

# Vale of Glamorgan Replacement Local Development Plan 2021 – 2036

## Candidate Site Assessment Methodology

June 2022



**LDP Team**  
**Vale of Glamorgan Council**  
Dock Office, Barry Docks, Barry, CF63 4RT

[ldp@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk](mailto:ldp@valeofglamorgan.gov.uk)

## **Contents**

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. The Call for Candidate Sites</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Consideration of Existing LDP Allocations</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Candidate Site Assessment Process</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5. Consideration of additional sites submitted following publication of the Draft Preferred Strategy</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>6. Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>7. Sustainability Appraisal Criteria</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>8. Candidate Site Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>16</b>

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document sets out the methodology and process for evaluating the suitability of potential development sites for inclusion in the Replacement Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan 2021-2036 (RLDP). The methodology has been prepared to reflect legislative provisions, national policy contained within Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11 February 2021) (PPW) and national guidance for the preparation of LDPs set out in the Development Plans Manual (Edition 3 March 2020).
- 1.2 The candidate site assessment process forms part of the Council's RLDP background evidence. It will inform the identification of potential spatial growth options for the authority and inform the development of the RLDP Preferred Strategy for the Vale of Glamorgan over the Plan period.
- 1.3 The document identifies the approach that the Council will take in the identification of new site allocations including undeveloped sites previously allocated in the adopted LDP consistent with national planning policy. The aim of the assessment process is to ensure that the identification of candidate sites is founded on a robust and credible assessment of the availability and suitability of land.
- 1.4 The deliverability of sites is an important aspect of the methodology and will be critical in the identification of sites for inclusion within the RLDP. Consequently, the assessment process will be applied to all sites submitted for consideration at the Call for Candidate Sites stage, undeveloped allocated sites without planning consent in the adopted LDP, and any other sites considered appropriate. The evaluation of sites will draw upon a range of information held by the Council, supporting evidence submitted by site promoters and where relevant, consultation will be undertaken with specific consultation bodies to enable the full consideration of sites.

## 2. The Call for Candidate Sites

- 2.1 The official 'Call for Candidate Sites' is the first formal stage in the preparation of the RLDP following the agreement and publication of the approved Delivery Agreement. It provides an opportunity for individuals and organisations to promote sites for potential inclusion in the emerging RLDP. These can include sites for a range of uses such as housing, employment, retail, leisure, or community use.
- 2.2 The key principle of the candidate site process is to gather suitable evidence from site promoters to robustly demonstrate the sustainability, deliverability, and financial viability of sites for inclusion in the RLDP.
- 2.3 The Development Plans Manual (Edition 3) March 2020 suggests that the process should enable the following questions to be answered:
  - Is the site in a sustainable location in accordance with the site search sequence set out in Planning Policy Wales 11 (PPW)?
  - Is the site generally free from physical constraints, such as land ownership, infrastructure, access, ground conditions, biodiversity, landscape, heritage, flood risk issues and pollution?
  - Is the site capable of being delivered (can the site be developed during the plan period, or otherwise significantly progressed)?

- Is the development of the site financially viable? Namely is the site attractive to the market (both private and/or public sector), is the site capable of delivering the broad levels of affordable housing, other policy / section 106 requirements and infrastructure costs set out by the LPA whilst providing sufficient return to the developer/landowner?

2.4 To determine these factors, the candidate site submission form contains a series of questions in relation to the above and allows for the assessment of the site and its deliverability. The criteria contained within the submission form has been selected to enable the Council to filter out sites that are deemed unsuitable for further consideration. The reason for discounting sites may include but is not limited to, overarching constraints such as flooding; sites or proposals that are contrary to national planning policy, as well as national wellbeing, climate change and sustainable development objectives, e.g. development proposals in locations that offer limited accessibility to services and facilities or within the open countryside.

2.5 The potential implications arising from any revision to the LDP Strategy and settlement hierarchy will also have an impact on site selection. In this respect, the role and function of the settlement, along with its position within the settlement hierarchy and proximity of sites to existing settlement boundaries will also form a part of the considerations when determining the suitability of sites.

2.6 The matters that will determine the suitability of a candidate site will be initially considered through the information provided on the submission form and through additional evidence gathered by the Council. Sites which are considered suitable for further consideration will be subject to further detailed site analysis which will require consultation with external stakeholders / service providers and site-specific evidence provided by promoters including detailed site viability appraisals. Consultation will also be undertaken with relevant internal Council departments to determine the scope of any necessary planning obligations should the sites be allocated in the RLDP.

2.7 As part of the process, statutory requirements for undertaking Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) of the RLDP will be incorporated into the site assessment process. This will form part of the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA) of the RLDP that will also include Health Impact Assessment, Welsh language Impact Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment.

2.8 The Council will also need to ensure that the RLDP that will have no significant effect (alone and in-combination) on the European Sites resource (Habitats Regulations Assessment - HRA) during its implementation. In this regard, those emerging proposals (including site selection) will need to be informed by an iterative review against such frameworks as the Plan proceeds through the various stages of plan preparation and consultation.

### **3. Consideration of Existing LDP Allocations**

- 3.1 As part of the LDP review the Council will require existing LDP site allocations without extant planning permission to be re-appraised through the candidate site assessment process, and the owners of such sites should not presume that they will be automatically carried forward as part of the review.
- 3.2 Consequently, owners / developers of existing LDP site allocations must make a candidate site submission to demonstrate that their site is deliverable and explain why planning permission has not been secured to date. In the absence of up-to-date evidence that an existing site is available and deliverable, such sites are unlikely to be considered suitable for re-allocation in the emerging RLDP.
- 3.3 In determining whether existing LDP allocations are deliverable, the Council will apply the definition of a 'deliverable' candidate site as set out in paragraph 3.47 of the Development Plans Manual (Edition 3 March 2020).

