansion would take place. Effects on land are more likely to be negative relative to the baseline, which sets out where new development would happen.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>As growth of EHU would be limited to the campus and tightly controlled, this should not result in any loss of greenfield or agricultural land or soil. No change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / – / + (?)</p> <p>Having a satellite campus would mean extra land-take. The effects could be negative or neutral (even positive) relative to the baseline depending on whether the satellite campus is on greenfield or brownfield / derelict land.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>As above, effects on this topic area are unclear but it would be expected that they would be zero relative to the baseline for schools / colleges, and for EHU the effects would depend on the framework for future growth.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0 / –</p> <p>Developing land south of St Helens Road could lead to negative effects on the landscape compared to the baseline position. These could be reduced or even neutralised through high quality design and screening, etc.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>If EHU were to expand under this option, it is not known where the expansion would take place. Presumably, effects on heritage would be controlled by other policies. Likely effects on landscape are unclear.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option, confining new development to the existing EHU campus, should have no effect relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / – (?)</p> <p>The effects of this option relative to the baseline depend on where any satellite campus is located. It is most likely that a campus would be within an existing settlement rather than in a sensitive landscape / heritage area.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>Overall, no net effects expected relative to the baseline. Effects relating to EHU depend on the framework for future growth and where this might take place.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option is unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option is unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Effects depend where any satellite campus is located. Presumably, flood risk areas would be avoided; new buildings could be low or zero carbon and energy-efficient.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option is unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option is unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position. Presumably sustainable drainage systems would be used for new development.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>It is unclear what effects this option would have on water quality and resources relative to the baseline position; it depends where any future growth would happen.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option is unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>Effects of this option relative to the baseline on water quality and resources would depend on where any satellite campus is located and the nature of the development.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>This option is unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position. For EHU, the nature of effects depend on the framework for future growth.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Air quality (Objective 8)	– EHU expansion would lead to extra traffic which could have negative effects on air quality. These could be mitigated through a travel plan but overall are likely to be negative relative to the baseline.	– EHU expansion would lead to extra traffic which could have negative effects on air quality. No travel plan would be required under this policy although it may be covered by other policies.	0 / – Modest on-campus EHU expansion could lead to extra traffic which could have negative effects on air quality. These could be mitigated through a travel plan so only minor effects relative to the baseline.	– A satellite campus would create additional journeys between the new and current campus. Some would be by sustainable modes, but it is expected many would be by car, so negative effects relative to the baseline.	0 / – / ? This option is unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position. For EHU, the nature of effects depend on the framework for future growth; traffic generated by future growth is likely to have negative effects relative to the baseline, in terms of air quality.
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	0 New development proposals would be subject to the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) policy, but the effects of a BNG policy are accounted for elsewhere. This option is thus unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position.	0 New development proposals would be subject to the BNG policy, but the effects of a BNG policy are accounted for elsewhere. This option is thus unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position.	0 This option is not expected to have any net effect relative to the baseline in terms of biodiversity.	0 New development proposals would be subject to the BNG policy, but the effects of a BNG policy are accounted for elsewhere. This option is thus unlikely to have any material effect on this topic area relative to the baseline position.	0 This option is not expected to have any net effect relative to the baseline in terms of biodiversity.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>New services may be provided, but these are primarily for additional students so overall there would be expected to be no net change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / –</p> <p>New services may be provided, but these would be for additional students and there would be no policy requirement to create links between EHU and the local community so overall there would be expected to be zero or negative effects relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>Only a limited number of new services (if any) may be provided, and these would be primarily for additional students, so overall there would be expected to be no net change relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>Providing a satellite campus would spread facilities from one location to two. If the policy requires EHU benefits to spread to the community (as per baseline policy) – including public use of EHU facilities, this should result in positive effects relative to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>Future development of education facilities could have a positive effect relative to the baseline if this framework included encouraging / requiring facilities to be shared with / benefit the local community. This is already the case for EHU, so effects would be minor.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would be likely to have positive effects in terms of benefits to the local economy and jobs, but negative effects in terms of land (especially if the campus were to expand to agricultural land south of St Helens Road) and transport.

Option 2 would have a mixture of negative and uncertain effects, as it would not be known how and where the University may seek to expand.

Option 3 would have fewer negative effects as development on the University campus would be strictly controlled, but there would be no positive economic effects as the future growth and development of the University would be constrained.

Option 4 would have a mixture of positive effects (spreading of economic benefits beyond Ormskirk) and negative effects (accommodation pressures and transport issues) as well as uncertainty – it would depend on the location of any satellite campus.

Option 5 should have positive economic effects and should generally avoid negative effects relative to the baseline. There is uncertainty relating to what the framework would be for Edge Hill University under this option – effects would be as per options 1-3.

Overall, option(s) 1 and 5 are considered the most sustainable, depending on whether Edge Hill University expands in Ormskirk (more sustainable) or onto greenfield land (less sustainable).

ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT / EE04B – SKILLS & TRAINING

Summary of 'options':

1. A skills and training policy

The employment of local people and use of local businesses during the construction and implementation stages of major development proposals would be promoted. Planning applications for major development would be expected to produce an employment and skills plan identifying opportunities for the employment and up-skilling of local people during the implementation phase. This policy would apply to schools, further education, and higher education.

2. Have no skills and training policy.

Overview of current baseline:

The current Local Plan and its accompanying SPDs have no skills and training policy. The NPPF does not mention skills and training. Any skills and training provided are not as a result of planning policy.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+ / ++</p> <p>This option, if taken up, would have a positive effect compared to the baseline as it should increase the level of participation and attainment in education, address skills gaps and enable skills progression, help develop the Borough's knowledge base, and improve people's chance of success in applying for jobs. There may be other knock-on effects too (e.g. having a job compared to being unemployed can have health and social benefits).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no effect on this policy area, given the baseline position has no skills and training policy, either locally or nationally.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>+ / ++</p> <p>This option should have a positive effect, possibly a significant positive effect if taken up <i>en masse</i> as it should provide job opportunities, including in the most needy areas, provide a broad range of jobs and employment opportunities, and possibly help attract workers, residents and investors to the Borough.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option will have no or little effect on this policy area.</p>

Summary

Option 1, having a skills and education policy, would provide social and economic sustainability benefits in terms of improving people's skills and possibly qualifications, and helping employment prospects compared to the baseline position, which has no such policy (the same as option 2).

Option 1 is therefore clearly the more sustainable option.

ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH / EH01 – PRESERVING AND ENHANCING THE BOROUGH'S NATURE

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Continue the current approach of WLLP Policy EN2, but include new requirement in relation to a 10% BNG
 2. Continue the current approach of WLLP Policy EN2, but include new requirement in relation to a 20% BNG
 3. Continue the current approach of WLLP Policy EN2, but with a 'banded' BNG requirement – for example, 10% in urban areas and 20% in areas with more diverse wildlife
 4. Create a separate, specific Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) policy (could be weaker or stronger than 10%). This would likely set out the details through a Supplementary Planning Document.

