

Appendix P - Site Appraisal Framework – October 2012

Sustainability objective	Site appraisal criteria	SA scores?
1. Biodiversity	(a) Designations Habitats and/or species of International / National significance within 600m – eg SSSI, SACs, Great Crested Newts Habitats and/or species of regional significance within 300m – eg SBIs Habitats and/or species of community significance eg Local Nature Reserve, TPOs No environmental constraints or designations within or adjacent to site	XXXX XX X 0
	(b) Priority habitats and species Ecology study outcomes. Qualitative assessment	N/A
2. Air Quality	(a) Potential air quality impacts / (b) Impacts with mitigation/infrastructure improvements Major negative impact – increased levels of pollution and exposure to poor air quality Moderate negative impact – increased levels of pollution and/or exposure to poor air quality Minor negative impact – increased levels of pollution and/or exposure to poor air quality Neutral impact Major positive impact – decreased levels of pollution and/or exposure to poor air quality Major positive impact – decreased levels of pollution and/or exposure to poor air quality Major positive impact – decreased levels of pollution and exposure to poor air quality	XXXX XX X 0 ✓ ✓✓ ✓✓✓
3. Soil and Minerals	(a) Brownfield / Greenfield proportion Site is 100% Greenfield Site predominantly Greenfield (more than 70%) Greenfield/Brownfield roughly 50/50 Site predominantly Brownfield (more than 70%) Site 100% Previously Developed Land	XXXX XX X ✓ ✓✓
	(b) Impact on agricultural land Site development would result in significant loss of the “best and most versatile” agricultural land (grade 1, 2 and 3a) Site development would result in some loss of the “best and most versatile” agricultural land (grade 1, 2 and 3a) Site development would result in loss of agricultural land classified as 3b and 3c / loss of land used for agriculture Land is 3c or below and will not result in significant loss of land that is currently used for agriculture	XXXX XX X 0

Appendix P - Site Appraisal Framework – October 2012

Sustainability objective	Site appraisal criteria	SA scores?
4. Water	(a) Flood risk (fluvial) Significant parts of site within flood zone 3 (a & b) Significant parts of site within flood zone 2 Site adjacent to significant areas of flood zone 3 (a & b) Small parts of site within flood zones 2 and 3 Site adjacent to significant areas of flood zone 2 Majority of site within flood zone 1 (less than 1 in 1000 probability) / Site not adjacent to significant area of zone 3 (a or b)	XXXX XX XX X X 0
	(b) Water supply issues Significant supply issue identified requiring major infrastructure provision Capacity issues identified i.e. reinforcement required or identification that certain uses may cause capacity issues No issues reported	XXXX X 0
	(c) Waste water services Site with major capacity constraints/servicing/cost issues Site with moderate capacity /servicing/cost issues Site with no capacity /servicing/cost issues	XXXX XX 0
5. Landscapes	Landscape character appraisal (Subjective appraisal based on character areas /sensitivity) Major negative impact Moderate negative impact Minor negative impact Neutral impact Minor positive impact Moderate positive impact Major positive impact	XXXX XX X 0 ✓ ✓✓ ✓✓✓
6. Built Environment	Historic environment designations Listed buildings Grade 1 within or adjacent to site Listed buildings Grade 2 within or adjacent to site Conservation Area, Several Blints within or adjacent to site Buildings of local interest within or adjacent to site / local historic features No constraints or designations within or adjacent to site	XX XX X 0/X ✓
7. Community Safety	Qualitative assessment undertaken by Community Safety Team	

Appendix P - Site Appraisal Framework – October 2012

Sustainability objective	Site appraisal criteria	SA scores?
8. Neighbourhood Quality	(a) Amenity considerations Unacceptably high adverse affects for adjacent occupiers Significant adverse affects for adjacent occupiers Moderate adverse affects for adjacent occupiers Slight adverse affects for adjacent occupiers Amenity of adjacent occupiers unaffected/improved	XXXX XX X 0 ✓
	(b) Environmental gain Environmental gain non-existent or even negative Minimal environmental gain Moderate levels of environmental gain Strong levels of environmental gain Very strong levels of environmental gain	X 0 ✓ ✓✓ ✓✓✓
9. Waste	Qualitative assessment considering impact on waste production	
10. Health	Qualitative assessment considering impact on services and ability to deliver new services	
11. Leisure and Culture	(a) Impact on existing recreational space and opportunity for enhancement Major loss of quality open space without like for like replacement Some loss of open space with local amenity value without adequate compensation Some loss of open space with adequate compensation Some loss of open space but provision of higher quality space as compensation Net Gain in quality open space for recreation Significant net gain in quality open space for recreation	XXXX XX XX 0/✓ ✓✓ ✓✓✓
	(a) Contribution towards housing delivery targets Significant Moderate Minor Negligible	✓✓✓ ✓✓ ✓ 0
12. Housing	(b) Viability of sustainability / affordability targets Very weak Weak Moderate Strong Very strong	XXXX XX ✓ ✓✓ ✓✓✓