### **4. Candidate Site Assessment Process**

- 4.1 It is essential that the land allocated for development in the RLDP meets the relevant objectives and is capable of being developed within the Plan period. To achieve this, the Council will undertake a comprehensive four stage candidate site assessment process and will seek to ensure that it is transparent, with a trail of a sites' progress through it.
- 4.2 To inform the site assessment process, data will be collected at various stages of the candidate site assessment process using a range of methods, including:
- Site specific information provided by site promoters via the candidate site submission form, including viability appraisals, master planning, and where applicable information from planning application submissions.
  - Desktop analysis of sites using data already held by the Council or available in the public domain.
  - A 'Technical Consultation' through which service providers and public bodies will provide information; and,
  - Site visits to understand the site's features and local context.
- 4.3 The Council recognises that certainty on the deliverability of a site may not always be definitive until more detailed viability information is known as the Plan progresses. Consequently, the level of information used to appraise sites will be determined throughout the candidate site assessment process. It is therefore anticipated that further detailed information will be required at the latter stages of the Plan preparation process to enable the Council to fully assess the suitability of the site for allocation in the Deposit RLDP. In particular, site viability appraisals will need to take into consideration provision of necessary infrastructure to support the development, including Section 106 contributions towards affordable housing, sustainable transport, and community facilities etc.
- 4.4 As previously stated, the statutory process of SA / SEA will also be incorporated into the candidate site assessment and identification process, which will align with the overall SA/SEA undertaken for the whole RLDP preparation process.

4.5 To assist candidate site submissions, the Council has produced an interactive constraints map. This will enable site promoters to easily identify any constraints associated with sites, and signposts whether additional information will be required as part of the Council's candidate site assessment process.

### Site Assessment Stages

4.6 Stage 1 will involve a high-level assessment (i.e., an initial sift) which seeks to dismiss unsuitable sites at an early stage as follows:

#### Stage 1 – Initial Site Filter

- **Site threshold** - For residential sites there is a minimum site size threshold of 0.3 ha or 10 dwellings, at a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare [net]. In appropriate 'urban locations' e.g. Barry town centre the Council will seek a minimum density of 50 dwellings per hectare [net] in line with the strategic placemaking principles in Future Wales. For non-residential development a building must have a minimum floorspace of 1,000m<sup>2</sup> or the site must have a minimum gross site area of 1ha.
- **Planning History** - Sites which have previously been refused on the grounds of amenity, highway safety, visual impact etc will be excluded from further consideration. The candidate site process should not be seen as a way for development proposals to circumvent a previous planning decision which remains valid.
- **Located in the open countryside** - (residential proposals only). In order to pass the initial sift, a housing site must either be within or adjacent to an existing settlement. This applies to sites that lie immediately next to the built form of the settlement, as well as sites that lie so close to the built form that it is reasonable to consider them as a possible extension to an existing settlement boundary. The latter may include sites that are detached from the built form by a small field boundary or an area of open space (e.g. playing field). Residential proposals isolated from an existing settlement will be classed as being within the countryside and will not be considered further. In line with national planning policy proposals for new settlements will not be accepted as these are more appropriate for identification through the Strategic Development Plan process (PPW paragraph 3.53 refers).
- **Flood risk** – sites located within either a TAN 15 Defended Area, or Flood Zone 2 or 3 area which do not meet the justification test and acceptability of consequences section 10 and 11 out in TAN 15 will not pass the initial sifting.
- **Biodiversity and Habitats** - International or nationally designated sites for biodiversity will be excluded in the initial sift. These habitats include:
  - Special Protection Areas (SPA)
  - Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)
  - Ramsar Sites
  - Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
  - National Nature Reserves
  - Ancient Woodlands

- **Located within an HSE Zone** - If a site is fully within the HSE Inner Zone it will be excluded for residential use in accordance with the HSE land use planning methodology. However, it would not be excluded for non-residential uses such as employment.
- **Archaeological or historically important sites** - Proposals located directly within a site of archaeological or historical importance will be excluded. These include Scheduled Monuments (SM) and historic parks and gardens.
- **Deliverability issues** - Consideration will be given to the deliverability of sites through either the presence of major physical site constraints, the absence of financial viability evidence, legal constraints or covenants that restrict the site being brought forward in the Plan period.

4.7 The results of the initial sift will be made public as part of the publication of the Candidate Sites Register in accordance with LDP Regulation 15. The candidate sites that satisfy the initial assessment will be taken forward to Stage 2, and the final selection of preferred sites will form part of the Deposit RLDP which is expected to be published for consultation in April 2024. The Draft Preferred Strategy will identify key sites crucial to the implementation of the preferred approach.

## **Stage 2 (A) Detailed Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal**

### **Detailed Site Assessment**

4.8 Stage 2 of the candidate site assessment will consist of a 2-part assessment process (A and B) and will involve a further assessment of sites that have passed through the Stage 1 filtering process. This will involve a detailed appraisal of sites against the assessment criteria set out below, and against the sustainability objectives.

4.9 This will include the verification by the Council of the information provided by site promoters, in respect of initial site viability appraisals or information regarding site mitigation measures relating to any site constraints identified at the submission stage. At this stage, the Council may also seek further information from site promoters to assist in the assessment process.

4.10 Internal consultation will also be undertaken with relevant service areas of the Council (e.g. highways, ecology, environmental health), to determine the suitability of sites, as well as any likely planning contributions arising from the development of the site (such as education, affordable housing, green infrastructure, sustainable travel).

### **Sustainability Appraisal**

4.11 At this stage, sites will also be assessed against the Council's Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA) framework for the assessment of candidate sites. Following the conclusion of Stage 2B, a clear indication of which sites are suitable for development will emerge. Those sites which receive poor assessments will be eliminated from the process.

4.12 The final selection of sites will also be subject to ISA. The ISA will assess the individual and cumulative effects of each policy in the RLDP, including site allocations. The information collected through the candidate site assessment process, along with other sources of evidence, will directly inform the ISA of those sites.