Current baseline: The draft Environment Bill, expected to be enacted later in 2021, will require a minimum net gain in biodiversity of 10% for new development. Essentially, biodiversity net gain (BNG) could be dealt with as a new stand-alone policy or incorporated into a wider natural environment policy. Currently the baseline position is the NPPF, which sets out the importance of achieving environmental sustainability, including improving biodiversity and net gain, and WLLP Policy EN2: Preserving and enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment – which includes reference to nature conservation sites, priority species and habitats, trees and landscaping, land resources, coastal zones and landscape character.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This is the option most aligned to the baseline / current policy but would additionally introduce the (anticipated) national BNG requirement of 10%.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, and such improvements would create attractive environments which enhance health and wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>A 10% requirement, in line with national policy, would have little/no effect compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This approach would require 20% BNG, above the national 10% requirement, but could only be introduced with appropriate evidence.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, and such a requirement would create greater, attractive environments which enhance health and wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>However, increasing requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver improvements.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This approach would support a banded BNG requirement, above the national 10% requirement, but could only be introduced with appropriate evidence.</p> <p>A 10% requirement, in line with national policy, would have little/no effect on the baseline. An additional requirement seeking up to 20% BNG would help increase biodiversity above the baseline.</p> <p>A flexible approach such as this could help maximise opportunities but would depend on a strong evidence base.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, and such a requirement would create greater, attractive environments which enhance health and wellbeing and quality of life.</p>	<p>0 / + / ?</p> <p>The creation of a specific BNG policy would be a more prescriptive approach and could set out a framework on an area basis, or how developments could contribute to off-site schemes. A specific BNG policy, with supporting SPD, would help create attractive, biodiverse environments which enhance health and wellbeing and quality of life and could go much further to tightly prescribe and control the type / location of BNG required. However, without further information on what this approach may contain, and whether it could be weaker or stronger approach, it is difficult to assess.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>The requirement for 10% BNG could have some effects on the land resources (e.g. if land was to be required for habitat creation), but this would not be expected to create any significant impacts on land resource and in most cases would be expected to make a positive contribution to restoring land to nature (re-wilding).</p> <p>As 10% BNG is to be a national requirement, formalised through local policy, it is expected that this would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / + / ?</p> <p>A higher requirement for 20% BNG could have some effects on the land resources (e.g. land required for habitat creation), but this would not be expected to create any significant impacts on land resource and in most cases would be expected to make a positive contribution to restoring land to nature (re-wilding).</p> <p>The impact of this option on land resources would likely depend on how BNG was to be delivered – on or off site, and whether new habitat areas are to be created or whether existing ones would be improved.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, but greater requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver improvements.</p>	<p>0 / + / ?</p> <p>A banded approach requiring up to 20% could have some effects on land resources, but this would not be expected to create any significant impacts on land resource and in most cases would be expected to make a positive contribution to restoring land to nature (re-wilding).</p> <p>The impact of this option would likely depend on how BNG was to be delivered – on or off site, and whether new habitat areas are to be created or whether existing ones would be improved.</p> <p>A flexible approach in relation to requirements could help maximise opportunities to improve biodiversity but would depend on a strong evidence base.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, but greater requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver improvements.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>The creation of a specific BNG policy would be a more prescriptive approach. A specific BNG policy, with supporting SPD, would help create attractive, biodiverse environments. However, without further information on what this approach may contain, and whether it could be weaker or stronger approach, it is difficult to assess the impact on land resources.</p> <p>The impact of this option would likely depend on how BNG was to be delivered – on or off site, and whether new habitat areas are to be created or whether existing ones would be improved.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>The requirement for 10% BNG could have some effects on the visual landscape (e.g. planting of more trees, habitat creation), but this would not be expected to create any significant detrimental impacts on landscape with due consideration of appropriate siting. As 10% BNG is to be a national requirement, formalised through local policy, it is expected that this would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>The additional requirement for 20% BNG could have some greater effects on the visual landscape (e.g. planting of more trees, habitat creation), but this would not be expected to create any significant impacts on landscape with due consideration of appropriate siting</p> <p>The impact of this option would likely depend on how BNG was to be delivered – on or off site, and whether new habitat areas are to be created or whether existing ones would be improved.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, but greater requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver improvements.</p>	<p>0 / ?</p> <p>A banded approach requiring up to 20% BNG could have some greater effects on the visual landscape (e.g. planting of more trees, habitat creation), but this would not be expected to create any significant impacts on landscape with due consideration of appropriate siting.</p> <p>The impact of this option would likely depend on how BNG was to be delivered – on or off site, and whether new habitat areas are to be created or whether existing ones would be improved.</p> <p>A flexible approach in relation to requirements could help maximise opportunities to improve biodiversity but would depend on a strong evidence base.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, but greater requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver improvements</p>	<p>?</p> <p>The creation of a specific BNG policy would be a more prescriptive approach. A specific BNG policy, with supporting SPD, would help create attractive, biodiverse environments. However, without further information on what this approach may contain, and whether it could be weaker or stronger approach, it is difficult to assess the impact on landscape.</p> <p>The impact of this option would likely depend on how BNG was to be delivered – on or off site, and whether new habitat areas are to be created or whether existing ones would be improved.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>The requirement for 10% BNG could help to provide blue and green habitats that can help to mitigate climate change and flooding. As 10% BNG is to be a national requirement, formalised through local policy, it is expected that this would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>The requirement for 20% BNG could help to provide blue and green habitats that can help to mitigate climate change and flooding. A 20% requirement would be greater than national policy, and so deliver more improvements.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, but greater requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver improvements.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>The requirement for up to 20% BNG could help to provide blue and green habitats that can help to mitigate climate change and flooding.</p> <p>A 20% requirement would be greater than national policy, and so deliver more improvements. A 10% requirement, in line with national policy, would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p> <p>A flexible approach in relation to requirements could help maximise opportunities to improve biodiversity but would depend on a strong evidence base.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, but greater requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver improvements.</p>	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>The creation of a specific BNG policy would be a more prescriptive approach. A specific BNG policy, with supporting SPD, would help create attractive, biodiverse environments. However, without further information on what this approach may contain, and whether it could be weaker or stronger approach, it is difficult to assess the impact on climate change and flooding.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>The requirement for 10% BNG could help to improve blue infrastructure and water quality so to provide habitat and support species. 10% BNG is to be a national requirement, formalised through local policy, so it is expected that this would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>The additional requirement for 20% BNG could help to improve blue infrastructure and water quality so to provide habitat and support species.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A 10% requirement, in line with national policy, would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p> <p>The additional requirement for up to 20% BNG could help to improve blue infrastructure and water quality so to provide habitat and support species.</p> <p>A flexible approach in relation to requirements could help maximise opportunities to improve biodiversity but would depend on a strong evidence base.</p>	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>The creation of a specific BNG policy would be a more prescriptive approach. A specific BNG policy, with supporting SPD, would help create attractive, biodiverse environments. However, without further information on what this approach may contain, and whether it could be weaker or stronger approach, it is difficult to assess the impact here.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>The requirement for 10% BNG could help to indirectly help improve air quality through an increase in habitat (e.g. more trees). 10% BNG is to be a national requirement, formalised through local policy, so it is expected that this would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>The additional requirement for 20% BNG could help to indirectly help improve air quality through an increase in habitat (e.g. more trees).</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A 10% requirement, in line with national policy, would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p> <p>The additional requirement for up to 20% BNG could help to improve air quality through an increase in habitat (e.g. more trees).</p> <p>A flexible approach in relation to requirements could help maximise opportunities to improve biodiversity but would depend on a strong evidence base.</p>	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>The creation of a specific BNG policy would be a more prescriptive approach. A specific BNG policy, with supporting SPD, would help create attractive, biodiverse environments. However, without further information on what this approach may contain, and whether it could be weaker or stronger approach, it is difficult to assess the impact here.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>The requirement for 10% BNG would help improve biodiversity. As 10% BNG is to be a national requirement, formalised through local policy, it is expected that this would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p>	<p>+ / ++</p> <p>The additional requirement for 20% BNG would certainly help improve biodiversity. With a 20% requirement, this approach would provide the greatest potential increase in biodiversity.</p> <p>The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, but greater requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver improvements.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A 10% requirement, in line with national policy, would have little/no effect on the baseline.</p> <p>The additional requirement for up to 20% BNG would certainly help to further improve biodiversity.</p> <p>A strong evidence base would be needed to understand those areas which could support / demand a higher requirement, and this could be difficult to do at a local / site level. Furthermore, setting requirements based on the biodiversity value between urban and rural sites is problematic as it makes an assumption that all urban/brownfield sites are of lower value than rural/greenfield sites, whereas brownfield sites can have a high biodiversity and environmental value.</p> <p>Greater requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver improvements.</p>	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>The creation of a specific BNG policy would be a more prescriptive approach. A specific BNG policy, with supporting SPD, would help create attractive, biodiverse environments. However, without further information on what this approach may contain, and whether it could be weaker or stronger approach, it is difficult to assess the impact here.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>

Summary

Option 1 is the option most aligned to the baseline / current policy but would introduce the (emerging) national BNG requirement of 10%. The importance of increasing biodiversity is well-established, and the introduction of biodiversity net gain is a positive, sustainable step in addition to the existing baseline and/or continued policy.

Option 2 would introduce a BNG requirement of 20%, above the national requirement. This would work to improve biodiversity beyond Government targets, which is an admirable and ambitious approach. However, increasing requirements could render some sites unviable making it harder to deliver wider improvements (i.e. it would be better to have some improvement than no improvements).

Option 3 would be the most flexible approach, requiring a minimum of 10% but up to 20% on sites with more diverse wildlife, and is essentially a hybrid of options 1 and 2. It would be the most flexible approach to improving biodiversity in the Borough but would require the most substantial evidence base in order consider viability and identify clear boundaries for the banded requirements.

Option 4 would create a specific BNG policy, supported by an SPD. It would be a more prescriptive approach and could help secure more BNG than that at present, potentially above the national 10%, with a figure, and all other requirements, determined based on gathered evidence.

Overall, option 3 is considered to be the most sustainable and flexible approach, but is subject to the availability of sufficiently detailed evidence to identify clear boundaries for banded requirements. The remaining options are also subject to evidence relating to viability and biodiversity.

ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH / EH02 – Landscape & land resources

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Continue the approach of WLLP Policy EN2: Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment, including Parts 4 (Land Resources), 5 (Coastal Zone) and 6 (Landscape Character).
 2. Continue with existing policy but remove the Coastal Zone designation from both the Local Plan Policies Map and the policy. i.e. remove Part 5 of the existing Local Plan Policy EN2.
 3. A less restrictive approach than existing Local plan Policy EN2.
 4. A more prescriptive approach than existing Local Plan Policy EN2.

Overview of current baseline: The existing approach of EN2 has a restrictive approach to new development taking place on the best quality agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a) and would limit uses within the designated Coastal Zones shown on the Local Plan Policies Map to the essential needs of coastal navigation, recreation, tourism and leisure, flood protection, fisheries, nature conservation and / or agriculture. Options 1 therefore represents the current baseline position.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A less restrictive approach, when compared to the baseline, could result in the allocation of more development sites on the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. This would allow for more residential development opportunities in the Borough. As such this option is considered to have a positive effect on this objective.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>A more prescriptive approach may result in fewer development sites being on Green Belt and BMV agricultural land, as it would require greater compensation methods where harm is identified, and therefore may result in sites being unviable. As such this option is considered to have a negative effect when considered against the existing baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A less restrictive approach, when compared to the baseline, could result in the allocation of more development sites on the best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. This could allow for more commercial development opportunities in the Borough. As such this option is considered to have a positive effect on this objective.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>A more prescriptive approach may result in fewer development sites being on Green Belt and BMV agricultural land, as it would require greater compensation methods where harm is identified, and therefore may result in sites being unviable. As such this option is considered to have a negative effect when considered against the existing baseline.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy approach would likely result in development on the Borough's important land resources which otherwise would be protected from development.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A more prescriptive approach would seek to preserve the Borough's land resources and would prevent inappropriate development. Therefore it is considered that this approach would have a positive effect on this objective when considered against the existing baseline.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy approach would likely result in development affecting the Borough's landscape which otherwise would be protected from development.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>A more prescriptive approach would seek to preserve the Borough's landscape and would prevent inappropriate development. Therefore it is considered that this approach would have a positive effect on this objective when considered against the existing baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>The option to remove the Coastal Zone section of the existing policy could result in inappropriate development within the coastal zone area to the north of the Borough. In relation to flood risk, development in that area would then revert to national and local policy relating to flood risk. However, the Coastal Zones designation predominantly relates to intertidal areas and coastal marsh, part of which has recently been redesigned to flood with resultant benefits.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option could have a negative impact when compared to the existing baseline as it will fail to restrict development in inappropriate / less sustainable locations. As such this option is considered to have a negative effect when considered against the existing baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option could have a positive impact when considered against the existing baseline as development would be directed to the most sustainable land options. This could include ensuring development is not permitted where flooding could be a concern. Therefore, this option is considered to have a positive effect.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option could have a negative impact when compared to the existing baseline as it will fail to restrict development in inappropriate / less sustainable locations. Green Belt and BMV Agricultural Land can be linked to high biodiversity levels, and development on this land would harm this. As such this option is considered to have a negative effect when considered against the existing baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option could have a positive impact when compared to the existing baseline as it will restrict development in areas with high levels of biodiversity. As such this option is considered to have a positive effect when considered against the existing baseline</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option is a continuation of current Local Plan policy EC2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is a continuation of current policy, and therefore has a neutral effect when compared to the baseline position.

Option 2 seeks to remove the protection of the Coastal Zone from the original policy, and would, broadly, result in little change when compared to the baseline position, albeit could reduce some protection of that coastal zone.

Option 3 would have a positive impact on housing in the Borough by potentially allowing additional development within West Lancashire's natural environment, however the negative impacts on the biodiversity of the Borough, climate change and the Borough's land resources would result in this option being less sustainable when compared to the existing baseline.

Option 4 would restrict development and would require specific mitigation measures to help reduce the impact of a development proposal upon the Borough's landscape history and character. Whilst this would protect the Borough's land resource and biodiversity, it may restrict housing development, or direct it to an area where it is not needed the most. Therefore, this option is not considered to be particularly sustainable when considered against the existing baseline.

Overall, Option1 is considered the most sustainable.

ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH / EH03 – Flood risk / water resources

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. Update the existing WLLP policy to reflect advances in national guidance and practice and more recent local evidence on flood risk.
 2. Continue with existing Local plan policy GN3- Part 3.
 3. A new policy similar to the preferred policy approach but less strict about when a Flood Risk Assessment would be required with planning applications.

