

Appendix to Consultation Response from Keith Reed: Site Assessment Table

Ref	Name	Observations	Suitable for Development?	Qualifications / Further comment
S41	36 Lindeth Road	Site of disused greenhouses. Impinges into valuable and attractive open countryside / valley running between Know Hill and Lindeth Road. Development could create a precedent for further unacceptable development, in particular on S58. Duplicates part of S46.	No	
S42	Blue Hills Cottage, Spring Bank	Curtilage of existing semi-detached house. Large detached house recently built on site.	No	
S43	Elmslack Field, Cove Road	Highly visible site whose development would significantly increase the suburbanisation of Silverdale and impact on the landscape character of the AONB. Together with the adjoining play area and bowling green, forms an important open space.	No	It is understood that the owner does not wish this site to be developed. If available and justified to meet local need and permitted in such a way as to ensure no future extension onto this site, a small part of the site fronting Cove Road may be suitable. This would need to retain a narrow access to the field behind. However drainage may be problematic.
S44	Hawes Villa, Moss Lane	Isolated, unsustainable site.	No	
S 45	Hawthorn Bank, Cove Road	Site currently occupied by two dwellings, one of which has been substantially improved. Unclear what is being proposed.	No	Possible space for one dwelling within grounds. Possible access to land to the south, subject to adequate sight lines.
S46	Kayes Garden Centre, Lindeth Road	Former nursery; two existing dwellings (Waithman's House and Barn). Opportunity for development of eastern part of the site, but not the western part currently used for greenhouses (see S41 above). The curtilage of the existing dwellings, other overgrown land and the car-park/ former tea rooms could be developed. Existing dwellings could be redeveloped or retained. Sustainable location; served by Silverdale Shuttle.	Yes- part	Part of site (former garden centre car-park) is subject to a current planning application. It is understood that the owner (occupier of one of the houses) does not want the curtilage developed. This part is possibly available in the longer term? The greenhouse site to the west should revert to agricultural use as part of any permission, but could also be used as a drainage field for a sewage treatment plant to serve development on the eastern part of the site.
S47	Land between 10B and 12 Lindeth Road	Small site offering views to the attractive valley and hill beyond (site S58). Slopes	Yes	Has planning permission already been granted? Drainage may be problematic.

		steeply down to the west. Possible small infill site, but would need to maintain views through the site.		
S48	Land east of Lindeth Close	Well screened site to the rear of existing housing. Much of the site is wooded and sloping, but small area to the north (adjoining electricity sub-station) is developable, subject to access being obtained from Lindeth Close via track alongside 35a Lindeth Road. Would have some adverse impact on footpath through site.	Yes- part	It is understood that the northern and southern ends of the site are in private ownership and should be excluded from the site boundary, as should areas of woodland for retention. This may make the site unviable. The south-western part of the site (rear of 9-14 Lindeth Close) may be required for a drainage field, but would need to be 15 metres away from existing houses. .
S49	Land east of 12 Emesgate Lane	Part of curtilage of 12-14 Emesgate Lane. A possible brownfield site subject to access but would be piecemeal development. Best developed as part of a comprehensive scheme for the whole site in accordance with a planning brief to ensure it contributes to the improvement of the village centre.	Yes	It is understood that the owner is not willing to release this site at present. Possible allocation (together with the rest of the land) for years 10-15 of the plan period.
S50	Land east of St John's Avenue	Large highly visible site to the east of the village. Its development would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the village and of the AONB.	No	The frontage onto St John's Avenue and a small corner to the west of St John's Grove may be suitable if justified to meet local needs and permitted in such a way as to ensure no future extension onto this site. This would need to retain a narrow access to the field behind.
S51	Land north of Woodlands Cottage, Woodlands Drive	Sloping site covered in mature trees. Development would result in loss of trees and would then be prominent above existing house. Its development would have a significant adverse impact on the AONB.	No	
S52	Land east of Hawes Villa, Moss Lane	Isolated, unsustainable site.	No	
S53	Land south east of Woodlands Hotel	Although visible from distant viewpoints (e.g. the footpath across site S50), it is seen against existing development and is well screened and contained by trees. Pedestrian links to the village centre may need to be improved.	Yes	Consideration could be given to including land to the west and north, although the former comprises an attractive lawn fronting the Woodlands Hotel and the latter is also in the hotel grounds. The owners' intentions for this additional land are unknown. The southern part of the site would be