- 4.13 Sites with insurmountable constraints will be excluded from further consideration and those that perform poorly against the ISA framework will be excluded from further consideration. This phased approach is intended to filter out any non-deliverable or inappropriate sites so that statutory consultees are only commenting on sites that have a reasonable chance of being allocated in the RLDP and ultimately being delivered.

### **Stage 2 (B) External Consultations**

- 4.14 Stage 2 (B) will involve consultation with external consultees to determine the likely infrastructure needs of a development and verify any potential impacts/mitigation measures or further investigation work necessary to support a development site. These will include consultations with Natural Resources Wales, infrastructure providers such as (but not limited to) Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water (DCWW), the Local Health Board, National Grid, Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust, Wales and West Utilities, and Western Power Distribution.
- 4.15 The information obtained from Stage 2 (B) will be used by the Council to filter sites to be carried forward to Stage 3 of the assessment.

### **Stage 3- Site Evaluation- Verification of Site-Specific Viability Testing**

- 4.16 Following the filtering of sites through stage 1 and stage 2A/B, the Council will require remaining sites to be subject to a detailed site viability appraisal. Whilst it is a requirement for site promoters to undertake an initial viability assessment at the candidate site submission stage, the detailed viability assessment will form part of the Council's evaluation and selection of sites to be included in the RLDP (Stage 4).
- 4.17 The information collected by the Council through its internal and external consultation in respect of infrastructure requirements will be shared with site promoters to be used in the viability testing of sites. Consideration of any revisions to policy requirements identified as part of the Council's review will also need to be considered, particularly any revisions to affordable housing thresholds and targets.
- 4.18 Additionally, during this stage any issues raised that may affect the likelihood of a site being allocated or designated will be raised with the landowner, agent or interested party. Where there is deemed the potential to address or mitigate the issue, there will be an opportunity for the site promoter to identify the necessary works and provide indicative costings within the updated viability evidence.

### **Stage 4- Final Site Selection**

- 4.19 The final selection of sites shall be considered further in the light of the following:
1. The "Spatial Fit" of sites in respect of the Council's Preferred Growth Strategy, Strategic Objectives and Settlement Hierarchy, and key background evidence e.g. housing and employment, viability, strategic flood consequence assessment, infrastructure assessment.

2. Professional judgement of the suitability of the site in respect of local character and contribution towards national placemaking objectives (section 6 of site assessment criteria).
3. The sustainability and suitability of each site based on the findings of the candidate site assessment and ISA.
4. Information regarding the availability, deliverability and viability of each site obtained through the detailed viability appraisals undertaken at stage 3.

4.20 Sites that perform most strongly against the above will be considered by the Council for inclusion in the Deposit Plan.

4.21 The final selection of key sites will be published within the draft Preferred Strategy which will set out the Council's aspirations for growth and its strategic priorities over the Plan period. The draft Preferred Strategy is expected to be published in April 2023.

4.22 Sites allocated within the Deposit Plan will be subject to master planning in accordance with the national placemaking objectives. The content and format of masterplans should be undertaken in accordance with LDP Manual (paragraph 5.4).

## **5. Consideration of additional sites submitted following publication of the Draft Preferred Strategy**

5.1 Following the publication of the draft Preferred Strategy, the Council will undertake a 6-week public consultation. At this time, additional candidate sites may be submitted to the Council. Promoters of candidate sites submitted at the Preferred Strategy stage will be required to also submit all relevant evidence necessary in support of the site including a detailed viability appraisal, including an ISA of the site based on the Council's candidate site ISA framework. A site not supported by the required information is unlikely to be considered suitable for allocation in the Plan.

5.2 The Council recognises that the assessment process may result in some candidate sites that perform well against the assessment criteria being omitted from the Plan due to the levels of growth identified. Therefore, favourable outcomes in relation to the candidate site assessment methodology should not be taken to mean that a site will automatically be allocated for development, or that planning permission would be forthcoming for a particular site. Notwithstanding this, the Council will consider the need to produce a list of potential reserve sites, if for whatever necessary reason other sites are taken out of the RLDP after the Deposit Stage.

## 6. Assessment Criteria

6.1 The assessment criteria reflect the information requested on the Candidate Site submission form, thereby enabling site promoters to identify whether a site is affected by one or more constraints/designations. It also requires the promoter to provide supporting information explaining how the site can address any matters associated with the site. The process also enables the Council to request additional information from site promoters if necessary.

6.2 The assessment criteria set out in section 6 have been developed to cover a wide range of factors which are relevant to considering the suitability of sites for potential inclusion within the RLDP as well as compatibility with relevant national planning policy and guidance.

- **Section 1. Site Availability:** - sets out the criteria that will assist the Council in determining the availability and deliverability of the site over the Plan period.
- **Section 2: Site Deliverability and Viability-** examines the viability and deliverability of the site against the initial site viability information provided. Where site viability studies have not been provided, the Council may request these from site promoters or request further details to be provided. A final detailed site viability appraisal will be required prior to determining sites for allocation in the Plan taking into consideration necessary infrastructure identified through the assessment process.
- **Section 3. Environmental Considerations and Constraints-** sets criteria to identify whether a site is affected by any constraint that may impact on its deliverability, and the potential impacts a site may have on built and natural environment.
- **Section 4. Accessibility and Proximity to Services and Facilities-** sets out site criteria that will allow the Council to consider the sustainability of the site in respect of its relationship to the existing LDP settlement hierarchy as well as accessibility to services and facilities.
- **Section 5. Infrastructure Availability-** enables the Council to determine whether there are any constraints to development in respect of supporting infrastructure such as mains water and sewage, and in the provision of safe highway access.
- **Section 6 Placemaking-** sets out the considerations that officers will consider in determining the suitability of the site in respect of the site and its relationship to the existing built form, scale and character. This assessment will be informed by information collated through the assessment process and site visit appraisals against specific criteria.