- Overview of current baseline:**
- The current baseline is the NPPF and existing WLLP policy GN3.3. The policy ensures that development does not result in unacceptable flood risk or drainage problems by requiring it to:
- 1) be located away from Flood Zones 2 and 3 (therefore concentrating on coastal and river sources);
 - 2) where applicable, satisfy the sequential and exception test;
 - 3) be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (but in fewer circumstances than the preferred approach);
 - 4) show that sustainable drainage systems have been explored; and 5) reduce surface water run-off.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. However, it is acknowledged that limiting the risk of flooding for residential properties would ultimately have positive effects on the health and wellbeing of those residents.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. However, it is acknowledged that limiting the risk of flooding for residential properties would ultimately have positive effects on the health and wellbeing of those residents.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This policy option would introduce greater restrictions to development in areas at risk of flooding. It could therefore reduce development opportunities for new housing when compared to the current baseline o. However, it would also seek to ensure that uses that are most vulnerable to flooding would be sited on the parts of a development at lowest flood risk, thereby improving sustainable housing opportunities</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This option would be similar to Option 1, but be less strict about when a Flood Risk Assessment would be required., This could make it easier for sites to be brought forward, but could result in more housing sites being located in areas at high risk of flooding.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This policy option would introduce greater restrictions to development in areas at risk of flooding. It could therefore reduce commercial development opportunities when compared to the current baseline. However, it would also seek to ensure that uses that are most vulnerable to flooding would be sited on the parts of a development at lowest flood risk, thereby improving sustainable development opportunities. There may be economic impacts arising from development in flood risk areas, such as higher insurance premiums</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This option would be similar to Option 1 but be less strict about when a Flood Risk Assessment would be required. This could make it easier for sites to be brought forward but could result in more development sites being located in areas at high risk of flooding. There may be economic impacts arising from development in flood risk areas, such as higher insurance premiums.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>This approach would not propose any residential development site allocations in areas at high risk from flooding, and a stricter approach would therefore ensure only the most sustainable and appropriate sites are identified for development. Impact on land resources would be dependent on the sites ultimately allocated. .</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change.</p>	<p>/ ?</p> <p>This option would be similar to Option 1, but be less strict about when a Flood Risk Assessment would be required. This could make it easier for sites to be brought forward, but could result in more development sites being located in areas at high risk of flooding. Impact on land resources would be dependent on the sites ultimately allocated.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option will seek to ensure that development will not take place on land at highest risk of flooding, and developments which are at risk of flooding will require an FRA. Development will be required to incorporate SuDS as far as practical which will also provide flood risk mitigation. Therefore, this policy option is considered to make a positive impact when assessed against the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change</p>	<p>-</p> <p>As this option would result in smaller sites not requiring an FRA for development proposals, this option may result in these developments being at greater risk of flooding. Therefore, this policy option is considered to make a negative impact when assessed against the baseline.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would include requirements relating to water quality (relating to water courses water bodies and groundwater) and also the protection of assets and water resources. This option is therefore considered to have a positive effect when considered against the current baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. However, it is recognised that appropriate management of water resources can have an impact on biodiversity.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. However, it is recognised that appropriate management of water resources can have an impact on biodiversity.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option reflects the current baseline position and therefore represents no change</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would update existing policy to ensure that national guidance and practice is followed, and local evidence on flood risk is considered. Whilst the additional restrictions relating to Flood Risk Assessments and the safe disposal of surface water may have a negative impact on the provision of housing delivery across the borough, the positive impact of this policy approach on flood risk, water quality and land resources results in a sustainable approach to flood risk and water resources.

Option 2 would seek to continue with the current WLLP policy and therefore would have a neutral effect compared to the existing baseline position.

Option 3 would result in the relaxation of Flood Risk Assessment requirements for most smaller developments, and therefore whilst this will have a positive impact on housing delivery within the borough, because a greater number of smaller sites could come forward, the negative impact on flood risk and land resources results in a less sustainable option.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable.

ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH / EH04 – Contamination & pollution

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Continue WLLP approach but strengthen it with regard to health.
 2. Have no specific policy on pollution and contamination.
 3. Take a more relaxed approach to pollution and contamination in order to prioritise brownfield land development.

Overview of current baseline: WLLP Policy GN3.5 requires that proposals for development minimise the risk from all types of pollution and contamination and seek to remediate and restore contaminated land. This represents the current baseline position and aligns closely with Option 1.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would have positive impact on the population as it would seek to strengthen the protection of health (from pollution and contamination). Therefore this option would have a more positive impact on this topic than the current baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative impact on this topic as it may result in greater exposure to pollution and contamination for the residents of West Lancashire, thereby risking a detrimental effect on health. As such, this option would have a negative effect when compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative impact on this topic as it may result in greater exposure to pollution and contamination for the residents of West Lancashire, thereby risking a detrimental effect on health. As such, this option would have a negative effect when compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.></p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0 / -</p> <p>By increasing the focus on health, this approach could seek to direct development away from all types of 'unacceptable' levels of pollution and contamination risk. This may reduce the opportunity for some sites to be remediated and developed (for housing/commercial uses) meaning that there may be more demand placed on 'greenfield' sites. .</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option would give the Council less control over contaminated land, and would be led, instead, by the NPPF and other legislation outside of Planning. Having no policy may not help suitably address contaminated land issues in the borough.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This approach would take as supportive stance as possible to the redevelopment of brownfield land by minimising requirements for dealing with pollution and contamination. This would have a positive impact on the land resources of the borough as it could make more brownfield sites available for development, thereby protecting 'greenfield' sites. . Therefore, this option could have a more positive effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>The current baseline seeks to protect water quality and ground water resources. The absence of a local policy would therefore be likely to result in a negative effect on water quality in the borough.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>A more relaxed approach could encourage the development of Brownfield land with less remediation work required to reduce existing pollution on these sites. This could result in a negative impact on water quality in the borough. Therefore, this option would be likely to have a negative effect on this objective.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>The current baseline seeks to ensure development should be designed to minimise any reduction in air quality. The absence of a specific policy for contamination and pollution could result in a decrease in air quality. As such it is considered that this option would be likely to have a negative effect on this objective.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>The current baseline seeks to ensure development should be designed to minimise any reduction in air quality. A more relaxed approach / weaker policy could result in a decrease in air quality, and therefore this option would be likely to have a negative effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. However, having no specific policy would do less, than the current baseline, to respond to pollution and contamination issues. A weaker response may, in turn, impact on biodiversity by affording it less protection from harm.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. However, having a weaker policy would do less, than the current baseline, to respond to pollution and contamination issues. A weaker response may, in turn, impact on biodiversity by affording it less protection from harm.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Summary

Option 1 seeks to continue with the current baseline, whilst also strengthening the approach towards health by presuming against new development that would result in exposure to 'unacceptable' levels of pollution or contamination. This would result in a stronger policy which seeks to direct development to the most sustainable locations and better protects the health and wellbeing of residents of the borough.

Option 2 would have the most negative effects on the above objectives when compared to the current baseline. It would result in fewer restrictions on development/pollution/contamination which seek to protect the environment and population of West Lancashire and so is considered the least sustainable option.

Option 3 would result in the relaxation of current policy (the baseline) but it is considered that it would not adequately protect the environment and population of the Borough.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable.

ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH / EH05 – AIR QUALITY

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. General requirement for new development to minimise reductions in air quality and/or improve it where possible, and for sensitive uses to be sited away from sources of air pollution
 2. No air quality policy

Current baseline: WLLP Policy GN3.5 states proposals for development should 'be designed to minimise any reduction in air quality'. The NPPF states the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth and improve local environmental conditions to, amongst other things, improve air quality and public health. Option 1 aligns most closely with the current baseline position.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would continue the approach of current policy (WLLP GN3.5) by requiring new developments to minimise reductions in air quality but it would also add an additional requirement that new developments should seek to improve air quality, for example through planting or landscaping. Such improvements to air quality would help create greater positive impacts for public health. It could also improve well-being by creating more visually attractive and 'greener' environments.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p>This option would remove a specific policy on air quality and instead rely on other policies to protect air quality. Compared to the current baseline (the LP), it would consequently do less to protect and improve air quality. Therefore, it is unlikely that it would better help to address public health.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Housing (Objective 7)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Transport (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. However, in the absence of an air quality policy, greater emphasis would be placed on other policies, including transport, to reduce motor vehicle use and encourage active / green transport.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would place a greater requirement on new developments to help improve air quality, which could in turn also help mitigate climate change – for example, more tree planting and landscaping would improve air quality and also help to reduce CO2 levels and provide flood mitigation opportunities</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. However, in the absence of an air quality policy, greater emphasis would be placed on other policies, for example in supporting non-polluting means of energy generation and use.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would continue the approach of current policy (WLLP GN3.5) by requiring new developments to minimise reductions in air quality. It would also add an additional requirement that new developments should seek to improve air quality, for example through planting or landscaping. This would create a more sustainable policy, by adding a further 'positive' step to managing and improving air quality.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p>This option would remove a specific policy on air quality and instead rely on other policies to protect air quality. This would mean policies would work to limit loss of air quality, rather than seek to improve air quality through new developments. This would be a less sustainable approach than the current Local Plan because a specific policy relating to air quality would be removed, placing reliance solely on related policies.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would place a greater requirement on new developments to help improve air quality, which could in turn also help improve biodiversity – for example, more planting and landscaping would provide a greater variety of habitats.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. However, there would be some overlap with place-making, as policy would seek to locate sensitive uses as far away as possible from sources of air pollution (e.g. locate schools away from busy roads and instead close to green spaces). This may have an impact on where local services and community infrastructure are sited.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p> <p>If there was no dedicated 'air quality' policy in place, then there could potentially be more likelihood of sensitive uses being located near sources of air pollution, or 'out of settlement' services increasing traffic so to worsen air quality. It would place greater reliance on other policies to address air quality concerns.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would deliver some positive improvements to air quality because it would introduce additional requirements for developments to seek opportunities to improve air quality, rather than just minimise any reduction in air quality.

Option 2 would reduce the effectiveness of the current policy/baseline by removing air quality requirements and placing greater reliance on other policies to reference air quality and (indirectly) affect change.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable.

ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH / EH06 – Green Infrastructure & Open Space (4 policies)

Approach 1:

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. An overarching Green Infrastructure (GI) policy would promote protecting and enhancing the GI network as well as promoting Active Design and the improvement of cycling and walking networks.
 2. Update Adopted Local Plan Policy EN3: Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space to include criteria for development of open space to meet national advice.