Appendix P - Site Appraisal Framework – October 2012

Sustainability objective	Site appraisal criteria	SA scores?
13. Education and Learning	Impact on capacity Major impact Moderate impact Minor impact / neutral Positive impact	xx x 0 ✓
14. Community Development	(a) Appropriate development in deprived areas i.e. the site is well related to areas of high deprivation and presents opportunities to reduce the inequality gap Very low levels of deprivation overall (71-100% most deprived) Low levels of deprivation overall (41-70% most deprived) Moderate levels of deprivation overall (mainly 21-40% most deprived / or a mix of low and high level areas) Some high levels of deprivation but considerable amounts of moderate, low and very low levels of deprivation too. Moderate levels of deprivation overall – but with small pockets of high or very high levels High levels of deprivation overall (mainly 11-20% most deprived) Very high levels of deprivation in the area overall (mainly top 10% most deprived) <i>If there are areas surrounding or within the site with differing levels of deprivation, the score should be adjusted to reflect the OVERALL levels of deprivation</i>	xxx xx x 0 ✓ ✓✓ ✓✓✓
15. Energy	(a) Electricity supply constraints Site has a history of capacity issues and/or location of existing infrastructure would severely constrain development Some capacity issues identified and/or location of existing infrastructure would constrain development No / some minor capacity issues identified (b) Potential for decentralised and low carbon energy No scoring. Information only.	xx x 0 N/A

Appendix P - Site Appraisal Framework – October 2012

Sustainability objective	Site appraisal criteria	SA scores?
16. Accessibility and Transport	<p>(a) Public/sustainable transport accessibility No public transport routes within 10 minutes walk of centre of site Centre of site served by DRT or within 10 minutes walk of a low (less than 20 minute) frequency bus service Centre of site within 5 minutes walk of a low (less than 20 minute) frequency bus service Centre of site within 10 minutes walk of a bus stop with a high (20 minutes or better) frequency bus service Centre of site within 5 minutes walk of a high frequency bus service Centre of site within 10 minute walk of rail and/or bus station and within a 5 minute walk of a high frequency bus service Centre of site within 5 minute walk of rail and/or bus station <i>Note walking and cycle</i></p>	<p>××× ×× × 0 ✓ ✓✓ ✓✓✓</p>
	<p>(b) Existing congestion on surrounding road network Very high High Moderate Low Very Low</p>	<p>×× × 0 ✓ ✓✓</p>
	<p>(c) Improvements/mitigation /suggestions Notes. Qualitative assessment</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Appendix P - Site Appraisal Framework – October 2012

Sustainability objective	Site appraisal criteria	SA scores?
<p>17. Sustainable Economy</p>	<p>Appropriate employment provision in deprived areas i.e. the site is well related to areas of high deprivation (employment domain) and presents opportunities to reduce inequality gap: (Employment sites only)</p> <p>Very low levels of deprivation overall (71-100% most deprived)</p> <p>Low levels of deprivation overall (41-70% most deprived)</p> <p>Moderate levels of deprivation overall (mainly 21-40% most deprived / or a mix of low and high level areas)</p> <p>Some high levels of deprivation but considerable amounts of moderate, low and very low levels of deprivation too.</p> <p>Moderate levels of deprivation overall – but with small pockets of high or very high levels</p> <p>High levels of deprivation overall (mainly 11-20% most deprived)</p> <p>Very high levels of deprivation in the area overall (mainly top 10% most deprived)</p> <p><i>If there are areas surrounding or within the site with differing levels of deprivation, the score should be adjusted to reflect the OVERALL levels of deprivation</i></p>	<p>×××</p> <p>××</p> <p>×</p> <p>0</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓✓</p> <p>✓✓✓</p>
<p>18. Economy & Employment</p>	<p>(a) Attractiveness for development / raising Wigan’s economic profile</p> <p>Very weak</p> <p>Weak</p> <p>Moderate</p> <p>Strong</p> <p>Very strong</p>	<p>×××</p> <p>××</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓✓</p> <p>✓✓✓</p>
	<p>(b) Owner constraints</p> <p>Notes.</p>	<p>N/A</p>