6.3 Each of the assessment criteria is categorised as either 'stage 1' or 'stage 2':

- **Stage 1 criteria:** Relates to matters of critical importance. Where a site results in conflict with one or more criteria, development of the site would likely result in significant harm to human health, the environment, or conflict with national planning policy or legislation. For example, high flood risk or incompatibility with national planning policy.

- **Stage 2 criteria:** Relates to important planning issues and policy objectives. Where a site conflicts with one or more criteria, there may be potential for the conflict to be overcome, managed, or mitigated. For example, where a site is located within a Conservation Area, the RLDP could prescribe a higher standard of design quality.

6.4 A traffic light coding system (see Table 1 below) will be used to determine the suitability of sites against the assessment criteria with each section, thereby enabling the Council to filter sites out depending on a site's performance against the criteria outcomes and considered against the following outcome.

<b>Table 1 – Site Assessment Criteria Outcomes</b>	
<b>GREEN</b>	Positive- No constraint to development
<b>AMBER</b>	Amber – Constraints identified requiring mitigation/policy intervention- Further consideration required
<b>RED</b>	Negative- Major constraint to development or contrary to national policy or not enough information provided

6.5 In broad terms, if a site scores red against a criterion it is considered that development is affected by either a major constraint that cannot be overcome through mitigation measures such as flood risk, constraints that question the deliverability of the site or where a site is contrary to national planning such as isolated developments in the open countryside. Sites which are found to result in a red/negative outcome, (including a single red score) could be rejected on this basis depending on the nature of the constraint identified.

6.6 Conversely, where a site scores green against the criteria it is considered that the site is free from constraints, deliverable and potentially economically viable (subject to detailed viability testing) and is considered to have a positive outcome in relation to national planning policy and sustainability and placemaking outcomes.

6.7 Where a site scores amber this indicates that the assessment has highlighted site constraints or characteristics that can be mitigated and supported by evidence such as ecological or flood risk assessments or can be addressed through policy interventions through the RLDP- for example, where a site is located within a Conservation Area or adjoins a Special Landscape Area (SLA), the RLDP could prescribe a higher standard of design.

6.8 In this respect if the site promoter is aware of significant constraints, for example where a site is partially within an area of flood risk, or the site has an ecological value, it is within the site promoters' interests to submit information in respect of this constraint alongside their site submission. The early identification of any issues will help the proposer, the Council and statutory consultees to identify appropriate mitigation measures to alleviate potential problems. Where this information is not provided at the time of submission, the Council may contact site promoters to advise where further supporting evidence will be required to enable a detailed consideration of the site.

6.9 The evaluation of sites and final selection will be based upon the ranking of sites and supporting evidence. In cases where sites score a high number of negative (red) scores resulting in insurmountable impacts which are either contrary to national planning policy, insufficient or no evidence has been provided to indicate that the impacts can be sufficiently mitigated such sites are unlikely to be identified for allocation within the RLDP. In determining sites for inclusion in the RLDP the Council will also give consideration of evidence provided to the Council by statutory consultees.

## 7. Sustainability Appraisal Criteria

- 7.1 Work was undertaken to develop a methodology suited to site options appraisal and the level of information available, whilst also reflecting the ISA framework as best as possible. The methodology essentially involved employing GIS data-sets, and measuring ('quantitative analysis') how each site option related to various constraint and opportunity features.
- 7.2 Given the limited site-specific data availability for the majority of options it was not possible to simply discuss ('qualitative analysis') the merits of each site option under the ISA framework. Qualitative analysis of site options would only have been possible were time / resources available to generate data/understanding for all site options through site visits and discussion with promoters. Without this data/understanding, any attempt at qualitative analysis would have led to a risk of bias (e.g. sites that are being proactively promoted may have been found to perform favourably).
- 7.3 Two GIS tools were used to undertake the appraisal of site options depending on the feature and measurements required. These provided either a:
1. Straight line distance from a feature to a site option and percentage overlap of any features within a site option. Measurements were taken from the closest boundary of the site option and the feature.  
Or
  2. Distances calculated from a site option to a feature along a real world network of roads and urban footpaths using Ordnance Survey Integrated Transport Network. The network analyst tool helps to provide approximate real world walking distances. Measurements are taken from the boundary of the site where it is within 20m of the road/ footpath network and is therefore assumed to have access.
- 7.4 The site options appraisal methodology is presented in Table 2 below, setting out assessment questions, thresholds and criteria used. The table recognises data limitations. It is important to be clear that the aim of categorising the performance of site options is to aid differentiation, i.e. to highlight instances of site options performing relatively well/ poorly. The intention is not to indicate a 'significant effect'.

**Table 2: ISA candidate site framework and assessment questions**

ISA Themes	ISA Objectives	ISA candidate site assessment questions	
<b>Economy and Employment</b>	Support a strong, diverse and resilient economy, with innovative responses to changing conditions and support for a strong future workforce.	++	New employment land proposed at the site
		+	The site has good access to existing employment (within 1,600m of an employment centre)
		0	N/A
		?	Type of development uncertain at this stage
		-	The site has poor access to existing employment (over 1,600m away from an employment centre)
		--	Development at the site could result in the loss of existing employment land
<b>Population and</b>	To provide a sufficient quantity of good quality market and affordable homes,	++	The site has capacity (> 100 dwellings) to deliver a significant number of new homes and is well connected to an existing settlement