Overview of current baseline: WLLP Policy EN3 is currently split into 2 parts; the first covers Green Infrastructure and the second, Open Space and Recreation Facilities. Option 2 would therefore most closely reflect the current baseline.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>An overarching policy approach would help promote and enhance the GI network, thereby also supporting opportunities to improve the health and wellbeing of residents of West Lancashire. As such this option is considered to make a positive impact when compared to the existing baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This policy option would provide a more detailed approach to Green Infrastructure and Open space and recreation facilities. As this option would update and strengthen the existing policy, to include criteria for the development of open space to meet national advice, it would have a more positive impact on this objective when compared to the baseline policy approach. It would provide opportunities to improve health and wellbeing of residents.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Housing (Objective 7)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Transport (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would create an overarching GI policy to enhance the GI network, promote active design and improvements to cycling and walking networks. It would therefore help to promote sustainable and active travel networks, which could help reduce vehicular traffic and congestion, and improve opportunities for active travel.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0 / ?</p> <p>This option would update the existing EN3 policy but there are insufficient details about whether or not it would more strongly promote GI and active travel opportunities. .</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Whilst some land is required to deliver GI and recreation / open spaces, it is not anticipated that this would have a detrimental impact on land resources.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Whilst some land is required to deliver GI and recreation / open spaces, it is not anticipated that this would have a detrimental impact on land resources.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would provide the framework for enhancing the GI network which in turn will have a positive effect on the landscape within the borough through the promotion of open space.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This policy option will set the framework for more detailed policies relating to GI, open space and trees, which will have a positive effect on tackling the climate emergency. The protection of existing / support for new trees helps to lock in, and reduce, atmospheric carbon whilst the promotion of active travel, through GI, can reduce vehicular traffic reducing greenhouse gas emissions from transport. This approach would strengthen policy and have a positive impact when compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This policy approach would set out a strategic approach for how development would support the provision of a network of green spaces. This would be more detailed than the existing baseline and is therefore considered to be more positive.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Strengthening GI requirements, for example providing trees, could help improve air quality. This option would therefore have a small positive effect on the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Strengthening GI requirements, for example providing trees, could help improve air quality. This option would therefore have a small positive effect on the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This policy option will set the framework for more detailed policies relating to open space and trees. The provision of open space and trees within the borough will have a positive effect on the biodiversity of the borough. This policy approach is therefore considered to have a positive impact when compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>The strategic approach to the provision of open space will have a positive impact on the biodiversity of the borough as it is likely that a network will be achieved which supports the councils existing ecological networks. As such it is considered to have a positive impact when compared to the existing baseline.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would provide an overarching GI policy and would set a framework for more detailed policies in relation to open space and trees. Open space is classed as 'community infrastructure' and therefore this approach would have a positive effect on the provision of community infrastructure.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would include amended criteria relating to open space, local standards for providing new open space and costs for off-site open space provision. Open space is classed as 'community infrastructure' and therefore this approach would have a positive effect on the provision of community infrastructure.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is considered to be the more sustainable option as it is considered to have a positive effect on a number of the objectives. The potential for a more detailed framework addressing open space and trees will allow for more flexibility in terms of creating sustainable development opportunities.

Option 2 would update WLLP EN3 to meet national advice and requirements, so would deliver more positive effects when compared to the existing baseline.

Overall, Option 1 Is considered the most sustainable.

Approach Two

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. An Open Space, Sport, Leisure and Physical Activity policy.
 2. Update existing Local Plan Policy EN3.
 3. A separate built sports facilities policy.

Overview of current baseline: WLLP Policy EN3 is currently split into 2 parts; the first covers Green Infrastructure and the second, Open Space and Recreation Facilities. Option 2 would therefore most closely reflect the current baseline.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy approach would contain criteria for considering where the loss of open space and leisure facilities would be permitted and would also identify opportunities for providing new open space in connection with new development. This would therefore support opportunities for health and wellbeing, and so would be expected to have a positive effect when compared to the existing baseline.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This policy option would revert back to WLLP EN3, but with amended criteria relating to open space to meet national advice and requirements. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents no change compared to the baseline, or would result in only a minor positive effect, given that national requirements also form the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This approach would separate Option 1 into two separate policies – one dealing with open space and the other with built sport facilities. A separate built sports facilities policy would have a positive effect on this objective as it would result in the provision of additional facilities for the residents of West Lancashire.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Whilst some land is required to deliver GI and recreation / open spaces, it is not anticipated that this would have a detrimental impact on land resources.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Whilst some land is required to deliver GI and recreation / open spaces, it is not anticipated that this would have a detrimental impact on land resources.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy approach would contain criteria for considering the loss of open space, and also the provision of new open space. Open space and its links to the climate emergency are considered to be of importance and therefore this policy approach is considered to have a positive impact when compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>+</p> <p>Open space can help support and create greater levels of biodiversity, therefore the consideration for providing new open space for new residential developments will have a positive impact on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>+</p> <p>This option would provide detailed policy in relation to open space and built leisure facilities. Both are classed as 'community infrastructure' and therefore this approach would have a positive effect on the provision of community infrastructure.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would provide detailed policy in relation to open space and built leisure facilities. Both are classed as 'community infrastructure' and therefore this approach would have a positive effect on the provision of community infrastructure</p>

Summary

Option 1 would cover the loss and provision of open space and built leisure facilities, providing a more detailed policy than the existing baseline, and so creating positive effects on a number of the objectives.

Option 2 would seek to continue to follow the existing WLLP EN3 approach and therefore does not differ from the existing baseline position. It would therefore be expected to have a neutral effect on the objectives. However, aside other preferred approaches assessed here, it would be expected to result in quite a lengthy policy.

Option 3 would separate Option 1 into two policies – one dealing with open space and the other with built sports facilities. A more holistic approach, considering both together, may be more sustainable.

Overall, Option1 is considered the most sustainable.

Approach Three:

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Open Space and Residential Development. This approach would be a companion to preferred policy approach 2 (above) and would set out details regarding local open space standards for new residential development proposals and the financial costs for provision and maintenance of open space to support requirements for financial contributions.
 2. A policy similar to option 1 but also requiring open space to be provided in connection with selected commercial developments.

Overview of current baseline: WLLP Policy EN3 is currently split into 2 parts; the first covers Green Infrastructure and the second, Open Space and Recreation Facilities. EN3.2(d) states that, where deficiencies exist, financial contributions towards public open space may be required but does not specify the costs involved, which are currently subject to a separate SPD. However, SPDs are no longer a suitable approach because the Local Plan should set out the costs to ensure that their viability has been appropriately considered as part of plan-making. Both approaches here are therefore a departure from the current position.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This policy approach would set out the financial contributions required for open space provision in relation to new residential developments. Provision of new public open space areas would have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This policy approach would set out the financial contributions required for open space provision in relation to new residential and commercial developments. Provision of new public open space areas would have a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p style="text-align: center;">0 / -</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Financial contributions may have an impact on viability which could affect housing delivery.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0 / -</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Financial contributions may have an impact on viability which could affect housing and commercial delivery.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Under this option, commercial developments would not be subject to developer contributions towards public open space.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0 / -</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Financial contributions may have an impact on viability which could affect housing and commercial delivery.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Whilst some land is required to deliver GI and recreation / open spaces, it is not anticipated that this would have a detrimental impact on land resources.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Whilst some land is required to deliver GI and recreation / open spaces, it is not anticipated that this would have a detrimental impact on land resources.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Open space and its links to the climate emergency are considered to be of importance and therefore this policy approach is considered to have a positive impact when compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Open space and its links to the climate emergency are considered to be of importance and therefore this policy approach is considered to have a positive impact when compared to the baseline.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Open space can help support and create greater levels of biodiversity, therefore the consideration for providing new open space for new residential developments will have a positive impact on this objective.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Open space can help support and create greater levels of biodiversity, therefore the consideration for providing new open space for new residential developments will have a positive impact on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would provide detailed policy in relation to financial contributions towards new open space. This is classed as 'community infrastructure' and therefore this approach would have a positive effect on the provision of community infrastructure</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would provide detailed policy in relation to financial contributions towards new open space. This is classed as 'community infrastructure' and therefore this approach would have a positive effect on the provision of community infrastructure</p>

Summary

Option 1 would seek to secure the provision of open space, or a financial contribution to open space for new residential developments. This is considered a more sustainable policy option than the existing baseline as it will plan positively for open space within the borough, ensuring that open space financial contributions are identified within the Local Plan, rather than a separate SPD.

Option 2 would do the same as option 1 but would also include these requirements for some commercial developments. This could extend open space provision further than if it were just required for residential developments.

Overall, option 1 and 2 are both considered to be equally sustainable, subject to viability evidence.

Approach Four:

- Summary of 'options':**
1. A Trees, Woodland, Hedgerows and Landscaping policy.
 2. Part 3 of existing Adopted Local Plan Policy EN2: Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment.
 3. Similar to the preferred approach with the addition of linkages to carbon offset and biodiversity net gain.

Overview of current baseline: WLLP Policy EN2 (3) sets out the current policy in respect of trees and landscaping. The NPPF details national policy which applies in the consideration of trees and new developments.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+</p> <p>This option would seek to strengthen existing policy to protect and enhance existing trees, woodlands etc and encourage the creation of additional tree cover, as well as how trees etc should be considered in relation to new development proposals. This enhanced protection and support would have a positive effect on this objective because of the contribution they make to improving health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option would continue policy EN2. As such it is equivalent to the baseline position and therefore this option represents little or no change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would take option 1 and include additional commentary in relation to biodiversity net gain and the potential for carbon offset. This enhanced approach would have a positive effect on this objective because of the contribution trees, biodiversity and mitigating climate change ultimately have to improving health and wellbeing.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Tree etc requirements may have an impact on viability which could affect housing delivery although this would need to be subject to evidence.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Tree etc requirements may have an impact on viability which could affect housing delivery although this would need to be subject to evidence.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Tree etc requirements may have an impact on viability which could affect commercial delivery although this would need to be subject to evidence.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. Tree etc requirements may have an impact on viability which could affect commercial delivery although this would need to be subject to evidence.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy approach would plan positively to increase the tree cover within the Borough whilst also ensuring that ancient woodland and veteran trees have enhanced protection. As such this is considered to have a positive effect when considered against the existing baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy approach would plan positively to increase the tree cover within the Borough whilst also ensuring that ancient woodland and veteran trees have enhanced protection. As such this is considered to have a positive effect when considered against the existing baseline.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>+</p> <p>The protection and enhancement of existing trees, alongside the creation of additional tree cover will support the Boroughs goal to tackle the climate emergency by ensuring natural environments are retained and enhanced. Trees play an important role in storing carbon, providing cooling and shade (e.g. street trees) and improving drainage (mitigating flood risk). This is considered a stronger approach than the existing baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would be similar to option 1 but would also refer to linkages to carbon offsetting and biodiversity net gain. This is considered very positive when compared to the existing baseline, as it emphasises their importance in delivering sustainability and adapting and mitigating to the climate and biodiversity emergencies</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>+</p> <p>Trees remove carbon dioxide and other pollutants from the atmosphere, and so a policy supporting the protection of existing, and planting of new, trees would help improve air quality.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>Trees remove carbon dioxide and other pollutants from the atmosphere, and so a policy supporting the protection of existing, and planting of new, trees would help improve air quality, and have links to improving biodiversity.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>+</p> <p>The protection and enhancement of existing trees, alongside the creation of additional tree cover, will support the improvements of the Boroughs biodiversity. As such this policy approach is considered to have a positive effect when assessed against the existing baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would seek to be similar to option 1 but would also refer to linkages to carbon offsetting and biodiversity net gain. This is considered positive when compared to the existing baseline.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No change compared to the baseline.).</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would seek to protect and enhance trees, woodlands and hedgerows in the Borough – providing significant benefits to health and wellbeing, addressing climate change, protecting landscape and improving biodiversity and air quality

Option 2 would seek to continue to follow the existing WLLP approach and therefore would largely have a neutral effect on the existing baseline position.

Option 3 would follow option 1 but also expressly address the potential for trees to provide carbon offset and enhance biodiversity. This is considered positive when compared to the baseline, but it would result in the doubling up of these requirements as there are other policies which will cover both biodiversity net gain and carbon offsetting.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable, although a hybrid with Option 3 may also be appropriate.