				required for a drainage field (unless possible within the wooded area outside the site).
S54	Land south of Cove Drive	The site is not highly visible from distant views or nearby footpaths and is generally seen against existing development. It appears to have little landscape or wildlife value in its own right. It is in a very sustainable location, especially if pedestrian access can be secured to the village in a southerly direction.	Yes	It may constitute major development and would therefore need to be justified as meeting the exceptional circumstance and public interest tests in paragraph 116 of the NPPF. Drainage may be problematic since there is no obvious location for a drainage field at a lower level.
S55	Land south of Park Road and east of the Row	Highly visible site on entrance to the village. Unsustainable location.	No	
S56	Land south of Whinney Fold	The site is an attractive small undulating stone-walled and hedged field and exemplifies one of the special qualities of the AONB. It forms a long 'tongue' protruding into the countryside and its development would be an alien incursion into a tranquil and scenic location. It would have an adverse impact on the public footpath running between Lindeth Road and Shore Road. Development would be seen as a clear pre-cursor for development of the land to the east and possibly of the wider area to the south. Moreover, in the absence of mains drainage, foul drainage of the site so close to the shore could pose a major risk to the internationally recognised Morecambe Bay SPA.	No	Development would constitute major development and is unlikely to be justified as meeting the exceptional circumstance and public interest tests in paragraph 116 of the NPPF. If proved to be required to meet local housing need, a very small development confined to the northern extremity of the site may be possible, providing this was permitted in such a way (in terms of layout and a section 106 agreement) as to ensure no future extension on this site or into site S58. A drainage field would be required within the southern part of the site.
S57	Land south of Windy Ridge, Wallings Lane	A narrow strip of former orchard land below Wallings Lane. It overlooks site S43 and should be seen as part of the setting of that site, being highly visible from Cove Road. Development is likely to detract from the character of the dwellings to the north, i.e. Windy Ridge and Broomhill, and it is not in a good location to meet local needs. Access to the site is problematic, down a narrow dead-end track with poor turning facilities.	No	A carefully designed scheme for one house may be possible, subject to access and drainage considerations.

S58	Land west of Lindeth Road	This site occupies an attractive valley between Know Hill and Lindeth Road. The site exemplifies the outstanding landscape quality of the AONB which is described in the AONB Management Plan as “a living ‘patchwork’ of contrasting habitats criss-crossed by limestone field boundaries and hedgerows” and “the small-scale yet complex nature of the landforms [giving] an intimate feeling within valleys”. Its development would have a seriously adverse impact on the character of Silverdale and of the AONB and would be contrary to paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF, especially since the scale of development is likely to be in excess of local need and so would not constitute exceptional circumstances in the public interest. The site is also prone to flooding as seen recently by the formation of a large pond. Moreover, in the absence of mains drainage, foul drainage of a site on this scale and so close to the shore would not be possible without being a major risk to the internationally recognised Morecambe Bay SPA.	No	
S70	Railway Goods Yard, Red Bridge Lane	Brownfield site. Not a conventionally sustainable site for housing but well located for the railway station in order to commute to employment elsewhere, as well as for the Silverdale Shuttle for access to village facilities. However probably more suitable for employment use, if there is demand for such a use here.	Yes (employment)	
S98	Sixteen Buoys, Ford lane, Waterslack	Highly visible site on entrance to the village. Isolated, unsustainable site.	No	