**ISA Themes**      **ISA Objectives**      **ISA candidate site assessment questions**

<b>Communities</b>	and community infrastructure, in sustainable locations to meet identified needs.  To enhance design quality to create places for people that maintain and enhance community and settlement identity.	+	The site has capacity (< 100 dwellings) to deliver new homes and is well connected to an existing settlement.
		0	The site will deliver alternative uses including employment, education, community facility, etc.
		?	N/A
		-	The site could deliver new homes; however, the site is not well connected to an existing settlement.
		--	The site could deliver new homes; however, the site intersects with a designated green wedge and is not well connected to an existing settlement
		++	The site is within reasonable walking distance (< 800m) to a primary and a secondary school (< 1,600m)
		+	The site is within reasonable walking distance (< 800m) to a primary or a secondary school (< 1,600m)
		0	N/A
		?	N/A
		-	The site is not within reasonable walking distance (< 800m) to a primary or a secondary school (< 1,600m)
--	The site is > 1,600m from a primary school and secondary school		
<b>Health and wellbeing</b>	To improve the health and wellbeing of residents within Vale of Glamorgan through promoting healthy and sustainable places	++	The site is within 800m of a health facility, an active travel route and would result in the provision of enhanced open/recreational space
		+	The site is within 800m of a health facility or an active travel route
		0	N/A
		?	N/A
		-	The site is not within 800m of a health facility or an active travel route
--	The site is not within 800m of a health facility or an active travel route and development would result in the loss of designated open/ recreational space		
<b>Equality, diversity and social inclusion</b>	To reduce poverty and inequality; tackle social exclusion and promote community cohesion	++	The site falls within one of the 10 or 20% most deprived LSOAs in Wales and development proposes the delivery of a new religious or community building/ space, where the Vale's culture, including the Welsh Language is valued and promoted.
		+	The site falls within one of the 10 or 20% most deprived LSOAs in Wales
		0	The site falls within one of the 30 to 50% least deprived LSOAs in Wales
		?	N/A

**ISA Themes**      **ISA Objectives**      **ISA candidate site assessment questions**

		-	N/A
		--	Development at the site would result in the loss of a religious or community building/ space where the Vale's culture, including the Welsh Language is valued and promoted.
<b>Transport and movement</b>	Increase sustainable transport use and reduce the need to travel.	++	The site is within close proximity (within 800m) to public transport, a town centre and an active travel route
		+	The site is within reasonable walking distance (within 800m) of at least two of the following: public transport, a town centre or an active travel route
		0	N/A
		?	N/A
		-	The site is not within reasonable walking distance (> 800m) of at least two of the following: public transport, a town centre or an active travel route)
		--	The site is not within reasonable walking distance (> 800m) of public transport, a town centre or an active travel route)
<b>Natural Resources (Air, Land, Minerals and Water)</b>	To identify and pursue any opportunities to reduce, or at least, minimise population exposure to air pollution.	++	The site is entirely brownfield land
		+	The site is partially brownfield land (> 50%) and contains low quality agricultural land (Grade 3b, 4, urban)
		0	Neutral effect
	To make the best use of previously developed land and existing buildings to minimise pressure for greenfield development and protecting, where possible, higher grade agricultural land.	?	The site is partially greenfield land (> 50%) and contains low quality agricultural land (Grade 3b, 4, urban)
		-	The site is partially greenfield land (> 50%) and is high quality agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)
		--	The site is wholly greenfield land and contains high quality agricultural land (Grade 1, 2 and 3a)
	To conserve, protect and enhance the water environment, water quality and water resources.	++	N/A
		+	The site does not intersect with a minerals site
	To protect mineral resources and support waste management.	0	N/A
		?	N/A
		-	The site intersects with a minerals site
		--	N/A
<b>Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	Protect and enhance biodiversity within and surrounding the plan area.Vale of Glamorgan.	++	N/A
		+	The site is brownfield land and there is an opportunity to deliver net gain
		0	The site does not intersect and is not within 1km of any designated sites
		?	The site does not intersect and is not within 1km of any designated sites but there is an element of

**ISA Themes**      **ISA Objectives**      **ISA candidate site assessment questions**

		uncertainty relating to the potential for significant effects
		- The site intersects or is adjacent to a regionally or locally (RIGS, LNRs and SINCs) designated site and/ or priority habitats/ species
		-- The site intersects or is adjacent to an internationally (SAC, SPA, Ramsar) or nationally (SSSI, Ancient Woodland) designated site.
<b>Historic Environment</b>	Preserve and enhance Vale of Glamorgan's heritage resource, including its historic environment and archaeological assets.	++ Regeneration of brownfield land that intersects with a historic asset
		+ Regeneration of brownfield land that is within 200m of a historic asset
		0 N/A
	Promote understanding of Vale of Glamorgan's cultural heritage.	? The site is > 200m from a historic asset
		- The site is within 200m of a local or nationally designated historic assets
		-- The site intersects or is adjacent to a local or nationally designated historic assets
<b>Landscape</b>	To protect and enhance the quality and character of Vale of Glamorgan's landscape and townscape	++ The site is predominantly brownfield and does not intersect with a Registered Landscape of Outstanding and of Special Interest or a Special Landscape Area
		+ The site does not intersect with a Registered Landscape of Outstanding and of Special Interest or a Special Landscape Area
		0 N/A
	? N/A	
	- The site intersects with a Registered Landscape of Outstanding and of Special Interest, or a Special Landscape Area	
	-- The site is predominantly greenfield and wholly falls within a Registered Landscape of Outstanding and of Special Interest, or and a Special Landscape Area	
<b>Climate Change</b>	Support the resilience of the Vale of Glamorgan to the potential effects of climate change, including flooding from fluvial, coastal and surface water sources.	++ Development at the site would reduce flood risk and there is the opportunity to deliver renewable energy (e.g., a district heat network)
		+ The site does not intersect with a high flood risk area (flood zone 2 and 3)
		0 N/A
	Reduce Vale of Glamorgan's contribution to climate change from activities which result in greenhouse gas emissions.	? N/A
		- The site intersects with flood zone 2 or 3
	-- The site falls wholly within flood zone 2 or 3	