ENVIRONMENT & HEALTH / EH07 – HEALTHY EATING AND DRINKING

- Summary of 'options':**
1. A healthy eating and drinking policy supported by a healthy eating and drinking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
 2. No specific policy dealing with healthy eating and drinking as it is considered there is no need to address this matter in West Lancashire.
 3. No specific policy dealing with healthy eating and drinking but dealing with these issues through [parts of] other policies in the Local Plan.
 4. Similar to option 3, having no specific healthy eating and drinking policy, but covering these issues within other Local Plan policies, and, similar to Option 1, preparing a healthy eating and drinking SPD.

Current baseline:

There is no WLLP policy as such on healthy eating and drinking, nor any current SPD. NPPF Section 8 covers 'Promoting healthy and safe communities' and paragraph 91(c) advises that planning policies and decisions should enable and support healthy lifestyles, for example through access to healthier food.

In terms of data, the baseline position is that there is a health issue relating to obesity in West Lancashire, although in very general terms, this is no worse than in other areas. There are 'hotspots' of poor health in West Lancashire (including health linked to diet, as well as lifestyle), tying in with general deprivation patterns in the Borough.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+</p> <p>Having a healthy eating and drinking policy supported by a Healthy Eating and Drinking SPD should result in a positive change compared to the baseline in terms of encouraging healthier lifestyles and (to a lesser extent) reducing health inequalities; relevant planning applications would be accompanied by a health impact assessment (HIA), and there would be more control over the location of hot food take-aways.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>Given there is currently no Local Plan policy on healthy eating or drinking, this option (having no policy in the new Local Plan, and no SPD) would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. The same is the case for the other SA topics below.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>Not having a specific healthy eating and drinking Local Plan / SPD policy, but dealing with the issue in other Local Plan policies should still result in a positive change compared to the baseline in terms of encouraging healthier lifestyles and (to a lesser extent) reducing health inequalities. Relevant planning applications would require an HIA and there would be more control over the location of hot food take-aways.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>Not having a specific Local Plan policy on healthy eating and drinking, but dealing with the issue via other Local Plan policies and an SPD should still result in a positive change compared to the baseline in terms of encouraging healthier lifestyles and (to a lesser extent) reducing health inequalities. Relevant planning applications would require an HIA and there would be more control over the location of hot food take-aways.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective, compared to the baseline. It could be argued that by increasing control over the locations of hot food take-aways, there may be some reduction in accessibility to such 'services', but this would most likely be very minor compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect on this objective compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. It could be argued that by increasing control over the locations of hot food take-aways, there may be some reduction in accessibility to such 'services', but this would most likely be very minor compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective compared to the baseline. It could be argued that by increasing control over the locations of hot food take-aways, there may be some reduction in accessibility to such 'services', but this would most likely be very minor compared to the baseline.</p>

Summary

Option 1 introduces a new policy on healthy eating and drinking, compared to no current Local Plan or SPD policy; as such it has a positive effect on sustainability in terms of encouraging healthy lifestyles, and possibly also in terms of reducing health inequalities, compared to the baseline. In all other aspects of the sustainability appraisal framework, this preferred policy approach has minimal or no effect.

Option 2 proposes no policy, so is effectively the same as the baseline. It assumes there is no need to address these issues in West Lancashire; in that sense it is considered the least sustainable option as obesity / health inequalities are an issue in this Borough.

Options 3 and 4 are very similar to Option 1 in terms of their effect compared to the baseline situation. They seek to address health issues through other Local Plan policies, rather than through a specific policy. Option 3 proposes no SPD to clarify and elaborate on policy and could be argued is marginally less sustainable than Option 4.

As a Local Plan policy has more weight than an SPD policy, overall option 1 is considered the most sustainable, followed by Option 4.

TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE / TI01 – Transport network & access

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. A policy that sets out specific transport schemes and supports the 20-minute neighbourhood concept.
 2. To only list specific schemes that we know will be delivered.
 3. To not list any specific schemes.

Overview of current baseline: WLLP Policy IF2 sets out a number of transport schemes which the Council would support the delivery of. Aside this, the West Lancashire Highways and Transport Masterplan (LCC) lists a number of transport projects which are of importance in delivering Local Plan objectives. Option 1 is most closely aligned to the current policy approach (baseline), but with additional support lent to the concept of the 20-minute neighbourhood.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive effect as it would support the 20-minute neighbourhood concept, which promotes sustainability. In supporting transport infrastructure schemes, It would seek to discourage the use of the private car in favour of sustainable, and active, travel and so would have a positive effect on the health of the Borough's population as it would encourage walking and cycling within the borough and could help to improve air quality</p> <p>Therefore, this option is considered to have a positive impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This approach would omit reference to schemes such as the Ormskirk Bypass and Skelmersdale Rail where there is no certainty that the schemes will be delivered. However, these 'ambitions' form important parts of strategic planning, and their delivery could help improve accessibility to a variety of opportunities which could improve people's health and wellbeing, for example employment opportunities. Their omission could therefore have negative effects on this objective.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>To not list any schemes would have a negative effect on this objective because it would limit positive planning for such transport schemes, which can have positive effects on the population in terms of widening their opportunities. Therefore, this option would be considered to have a negative effect when considered against the current baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>+</p> <p>The 20-minute neighbourhood concept would support positive planning for new housing in the borough as it would get developers to think about how they link to transport networks, especially walking and cycling links, creating more sustainable housing developments.... Therefore, this option is considered to have a positive impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>The 20-minute neighbourhood concept would support positive planning for new housing in the borough as it would get developers to think about how they link to transport networks, especially walking and cycling links, creating more sustainable housing developments. However, the omission of some of these ambitions could have some negative effects on this objective by failing to provide sufficient strategic direction.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>To not list any schemes would have a negative effect on this objective because the absence of specific schemes, and replacement with a 'catch-all statement', would give less support to infrastructure schemes required to support new residential developments and would not promote positive or holistic planning. Therefore, this option is considered to have a negative impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>+</p> <p>The option to list specific transport schemes which would be delivered would support the local economy and employment as it would allow for positive and holistic planning. Therefore, this option is considered to have a positive impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>The option to list specific transport schemes which would be delivered would support the local economy and employment as it would allow for positive and holistic planning. These transport 'ambitions' form important parts of strategic planning, and their delivery could help improve accessibility to a variety of opportunities, including employment. The omission of some of these ambitions could therefore have some negative effects on this objective by failing to provide direction.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>To not list any schemes would have a detrimental impact on this objective as it would fail to provide direction for new employment development. Therefore, this option is considered to have a negative impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive effect on the transport objective as it would support the development of transport infrastructure and linkages to new developments. Therefore, this option is considered to have a positive impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive effect on the transport objective as it would support the development of transport infrastructure and linkages to new developments. However, the omission of some of these transport ambitions could have some negative effects on this objective by failing to provide sufficient strategic direction.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>To not list any potential transport schemes within the borough could restrict the identification of transport links which would support development.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive impact on the climate change objective as it would encourage the 20 minute neighbourhood concept which could reduce the use of the private car to make shorter journeys and encourage active travel, helping to reduce carbon emissions. As such this policy option would have a positive impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive impact on the climate change objective as it would encourage the 20 minute neighbourhood concept which could reduce the use of the private car to make shorter journeys and encourage active travel, helping to reduce carbon emissions. As such this policy option would have a positive impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This policy would not help to pro-actively address climate change.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive impact on the Air Quality objective as it would encourage the 20-minute neighbourhood concept which could reduce the use of the private car to make shorter journeys. As such this policy option would have a positive impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive impact on the Air Quality objective as it would encourage the 20-minute neighbourhood concept which could reduce the use of the private car to make shorter journeys. As such this policy option would have a positive impact when considered against the current baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This policy option will have little or no effect compared to the baseline for this objective.</p>

Summary

Option 1 would have a positive effect on the majority of the objectives when considered against the baseline. This option would provide a list of desired schemes and would support walking and cycling linkages within the borough.

Option 2 would result in the omission of some 'ambitious' schemes, such as the Ormskirk bypass and the Skelmersdale rail link, as there is currently no certainty that they will go ahead. Whilst this approach has a positive effect on a number of objectives, this is not the most sustainable of the policy options because of the lack of direction and support this proffers.

Option 3 would not list any schemes within the policy and so would be unlikely to help positively plan for the growth of the borough. This has a negative effect on a number of the objectives and therefore is the least sustainable of all the above options.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the considered the most sustainable.

TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE / TI02 - Parking Standards and Electric Vehicle Charging Points

- Summary of 'options':**
1. Continue the current policy approach (Adopted Local Plan Policy IF2 parts 2 and 3).
 2. A more restrictive policy to limit car parking spaces in new developments.
 3. A policy that does not restrict car parking space i.e. the standards set out in the policy would be a minimum.
 4. Do not require Electric Vehicle Charging Points.

Overview of current baseline: The baseline position is represented by the adopted Local Plan and the NPPF. WLLP Policy IF2 (parts 2 and 3) deal with parking standards for residential developments and electric vehicle charging points, respectively, with parking standards for other uses being set out at Appendix F. The NPPF primarily sets out what a local plan should do in relation to setting local parking standards (paragraph 105) and what planning applications should be required to do (paragraph 110). Option 1 therefore represents the baseline position.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative effect upon the topic compared to the baseline. By restricting car parking, it would be less likely to improve accessibility to jobs or encourage and support the growth of sustainable rural businesses. Additionally, it would not promote access to and provision of services in rural areas.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This policy option would have a positive effect upon the topic compared to the baseline. By not restricting car parking it may help to improve accessibility to jobs, encourage and support the growth of sustainable rural businesses and promote access to services in rural areas.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This policy option may improve the efficiency of the transport network and help reduce vehicular traffic and congestion if it encourages greater use of active travel and public transport. This would help to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from vehicles and would therefore help improve air quality. However, restricting parking on new developments could cause negative knock-on effects like on-street parking, exacerbating congestion and traffic/parking issues.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative effect upon the topic compared to the baseline. By not discouraging an increase in private vehicle use it would not improve the efficiency of the transport network and would not help reduce vehicular traffic and congestion. It would not increase access to and opportunities for walking, cycling ('active travel') and use of public transport and would therefore not reduce emissions of greenhouse gases or help improve air quality.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative effect upon the topic compared to the baseline. It would not assist in reducing or minimising emissions of greenhouse gases and would not assist in improving air quality.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option should have a positive effect on this topic as more restrictive car parking standards may assist in achieving the efficient use of land via higher density of development in suitable areas.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This option should have a negative effect on this topic as less restrictive car parking standards may reduce opportunities to achieve the efficient use of land via higher density of development in suitable areas.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>Compared to the baseline, this option may minimise the need for carbon-based energy generation / use by discouraging the use of private vehicles.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Compared to the baseline, this option would not minimise the need for carbon-based energy generation / use because it would not discourage the use of private vehicles.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>By removing the policy requirement for Electric Vehicle Charging Points this option would not minimise the need for carbon-based energy generation / use and would therefore have a negative effect upon the topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>This policy option would have an overall likely positive effect upon the topic compared to the baseline, albeit the effect is less certain in relation to some aspects. It may help reduce vehicular traffic and congestion if it encourages greater use of active travel and public transport. This would help to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from vehicles and would therefore help improve air quality.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative effect upon the topic compared to the baseline. It would not help reduce vehicular traffic and congestion or increase access to and opportunities for walking, cycling ('active travel') and use of public transport and would therefore not reduce emissions of greenhouse gases or help improve air quality.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option would have a negative effect upon the topic compared to the baseline. It would not assist in reducing or minimising emissions of greenhouse gases and would not assist in improving air quality.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / ?</p> <p>This policy option may have an uncertain positive effect upon the topic compared to the baseline in that it may increase use of public transport by discouraging use of private vehicles through more restricted parking. If car parking was more restricted, it would place greater importance on ensuring services are located in areas accessible by public transport or active/sustainable travel.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This policy option is likely to have a negative effect on this topic compared to the baseline in that by having less restrictive requirements upon car parking it would not increase access to and opportunities for walking, cycling ('active travel') and use of public transport.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is the same as the baseline position so would have a neutral effect in terms of sustainability.