**Table 3: ISA candidate site key**

++	Major positive effect
+	Minor positive effect

0	Neutral/ No effect
?	Uncertain effect
-	Minor negative effect
--	Major negative effect

## 8. Candidate Site Assessment Criteria

### 8.1. Site Availability

#### 8.1.1. Ownership and Legal Considerations (*stage 1 criteria*)

Public Land	Green	The site is in a published disposal strategy.
	Amber	The site is not yet within a published disposal strategy but is being considered for inclusion.
	Red	The site is not included in a published disposal strategy
Land ownership	Green	The site is owned by a single landowner who supports the site proposal or, if in multiple ownership there is evidence of an agreement to the site proposal.
	Amber	The site is owned by multiple landowners however there is no evidence of an agreement between the parties to the site proposal.
	Red	There is uncertainty regarding ownership of all or part of the site and/or landowners do not support the site proposal.
Developer Interest	Green	There is evidence of developer interest in the site proposal, or the site has extant planning permission.
	Amber	There is no developer interest identified at this stage, however there is evidence to indicate that the site is being actively promoted by the owner(s)
	Red	There is no evidence of developer interest.
Legal covenants	Green	There are no legal rights or restrictive covenants in place that would prevent development
	Amber	There are legal rights or restrictive covenants in place on part or all of the land and evidence submitted that this is unlikely to affect its allocation in part or as whole.
	Red	There is a covenant in place that will restrict the development of the site for its proposed use or insufficient information submitted regarding any covenants.

#### 8.1.1.2. Explanation

The Council considers that the receipt of a Candidate Site submission form does not necessarily indicate that a site is readily available for development. In this regard, the form includes specific questions on the site promoter's anticipated timetable for delivery. Information relating to land ownership and legal covenants provided via the Candidate Site submission form will be part of the Council's considerations into the availability and deliverability of a site as they relate to potential ownership disputes, ransom strips etc.

Where it is unclear as to whether any legal constraints on the land cannot be addressed the Council may determine that the site is affected by constraints that impact on the availability of the site. In such cases, the site will be considered to be undeliverable.

### 8.1.2. Site Availability (*stage 1 criteria*)

Site Availability	<b>Green</b>	Available for development in short term (within 5 years)
	<b>Amber</b>	Available for development in the medium term (5-10 years)
	<b>Red</b>	Available for development in long term (10 years or more)

#### 8.1.2.1. Explanation

National planning policy places great importance on the ability to demonstrate a supply of specific available and deliverable sites, sufficient to meet the identified housing requirements (with an additional buffer to ensure flexibility).

Sites which are available in the immediate and short term will be particularly favoured. However, a supply of sites over the mid and late stages of the plan period to 2036 is also required and the Council shall determine the availability of sites across the Plan period, considering a range of factors that may affect timescales for delivery such as availability of financing, public sector regeneration plans, or programmed investment for supporting infrastructure.

As part of the RLDP evidence base, the Council is required to provide a housing trajectory to identify when sites are likely to be brought forward during the lifetime of the Plan.

Promoters of land should provide information to support their intentions to bring forward a site such as information relating to the marketing of sites, developer interest etc. The timescales for bringing forward a site should consider pre-application discussions, pre application consultations and public engagement, the timescale of the planning application going through the development management process, and the time taken to commence the development. In considering these factors, the Council will not take sites forward where it considers there to be fundamental issues with the timescales of delivery.

<b>Site Availability Assessment Outcome</b>	
The site is considered available for development	<input type="checkbox"/>
The site is affected by some ownership constraints that can be addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>
The site is affected by ownership constraints that cannot be addressed or insufficient information provided	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 8.2. Site Viability

### 8.2.1. Initial viability appraisal (*stage 1 criteria*)

Viability	Green	An initial site viability appraisal has been undertaken and is within the viability parameters set out by the Council. Further detailed assessment is required as part of the candidate site assessment process.
	Amber	An initial site viability appraisal has been undertaken- further clarification is required in respect of the viability inputs before progressing further.
	Red	No initial viability appraisal undertaken – site viability and deliverability unknown. <b>Or</b> Site viability has been undertaken and indicates that the viability of the site is marginal to meet the Plan’s affordable housing and other necessary planning obligations.

#### 8.2.1.1. Explanation:

All sites submitted for residential (excluding gypsy and traveller accommodation) and commercial development need to be accompanied by an initial site viability appraisal. The submission of an initial viability appraisal provides an indication of the likely deliverability of a site as well as the intentions of a site promoter to bring the site forward during the Plan period.

This initial appraisal must illustrate how the site satisfies the broad viability parameters identified by the Council as well as affordable housing targets. ***Further details on the information required to complete the appraisal is contained in the viability guidance provided by the Council.***

Where sites progress through the RLDP development process, additional information and assessments will be required to ensure the site can meet policy requirements and remain viable and deliverable. Should the initial assessment raise questions regarding the ability of the site to deliver the required affordable housing targets and necessary planning obligations the site shall be excluded from further consideration. ***Similarly, submissions that are not accompanied by the initial viability appraisal will be deemed to be unviable and shall not be taken forward to Stage 2.***

The Council has undertaken a strategic viability assessment to consider planning obligation contributions and identify benchmark development costs for development within the authority. This information will be considered in verifying the information submitted within viability appraisals. Where sites progress through the RLDP process additional information and assessments will be required to ensure the site can meet policy requirements and remain viable and deliverable.

Deliverability and Viability Assessment Outcome	
Initial viability appraisal undertaken which illustrates adequately that the site is viable and deliverable	☐

Initial viability appraisal undertaken however further information required to determine site viable and deliverability	☐
No initial viability appraisal undertaken – site viability and deliverability unknown. <b>Or</b> Site viability has been undertaken and indicates that the viability of the site is marginal to meet the Plan’s affordable housing and necessary planning obligations.	☐

### 8.3. Site Characteristics: Environmental and Physical Constraints

#### 8.3.1. Flood Risk Zones (*stage 1 criteria*)

Flood Risk Zones	<b>Green</b>	The site is identified as being within Flood Zone 1 area or in a TAN 15 Defended Area where the proposal meets the justification test and acceptability of consequences set out in TAN 15
	<b>Amber</b>	The site is within a Flood Zone 2 or Zone 3 area <b>AND</b> meets the justification test and acceptability of consequences section 10 and 11 out in TAN 15 <b>OR</b> meets the definition of a water compatible development.
	<b>Red</b>	The site is within either a TAN 15 Defended Area, or Flood Zone 2 or 3 area and does not meet the justification test and acceptability of consequences section 10 and 11 set out in TAN 15.

##### 8.3.1.1. Explanation

The national planning policy framework places great importance on addressing flood risk through the planning system and is clear that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided, directing development away from areas at highest risk - whether it is an existing risk, or vulnerability to increased flood risk in the future due to climate change.

The Flood Risk scoring matrix is based on the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification set out in Technical Advice Note 15 Development, Flooding and Coast Erosion (December 2021) and shall enable the Council to consider the potential risk and exposure to flooding and also coastal erosion of candidate site submissions, and aims to ensure that in selecting site the Council shall:

- Direct new development to areas at minimal risk of flooding – areas in Zone 1,
- Enable resilient development in areas served by formal flood risk management defences that reduce the risk and consequences of flooding over the lifetime of development – areas in the TAN 15 Defended Zones.
- Allow resilient development in undefended areas of relatively low risk – areas in Zone 2;
- Only permit water compatible development, essential infrastructure, and less vulnerable developments by exception in areas of higher risk – areas in Zone 3.

In selecting sites, the Council will apply the sequential approach, as required by national policy and guidance:

#### **Sites located within Zone 1:**

Priority shall be given to locating development within Zone 1 or a TAN 15 Defended Area where the proposal is supported by a FCA that indicates that the potential consequences of a flooding event for the development proposed is found to be acceptable in accordance with the criteria contained in section 11 of TAN 15 (2021).

#### **Sites located within Zone 2 will only be considered where:**

It will assist, or be part of, a strategy supported by the Development Plan to regenerate an existing settlement or achieve key economic or environmental objectives or address national security or energy needs; AND

- Its location meets the definition of a brownfield site, And
- Is supported by a FCA that indicates that the potential consequences of a flooding event for the development proposed is found to be acceptable in accordance with the criteria contained in section 11 of TAN 15 (2021).

#### **Sites located within Zone 3 will only be considered where:**

- The development is required under exceptional circumstances, as defined in TAN e.g. addressing national security or energy security needs, reasons of public health or to mitigate the impacts of climate change, AND
- Its location meets the definition of a brownfield site, And
- Is supported by a FCA that indicates that the potential consequences of a flooding event for the development proposed is found to be acceptable in accordance with the criteria contained in section 11 of TAN 15 (2021).

In accordance with TAN 15- Water compatible development is acceptable, from a flooding perspective, in all flood zones. These include boatyards, marinas and essential works required at mooring basins; development associated with canals, flood defences and management infrastructure; open spaces (excluding equipped play areas) and Hydro renewable energy generation.

In all instances where a site falls within either Zone 2 or Zone 3 and is judged to meet the justification test of TAN 15, promoters of sites must undertake a Flood Consequence Assessment (FCA) and submit this with their candidate site submission. The FCA must clearly set out how the risk of flooding can be managed in accordance with national policy requirements contained in TAN 15 Development and Flood Risk. Sites which are not accompanied by a FCA or do not meet the tests shall be automatically discounted from further consideration.

The Council is also undertaking a Stage 1 Strategic Flood Consequences Assessment (SFCA) to identify the potential impacts of climate change on flood risk for the developments over their lifetimes. Sites which are identified as being at risk of flooding through the SFCA are not taken forward, unless further evidence has been provided to mitigate, or understand the factors associated with that flood risk.

### **8.3.2. Surface Water Flooding (*stage 1 criteria*)**

Surface Water Flooding	<b>Green</b>	The site is identified as being within Flood Zone 1 area where the susceptibility to surface water flooding or flooding from other sources is minimal.
	<b>Amber</b>	The site is identified as being within Flood Zone 2 area where the susceptibility to surface water flooding and/or at risk of flooding from other sources is intermediate but potential for mitigation
	<b>Red</b>	The site is identified as being within Flood Zone 3 area where the susceptibility to surface water flooding and/or at risk of flooding from other sources is high and unlikely to be resolved through mitigation.

#### 8.3.2.1. Explanation:

The Flood Map for Planning include two surface water and small watercourse flood risk zones. Zone 3 contains areas at highest risk, with Zone 2 areas facing a lower risk. Areas considered at minimal risk of flooding from these sources are in Zone 1. For sites located in either a s Zone 2 or 3 a Flood Consequences Assessment will be required for all site that are located fully or partly in Flood Zones 2 and 3 or on sites which adjoin Zones 2 and 3. The Council shall also consider the findings of its Strategic Flood Consequence Assessment to determine whether an FCA shall be required for any site located in Zone 1.

#### 8.3.3. Brownfield/ Greenfield Land (*stage 2 criteria*)

Brownfield /Greenfield	<b>Green</b>	The site is a brownfield /underutilised site within or adjoining and existing settlement
	<b>Amber</b>	The site is greenfield adjoining an existing settlement
	<b>Red</b>	The site is a greenfield site within the open countryside

#### 8.3.3.1. Explanation:

National Planning Policy emphasises the importance of re-using brownfield sites and requires Local Planning Authorities to apply the sequential approach to identification of sites for development, with preference given to brownfield sites within or adjoining existing settlements, followed by sustainable greenfield sites on the edge of settlements, in combination with other factors including agricultural land quality.