Option 2 could have a negative effect upon the local economy and employment topic but a positive effect upon the land resources topic. It may also have uncertain positive effects upon the transport, climate change, air quality and local services and community infrastructure topics with this uncertainty being a result of more restricted parking discouraging the use of private vehicles.

Option 3, by not restricting car parking, would have negative effects upon several topics (transport, land resources, climate change, air quality and local services and community infrastructure) whilst only being offset by a positive effect upon the local economy and employment topic.

Option 4 would have negative effects upon the transport, air quality and climate change topics and is inferior to the current policy represented by option 1. The NPPF does not compensate for the removal of the adopted Local Plan requirement for Electric Vehicle Charging Points as it only indicates that development should be designed to enable charging of plug-in vehicles.

Overall, options 1 or 2 are considered to be the most sustainable.

TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE / TI03 – Digital Connectivity

Summary of 'options':

1. A flexible policy that governs communications and digital connectivity. This would support the NPPF, which sets most guidance for communications development.
2. No policy, and instead rely on national planning policy (NPPF).
3. A high level of control, for example by requiring new development to go beyond Part R1 of the Building Regulations 2010.

Overview of current baseline:

The baseline comprises Local Plan Policy IF3: Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth along with section 10 (Supporting high quality communications) of the NPPF and Part R1 of the Building Regulations. Policy IF3 contains limited references to communications and digital connectivity, comprising a requirement for development to provide essential site communications infrastructure and outlining support for the delivery of broadband and communications technology. NPPF provides greater detail, including in relation to minimising the number of masts and what should not be expected from local authorities in terms of limiting the siting of digital communications. It also details the supporting evidence required for applications. The current baseline position therefore most closely aligns with option 2, supported by some limited Local Plan policy.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic when compared to the baseline. An enhanced Local Plan policy would assist digital connectivity thus reducing isolation in the community. It could increase levels of participation in education through remote learning and improve the knowledge base. This could also improve the quality of life in deprived areas and for deprived groups.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic when compared to the baseline. An enhanced Local Plan policy would assist digital connectivity thus reducing isolation in the community. It could increase levels of participation in education through remote learning and improve the knowledge base. This could also improve the quality of life in deprived areas and for deprived groups. However, a too prescriptive policy would make this difficult to achieve due to its inflexibility.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic when compared to the baseline. An enhanced Local Plan policy would support businesses to achieve better digital connectivity and inclusivity.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This option would have a negative effect in relation to this topic when compared to the baseline. A policy with a high level of control is more likely to be inflexible in supporting businesses. However, an enhanced Local Plan policy could support businesses to achieve better digital connectivity and inclusivity</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect on this topic compared to the baseline. It would have the potential to improve the quality of the built and historic environment by restricting the siting of digital communications equipment.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect on this topic compared to the baseline. It would have the potential to improve the quality of the built and historic environment by restricting the siting of digital communications equipment.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>+ / 0</p> <p>This option would have a small positive effect in relation to this topic when compared to the baseline. It would assist in reducing isolation in the community by assisting digital connectivity and inclusivity</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would effectively represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This option could have a small positive effect compared to the baseline as it could help reduce isolation in the community by assisting digital connectivity and inclusivity. However, it could have a negative effect by hindering a reduction of isolation in the community by being too inflexible.</p>

Summary

Option 1 introduces a new policy on digital connectivity in new developments, compared to minimal current Local Plan policy but with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 112-116 and Building Regulations standards on the matter. The positive sentiments of the option 1 result in small positive effects on sustainability in terms of the local economy and employment and local services and community infrastructure topics.

Option 2 is closest to the baseline position so would have a neutral effect in terms of sustainability, with little or no effect compared to the current baseline situation.

Option 3 would introduce a high level of control which would have a mixed effect in sustainability terms with a small positive effect upon the cultural landscape and heritage topic but potentially negative effects upon other areas due to its inflexibility and prescriptivism.

Overall, Option 1 would be the most sustainable.

TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE / TI04 – Low Carbon and Renewable Energy

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. Designate specific areas of opportunity for low carbon and renewable energy ('LCRE').
 2. Do not allocate any areas for low carbon and renewable energy to enable a flexible response to schemes.
 3. Require all new developments to provide renewable energy – e.g. solar panels on commercial buildings and new dwellings.

Overview of current baseline: The baseline position comprises adopted Local Plan Policy EN1: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure, the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 155 and 158 in particular), National Planning Practice Guidance and Building Regulations Approved Document L (Conservation of Fuel and Power). It should be noted that some measures identified by adopted Local Plan Policy EN1 have ceased nationally, including the Code for Sustainable Homes and 'Allowable Solutions', the latter of which gave developers an economical way of compensating for the CO2 emission reductions that were difficult to achieve through normal design and construction. As such, the baseline position is broadly reflected by option 2.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. Should the policy encourage LCRE community energy schemes then there are opportunities for communities to benefit from cheaper, renewable electricity-delivering positives in terms of affordable heat, reduction in fuel poverty, and thereby improvements to health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. Requiring new developments to deliver LCRE, should help reduce building energy costs, delivering positives in terms of affordable heat, reduction in fuel poverty, and thereby improvements to health and wellbeing.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect on this topic compared to the baseline. It would potentially increase the economic benefit derived from the Borough's natural environment by promoting and supporting a green economy.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;">+ / 0 / -</p> <p>This option may have an uncertain effect in relation to this topic as far as this relates to reducing the loss of high quality (best and most versatile) agricultural land until such areas are identified</p> <p>NPPG requires larger solar energy proposals to consider a sequence of sites / locations appropriate for such development comprising brownfield, followed by greenfield land, with poorer quality agricultural land to be used in preference to higher quality land. An approach that designates the most appropriate areas of the Borough for wind and solar energy schemes should reduce development pressure on high quality agricultural land, of which West Lancashire has a large proportion, providing that other suitable sites are available Where no 'sequentially preferred' sites exist then this may result in the use of agricultural land for LCRE uses. However, siting solar panels on land is reversible, and often agricultural uses, like sheep grazing, can continue with solar panels in situ. There should not be any significant impact on land resources, but it could result in the non-agricultural use of agricultural land (negative) or the protection of agricultural land (positive).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. LCRE would be encouraged on existing and new properties, which would help to protect greenfield / agricultural land from being used for LCRE.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)			

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic. Designating the most appropriate areas of the Borough for wind and solar energy schemes should guide development to protect the character and appearance of the Borough's more valuable landscapes.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>- / ?</p> <p>This option may have an uncertain negative effect in relation to this topic as far as this relates to not improving the quality of the built and historic environment. There may be a tension between requiring all new developments to provide renewable energy such as solar panels and ensuring visual aesthetics and quality, particularly in historic environments.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic. The proactive designation of appropriate areas of the Borough for wind and solar energy schemes would assist in minimising the need for carbon-based energy generation / use and maximising the production / deployment of renewable energy.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position. However, since the adoption of Policy EN4, the NPPF has mandated that Council's must designate specific areas for wind energy. A failure to designate specific areas means that the Council would be unable to support any proposals for wind energy, and, if taken as a wider approach with other forms of LCRE, would detrimentally impact on the Borough's ability to achieve net zero and to protect energy self-sufficiency.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect in relation to this topic. It would assist in minimising the need for carbon-based energy generation / use and maximising the production / deployment of renewable energy. It should also encourage new developments to achieve low, and ideally zero, carbon.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>+</p> <p>This option should have positive effect in relation to this topic as far as this relates to reducing emissions of greenhouse gases. The proactive approach to designating the most appropriate areas of the Borough for wind and solar energy schemes should encourage more renewable energy schemes of this nature and therefore reduce emissions of greenhouse gases.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have a positive effect on this topic compared to the baseline. Requiring all new developments to provide renewable energy will reduce reliance upon fossil fuels therefore reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>+</p> <p>This option would have the potential to deliver positive effects. Should the policy encourage LCRE community energy schemes then there are opportunities for communities to benefit from cheaper, renewable electricity, supporting community's self-sufficiency in relation to energy infrastructure.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Summary

Option 1 advances the existing baseline position by proactively designating the most appropriate areas of the Borough for wind and solar energy schemes. This would have positive effects in terms of sustainability in relation to the cultural heritage and landscape, climate change / climate emergency, energy and flooding, air quality and local economy and employment topics. In addition, there would be uncertain positive, or negative, effects in relation to land resources.

Option 2 would have neutral effects in terms of sustainability as it closely resembles the baseline position.

Option 3 would also have overall positive effects in terms of sustainability; with positive effects relating to the climate change / climate emergency, energy and flooding and air quality topics but would have uncertain negative effects in relation to cultural heritage and landscape.

Overall, option 1 would therefore be the most sustainable; however, option 3 would also have merit compared to the baseline situation. It should be noted that options 1 and 3 are not mutually exclusive and, if appropriate, it may be possible to combine them into a single future policy.

TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE / TI05 – Energy efficiency in new developments

Summary of ‘options’:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Require 'major' developments, and encourage other 'minor' developments, to deliver energy efficiency improvements above national standards, considering energy efficiency in scheme design. Developers should also be required to monitor energy efficiency improvements in their developments, to evaluate and improve performance to ultimately achieve zero net carbon goals. 2. Require both major and minor residential and commercial developments to demonstrate how they have considered energy efficiency in their design, as a minimum in line with any national standards. 3. Require major, but not minor, developments to demonstrate how they have considered energy efficiency in their design, as a minimum in line with, and / or above, any national standards. 4. Have no requirements for energy efficiency in new buildings and allow developers to provide energy efficiency improvements in accordance with national building regulations only. 5. (Part variation): Do not require developers to monitor and evaluate energy efficiency performance.
Overview of current baseline:	<p>National policy is set out in the NPPF but does not refer to 'energy efficiency' as such. Other national standards are set out in Part L of Building Regulations (conservation of fuel and power) and through the Future Homes Standard. The current adopted WLLP has a policy (EN1) on low carbon development and energy infrastructure, tying in with Part L of Building Regulations as a minimum, also referring to the Code for Sustainable Homes (now rescinded). Policy EN1 also has a requirement for an Energy Statement setting out how improvements are achieved.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+</p> <p>This option should have no effect on this topic area. It could be argued that energy efficiency could help reduce health inefficiencies to a small extent, but there would be no, or insignificant change compared to the baseline in this respect. Improved energy efficiency in new dwellings could help address some inequalities relating to climate justice, for example responding to fuel poverty by providing houses with cheaper running costs. Requiring buildings to consider shade and cooling would aid health and wellbeing in periods of hotter temperatures and reduce heat-related illnesses.</p>	<p>+</p> <p>This option should have no effect on this topic area. As for Option 1, whilst it could be argued that energy efficiency could help reduce health inefficiencies, there would be expected to be no significant change compared to the baseline. Improved energy efficiency in new dwellings could help address some inequalities relating to climate justice, for example responding to fuel poverty by providing houses with cheaper running costs. Requiring buildings to consider shade and cooling would aid health and wellbeing in periods of hotter temperatures and reduce heat-related illnesses.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>No, or insignificant, change compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>Having no Local Plan requirements for energy efficiency means that only the minimum Building Regulations standards are met. It would be likely that fewer improvements could be made to improve the energy efficiency of buildings and reach net zero in advance of target dates. However, there should be no significant change compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>Having no requirement to monitor and evaluate energy efficiency performance should result in no change compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area. The baseline (WLLP policy) also has energy efficiency requirements. The new policy may have a higher standard, but the difference is not considered significant.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area. Whilst having no Local Plan-based requirement for energy efficiency could in theory improve viability, the difference is not expected to be significant as Building Regulations still apply.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area. Energy efficiency requirements may cost more in the first place but should ultimately result in savings for new business.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area. Lower energy efficiency requirements may mean less cost at the outset for new business, but greater running costs, plus Building Regulations still apply.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, net effects compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area. (Air quality is considered below.)</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>No difference compared to the baseline for this topic area. Energy efficiency requirements may affect brownfield viability but Building Regulations still apply so differences are likely to be minor.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>+</p> <p>This option should result in positive benefits in terms of energy generation and use, and achievement of zero carbon. It is positive compared to the baseline, as the requirement is to go above national standards.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option should result in positive benefits in terms of energy generation and use, and achievement of zero carbon. However, the baseline also requires similar measures, so the differences are limited.</p>	<p>0 / +</p> <p>This option should result in positive benefits in terms of energy generation and use, and achievement of zero carbon. However, the baseline also requires similar measures, so the differences are limited.</p>	<p>0 / –</p> <p>Having no Local Plan-based energy efficiency requirements could result in negative effects for this topic area, although as Building Regulations still apply, the differences would be limited compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0 / –</p> <p>Having no monitoring requirement could result in negative effects for this topic area, although the differences would be expected to be limited compared to the baseline.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Air quality (Objective 8)	0 / + Impacts on air quality will be dependent on the type of energy being used (e.g. 100% renewable vs coal burning) at the source and so may not be directly affected by this approach. However, improving energy efficiencies mean that less energy would be needed to heat / light / cool buildings. This option should result in positive effects for this topic area. The effects would not be major compared to the baseline, which has comparable requirements.	0 / + Impacts on air quality will be dependent on the type of energy being used (e.g. 100% renewable vs coal burning) at the source and so may not be directly affected by this approach. However, improving energy efficiencies mean that less energy would be needed to heat / light / cool buildings. This option may result in positive effects for this topic area. However, the effects would be limited compared to the baseline, which has similar requirements.	0 / + Impacts on air quality will be dependent on the type of energy being used (e.g. 100% renewable vs coal burning) at the source and so may not be directly affected by this approach. However, improving energy efficiencies mean that less energy would be needed to heat / light / cool buildings. This option may result in positive effects for this topic area. However, the effects would be limited compared to the baseline, which has comparable requirements, and it does not apply to minor developments.	0 / – As for the other options, impacts on air quality will be dependent on the type of energy being used, but in general terms, improving energy efficiencies mean that less energy would be needed to heat / light / cool buildings. This option, which has no requirements for energy efficiency in new buildings, may therefore result in negative effects for this topic area. Nevertheless, Building Regulations apply, so the effects would be expected to be limited.	0 / – As for the other options, impacts on air quality will be dependent on the type of energy being used, but in general terms, improving energy efficiencies mean that less energy would be needed to heat / light / cool buildings. This option, which has no requirements for monitoring and evaluating energy efficiency performance, may result in negative effects for this topic area as more energy could possibly need to be generated. Nevertheless, Building Regulations apply, so the effects would be limited.
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	0 This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.	0 This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.	0 This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.	0 This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.	0 This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option should result in no, or insignificant, difference compared to the baseline for this topic area.</p>

Summary

Options 1-3 have few significant differences compared to the baseline, given the baseline policy position set out in the WLLP is similar in requiring meeting Building Regulations as a minimum. The positive effects relative to the baseline (under the topic areas of the climate emergency and air quality) are the most marked for Option 1 as this requires energy efficiency improvements above national standards for major development and encourages them for minor development.

For Options 2 and 3, the positive effects compared to the baseline are less marked as Option 2 only requires energy efficiency in line with national standards, and Option 3 only applies to major developments, and could be either in line with, or above, national standards.

Option 4 has negative effects compared to the baseline for the topic areas of the climate emergency, and air quality, given its lack of local plan requirements to exceed national standards. (The baseline encourages going above national standards, or at least anticipates national standards increasing over time.)

Option 5 is considered only to have minor effects compared to the baseline for the above two topic areas, as it is not guaranteed that a lack of monitoring and evaluation would actually result in lower energy efficiency standards, or if it did, these would not be expected to be significant.

Overall, Option 1 is considered to be the most sustainable, followed by Option 3.

TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE / TI06 – Water efficiency in new residential developments

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. To introduce tighter, local restrictions, above that of the minimum optional Building Regulation standards, to improve water efficiency in new residential developments.
 2. Do not have a policy; rely instead on Building Regulations to deliver water efficiency.

Overview of current baseline: There is no WLLP policy dealing with water efficiency in new developments, nor any current SPD. There are no explicit references to water efficiency in the NPPF but there are more general references to water management and that local plan policies should support measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts. NPPG (Housing: optional technical standards) indicates how a tighter water efficiency standard may be required in new dwellings. Building Regulations Approved Document G provides guidance on the supply of water to a property, including water efficiency i.e. an easily accessible water supply that doesn’t incur wastage. This relates to the use of fittings in relation to water consumption, e.g. for a toilet, and is optional. However, there is an overall mandatory national requirement for all new homes to meet the usage standard set out in Building Regulations of 125 litres/person/day. Option 2 therefore represents the baseline position.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Having a water efficiency in new developments policy should result in a positive change compared to the baseline by helping to improve resilience to the likely effects of climate change. As a result of climate change, the amounts and frequency of rainfall will change. Winters will be wetter, and summers will become hotter and more prolonged and this will result in increased pressure on water resources.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p style="text-align: center;">+</p> <p>Having a water efficiency in new developments policy should result in a positive change compared to the baseline by helping to minimise effects upon water supply and, to some extent, reducing the amount of wastewater generated by development. This would help to ensure an adequate supply of water as better water efficiency means that new homes will use less water.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Summary

Option 1 introduces a new policy on water efficiency in new developments, compared to no current Local Plan policy and optional Building Regulations standards on the matter. As such it has a positive effect on sustainability in terms of helping to improve resilience to the likely effects of climate change by improving water efficiencies and so reducing demand on the water supply and, to some extent, reducing the amount of wastewater generated by development. In all other aspects of the sustainability appraisal framework, this preferred option has little or no effect compared to the baseline situation.

Option 2 proposes no policy, so is the same as the baseline. It assumes there is no need to expressly address the issue in West Lancashire; in that sense it is considered less sustainable than option 1.

Using water resources more efficiently is a global issue that policy at the local level can contribute towards and therefore option 1 is the most sustainable.

OTHER POLICIES / OT01 – Sequential Tests

- Summary of ‘options’:**
1. A Sequential Test Policy comprising retail and other town centre uses on sites outside centres and proposals at risk from flooding. This is about guiding new town centre uses to town centres as a first priority, then edge of town centre sites and finally out of centre locations that are accessible. In relation to flood risk, it entails guiding new development towards sites at less risk of flooding from all sources
 2. To not have a Local Plan sequential test policy and rely on national planning advice instead
 3. Setting out the approach to undertaking a sequential test, as outlined by option 1, in separate town centre and flood risk policies
 4. Existing Local Plan Policy GN5: Sequential Tests. This relates to retail and other town centre uses on sites outside centres; proposals at risk from flooding; affordable housing, employment uses and community facilities on Protected Land; affordable Housing or Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Green Belt; and accommodation for temporary agricultural / horticultural workers

Overview of current baseline: There is an existing WLLP policy on sequential tests (Policy GN5) as well as the matter being covered by the National Planning Policy Framework sections 7 (Ensuring the vitality of town centres) and 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change) and supported by National Planning Practice Guidance. This is the baseline situation and represents option 4.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. This is because the baseline (represented by option 4) simply details how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Reducing the uses to which the sequential test applies would have no effect in terms of sustainability as other local plan policies indicate the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. This is because the baseline (represented by option 4) simply details how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Omitting the sequential test policy from the local plan would have no effect in terms of sustainability as other local plan policies indicate the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. This is because the baseline (represented by option 4) simply details how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Reducing the uses to which the sequential test applies would have no effect in terms of sustainability as other local plan policies indicate the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. This is because the baseline (represented by option 4) simply details how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Reducing the uses to which the sequential test applies would have no effect in terms of sustainability as other local plan policies indicate the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. This is because the baseline (represented by option 4) simply details how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Omitting the sequential test policy from the local plan would have no effect in terms of sustainability as other local plan policies indicate the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. This is because the baseline (represented by option 4) simply details how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Reducing the uses to which the sequential test applies would have no effect in terms of sustainability as other local plan policies indicate the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. This is because the baseline (represented by option 4) simply details how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Reducing the uses to which the sequential test applies would have no effect in terms of sustainability as other local plan policies indicate the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. This is because the baseline (represented by option 4) simply details how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Omitting the sequential test policy from the local plan would have no effect in terms of sustainability as other local plan policies indicate the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline. This is because the baseline (represented by option 4) simply details how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Reducing the uses to which the sequential test applies would have no effect in terms of sustainability as other local plan policies indicate the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it closely resembles the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>

Summary

Options 1, 2 and 3 differ in composition compared to the baseline, but all would be equally sustainable as the baseline position because all also have neutral effects in terms of sustainability. This is because the policy approach simply gives clarity relating to technical matters of how to undertake a satisfactory sequential test. Therefore, this deals with the quality of the test i.e. how to do it. Other local plan policies detail additional uses of relevance and circumstances (other than town centre uses and flood risk which are covered by national advice) and the sequence to be followed in establishing site / a proposal's suitability for those uses. What other uses that are listed in the sequential test as alternative policy approaches is therefore irrelevant in varying the assessment of them in terms of sustainability.

Option 4 follows the current local plan policy approach in West Lancashire and, along with national planning advice, this represents the baseline; as such it has a neutral effect in terms of sustainability. .

As such, all options 1-4 are equally sustainable and the choice of option would be determined by other matters e.g. option 3 unduly repeats policy.

OTHER POLICIES / OT02 – Viability

- Summary of 'options':**
1. A general 'hierarchy of viability', reflecting the priorities of the Local Plan, and 'ranking' the desirable outcomes that should be achieved (e.g. Affordable housing, biodiversity net gain, infrastructure). The policy would also include criteria for demonstrating viability (e.g. marketing)
 2. Have a very rigid policy that only allows the set 'hierarchy' to be followed with no variation from it. The approach for demonstrating viability (e.g. marketing) would also be stricter than under current policy GN4.
 3. Have a more relaxed policy that essentially allows applicants to choose the desirable outcomes they want with very few or even no criteria to be satisfied. The approach for demonstrating viability (e.g. marketing) would be less strict than under current policy GN4.

Overview of current baseline: WLLP Policy GN4 takes a flexible approach, to allow some deviation from policy where it can be demonstrated that a use is no longer viable and marketing evidence shows there is no demand for that use. The importance of viability repeats itself through the NPPF, and further guidance can be found in the MHCLG Guidance Note on Viability. Option 1 is most closely aligned to the existing baseline, but includes additional requirements relating to a viability hierarchy.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p>+</p> <p>This approach would continue current policy GN4 in relation to demonstrating viability. In addition, it would also 'rank' the desirable outcomes that should be achieved through new development, based on viability evidence. This would mean that those outcomes deemed most important, for example affordable housing, would be prioritised for delivery. At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, it cannot be known which requirements this would be. However, this approach would likely be most flexible to delivering improvements to benefit the Borough's population, health and social inclusion (affordable housing, infrastructure) whilst protecting against the loss of key community, retail or employment facilities.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a stricter policy than the current baseline (GN4). Whilst, in theory, this could deliver greater improvements for the Borough's population, in reality, an inflexible policy would likely mean that developments would not go ahead because of viability issues, or the re-use of non-viable premises would not occur, meaning that the 'knock-on' benefits would not be delivered.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This approach would introduce a weaker policy than the current baseline (GN4). Applicants would be able to choose those outcomes they want, with the likely result that very few, or no, requirements would be delivered. This would mean that the 'knock-on' benefits would also be very unlikely to be delivered. Typically, these requirements (affordable housing, open space etc) help improve health and social wellbeing.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Housing (Objective 7)	<p>?</p> <p>This approach would continue current policy GN4 in relation to demonstrating viability. In addition, it would also 'rank' the desirable outcomes that should be achieved through new development, based on viability evidence. This would mean that those outcomes deemed most important, for example affordable housing, would be prioritised for delivery. At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help meet the housing needs of sections of society. There is the potential for it to help deliver affordable housing .</p>	<p>?</p> <p>This approach would introduce a stricter policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help meet the housing needs of sections of society.</p>	<p>?</p> <p>This approach would introduce a weaker policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help meet the housing needs of sections of society.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p>0</p> <p>This approach would continue current policy GN4 in relation to demonstrating viability, and so protect against the loss of commercial premises unless poor viability could be demonstrated.</p>	<p>+ / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a stricter policy than the current baseline (GN4). Whilst this would protect more against the loss of commercial premises, it would be less flexible in those cases where poor viability was demonstrated making it harder to support changes of use and support sustainable settlements.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>This approach would introduce a weaker policy than the current baseline (GN4). It would make it harder to protect against the loss of commercial premises to other uses.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective. Continuing policy GN4, with a flexible approach to considering viability, would help support the re-use of heritage buildings, e.g. listed buildings.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>A stricter policy, than the current baseline (GN4), could make it more difficult to redevelop, and so protect, cultural heritage buildings.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>A weaker policy, than the current baseline (GN4) could help support the re-use of heritage buildings, although it would be unlikely that any 'knock-on' benefits would be secured.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>? / +</p> <p>This approach would continue current policy GN4 in relation to demonstrating viability. In addition, it would also 'rank' the desirable outcomes that should be achieved through new development, based on viability evidence. This would mean that those outcomes deemed most important, for example energy/water efficient housing, would be prioritised for delivery. At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help meet domestic carbon reduction targets. There is the potential for it to support energy efficient housing or to create sustainable settlements.</p>	<p>? / + / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a stricter policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help meet the housing needs of sections of society. In theory, it could help ensure energy efficiencies are prioritised, so meeting carbon reduction targets, but it could also mean a number of requirements would ultimately prevent any developments / benefits from being delivered.</p>	<p>? / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a weaker policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help meet carbon reduction targets. It would be expected that very few, or no, requirements would be delivered, making it harder to respond to the climate emergency.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>? / +</p> <p>This approach would continue current policy GN4 in relation to demonstrating viability. In addition, it would also 'rank' the desirable outcomes that should be achieved through new development, based on viability evidence. This would mean that those outcomes deemed most important, for example energy/water efficient housing, would be prioritised for delivery. At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help improve water resources.</p>	<p>? / + / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a stricter policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help meet the housing needs of sections of society. In theory, it could help ensure water efficiencies are prioritised but it could also mean a number of requirements would ultimately prevent any developments / benefits from being delivered.</p>	<p>? / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a weaker policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help improve water efficiencies. It would be expected that very few, or no, requirements would be delivered, making it harder to deliver these improvements.</p>
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this objective.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p>? / +</p> <p>This approach would continue current policy GN4 in relation to demonstrating viability. In addition, it would also 'rank' the desirable outcomes that should be achieved through new development, based on viability evidence. This would mean that those outcomes deemed most important, for example biodiversity net gain, would be prioritised for delivery. At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help improve biodiversity.</p>	<p>? / + / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a stricter policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help deliver improvements to biodiversity. In theory, it could help ensure biodiversity net gain is prioritised but it could also mean a number of requirements would ultimately prevent any developments / benefits from being delivered.</p>	<p>? / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a weaker policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help improve biodiversity. It would be expected that very few, or no, requirements would be delivered, making it harder to deliver these improvements.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>? / +</p> <p>This approach would continue current policy GN4 in relation to demonstrating viability. In addition, it would also 'rank' the desirable outcomes that should be achieved through new development, based on viability evidence. This would mean that those outcomes deemed most important, for example community infrastructure, would be prioritised for delivery. At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help improve community infrastructure.</p>	<p>? / + / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a stricter policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help deliver improvements to community infrastructure. In theory, it could help support the delivery of community infrastructure but it a high number of requirements could also mean developments / benefits may ultimately not be delivered.</p>	<p>? / -</p> <p>This approach would introduce a weaker policy than the current baseline (GN4). At present, until evidence details the relative costs of each requirement, and a priority for them is established, it cannot be known whether this approach would help improve community infrastructure. It would be expected that applicants would choose to deliver very few, or no, requirements, making it harder to deliver improvements to community infrastructure.</p>

Summary

Option 1 is considered the most sustainable option, maintaining the current policy GN4, but with an added approach to 'rank' the desirable outcomes that should be achieved through new development, based on viability evidence. Option 1 promotes the greatest flexibility in approach, balancing viability considerations with achieving the greatest 'knock-on' benefits possible, via a hierarchy, informed by evidence.

Option 2 would introduce a stricter policy than the current baseline position. At this stage, without the viability evidence, the level of impact on sustainability cannot truly be known – in theory it could help greater support delivery of benefits, but a higher number of requirements could also mean developments / benefits may ultimately not be delivered as they could be rendered unviable.

Option 3 would introduce a weaker policy than the current baseline position. It would be expected that applicants would choose to deliver very few, or no, requirements meaning that few benefits would be delivered, and/or there would be less control in ensuring that the 'higher priority' items are delivered.

Overall, Option 1 is considered the most sustainable.

OTHER POLICIES / OT03 – Developer Contributions

- Summary of 'options':**
1. To follow the current local plan policy approach of requiring certain developments to provide a development contribution towards funding or delivering new infrastructure requirements.
 2. To not have a policy requiring developer contributions.

Overview of current baseline: There is an existing WLLP policy on developer contributions (Policy IF4) and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is operative in West Lancashire. There is also an SPD (Provision of Public Open Space in New Residential Developments) dealing with planning obligations (Section 106 legal agreements) and NPPF Section 4 covers 'Planning conditions and obligations' including setting out the 3 tests for when obligations may be sought. This is the baseline situation and represents option 1.

The baseline position allows the local authority to raise CIL funds from developers who are undertaking new building projects in the area and the money can be used to pay for a wide range of infrastructure that is needed to support new development. Planning obligations can be used where they are necessary to make a proposed development acceptable.

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Population, Health and Social Inclusion (Objectives 1-3)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0 / -</p> <p>This option would have a small negative effect on this topic compared to the baseline. Whilst there would be no Local Plan policy requiring developer contributions, both the Community Infrastructure Levy and planning obligations could still be used to deliver infrastructure and affordable housing. However, the opportunity to review / update (or even add to) existing supplementary planning advice may be reduced. As there is an existing Provision of Public Open Space in New Residential Developments SPD, which could require review, there may therefore be a small negative effect upon opportunities to enhance areas of public open and recreational space, and Green Infrastructure. In relation to this topic, they support opportunities for physical and mental health improvement.</p>
Housing (Objective 7)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Local Economy and Employment (Objectives 4-6)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Transport (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Land Resources (Objective 9)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Cultural heritage and landscape (Objective 10)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Climate change / the climate emergency, energy and flooding (Objective 11)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Water quality and resources (Objective 12)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Air quality (Objective 8)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>
Biodiversity (Objective 13)	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>This option would have little or no effect on this topic compared to the baseline.</p>

Topic	Option 1	Option 2
Local services and community infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 8)	<p>0</p> <p>This option would have no effect in relation to this topic as it would represent the baseline position.</p>	<p>0 / -</p> <p>This option would have a small negative effect on this topic compared to the baseline. Whilst there would be no Local Plan policy requiring developer contributions both the Community Infrastructure Levy and planning obligations could still be used to deliver infrastructure and affordable housing. However, the opportunity to review / update (or even add to) existing supplementary planning advice may be reduced. As there is an existing Provision of Public Open Space in New Residential Developments SPD, which could require review, there may therefore be a small negative effect upon opportunities to improve the quantity and quality of, and access to, areas of open and recreational space, and to Green Infrastructure in general.</p>

Summary

Option 1 follows the current local plan policy approach in West Lancashire of requiring certain developments to provide a development contribution towards funding or delivering new infrastructure requirements. As this represents the baseline, it has a neutral effect in terms of sustainability.

Option 2 (to not have a policy requiring developer contributions) would still enable both the Community Infrastructure Levy and planning obligations to be used to deliver infrastructure and affordable housing, but it is slightly less sustainable in relation to the population, health and social inclusion and the local services and community infrastructure topics.

Therefore Option 1, whilst neutral, is the more sustainable of the two.