#### 8.3.4. Ecological Designations and Protected Species

##### 8.3.4.1. European Sites (*stage 1 criteria*)

Ecological Designations and Protected Species	<b>Green</b>	No adverse impact on the SAC /SPA/Ramsar designation.
	<b>Amber</b>	Potential for adverse impact on SAC/SPA/RAMSAR designation but appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures can be put in place to mitigate.
<b>European Sites:</b>		

SAC/SPA/RAMSAR	Red	Development will significantly affect a SAC/SPA/RAMSAR designation
----------------	-----	--

#### 8.3.4.1.1. Explanation

Sites of internationally and nationally important wildlife sites, are afforded protection by national policy and legislation, and as such proposals that will directly impact on the integrity of the following designations shall be discounted from further consideration:

- Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) – animal and plant habitats designated under the Habitats Directive.
- Special Protection Areas (SPAs) – wild bird habitats designated under the Wild Birds Directive.
- Sites in the process of becoming SACs or SPAs; and identified or required as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites; and
- Listed and proposed ‘Ramsar’ sites – wetlands of international importance

Where a site is within 100m of a SAC/SPA/RAMSAR consultation shall be undertaken with NRW to determine the impact of the proposal on the designation, as well as consideration of the impact that the proposal would have on opportunities for ecological connectivity and adaptability to change in accordance with national policy. Proposals which are considered to have an adverse impact on the designation shall be discounted from further consideration.

The effect of candidate sites on the above designations (individually and cumulatively) shall be considered through the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Report (Appropriate Assessment). The HRA report will inform the selection of sites and formulation of policies, including mitigating impacts on biodiversity or habitats.

#### 8.3.4.2. SSSI Designations and Ancient Woodlands (*stage 1 criteria*)

Ecological Designations and Protected Species  SSSI and Ancient Woodlands	Green	No adverse impact on the SSSI/Ancient Woodland designation.
	Amber	Potential for adverse impact upon a SSSI/ Ancient Woodland designation but appropriate mitigation and enhancement proposals can be provided so as not to affect the features of the site.
	Red	Development will significantly affect a SSSI/Ancient Woodland designation.

#### 8.3.4.2.1. Explanation

Where a site is within 100m of a SSSI/Ancient Woodland consultation shall be undertaken with NRW to determine the impact of the proposal on the designation, as well as consideration of the impact that the proposal would have on opportunities for ecological connectivity and adaptability to change in accordance with national planning policy. Proposals which are considered to

have a diverse impact on the designation shall be discounted from further consideration.

**8.3.4.3. Locally Protected Sites (SINCS and Local Nature Reserves) (stage 2 criteria)**

Ecological Designations and Protected Species Locally Protected Sites-  <b>SINCS, Local Nature Reserves</b>	<b>Green</b>	No adverse impact on locally designated sites.
	<b>Amber</b>	Potential for adverse impact upon either a SINC or LNR but appropriate mitigation measure can be implemented to avoid significant damage.
	<b>Red</b>	Development will significantly affect a locally designated site.

**8.3.4.3.1. Explanation:**

Environment (Wales) Act 2016 (EWA) places a statutory duty to “maintain and enhance biodiversity” in undertaken its statutory functions, and to ensure that biodiversity is an integral part of the decisions that public authorities take in relation to Wales.

Consequently, the assessment of sites shall consider how proposals would impact on existing local ecological designations and consider how proposals shall contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity, ecological systems and networks in accordance with national policy.

Proposals which result in a significant loss of habitats or species populations locally or nationally will be discounted from further consideration. In considering the suitability of sites, the assessment shall consider the following:

- The diversity between and within ecosystems;
- the connections between and within ecosystems.
- the scale of ecosystems;
- the condition of ecosystems including their structure and functioning; and
- the adaptability of ecosystems

In considering the impact on existing designations and opportunities to enhance biodiversity the Council’s Ecology Officer shall be consulted to determine the suitability of sites and consider the supporting information provided by site promoters in respect of mitigation and ecological enhancements proposed.

**8.3.5. Historic Environment (stage 1 criteria)**

Historic Environment	<b>Green</b>	The site does not have, or is not within close proximity to, a historic asset, the setting of an historic asset and/or archaeologically sensitive area
----------------------	--------------	--

	<b>Amber</b>	The site has, or is in close proximity to, a historic asset, the setting of a historic asset and/or archaeologically sensitive area, and appropriate mitigation can likely be achieved
	<b>Red</b>	The site has, or is in close proximity to, a historic asset, the setting of a historic asset and/or archaeologically sensitive area and would result in harm to the significance of the historic asset or appropriate mitigation is unlikely to be achieved.

#### 8.3.5.1. Explanation

Proximity to Conservation Areas and heritage assets (namely, listed buildings, scheduled monuments and Registered Parks & Gardens) and the impact of the proposed site shall be considered through consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer and where relevant CADW to provide a greater understanding of the significance of heritage assets and the potential impacts of submitted sites.

Consultations shall also be undertaken with Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust to assist in the identification of any archaeological assets or sensitivities with the potential to be affected by submitted sites. Sites which may impact on the setting or features of a Scheduled Monuments or Remains of National Importance will not be taken forward.

To limit harm to the historic environment, sites which do not include a heritage asset or are not within a conservation area will be more favourably than sites which include a heritage asset or are located within the Conservation Area, in accordance with the matrix.

#### 8.3.6. Agricultural Land Quality (*stage 2 criteria*)

Agricultural Land	<b>Green</b>	The site is previously developed land or would not result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land
	<b>Amber</b>	The site would result in loss of grade 3a BMV land
	<b>Red</b>	The site would result in a loss of the either Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land

#### 8.3.6.1. Explanation:

Best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land is defined in PPW as Grades 1, 2 and 3a and is excellent to good quality land which is able to best deliver the food and non-food crops.

National planning policy states that land in grade 1, 2 and 3a will only be considered for development if there is an overriding need for the proposal, and either previously developed land or land in lower agricultural grades is unavailable, or available lower grade land has an environmental value recognised by a landscape, wildlife, historic or archaeological designation which outweighs the agricultural considerations. The site assessment criterion reflects the safeguarding principles set out in national planning

policy, with preference given to development of previously developed land or lower quality agricultural land.

The initial identification of BMV land shall be undertaken via a GIS desk top analysis utilising the Predictive Agricultural Land Classification Map – access to this map layer is also available to site promoters and uses the best available information to predict the Grade of land on national basis. Where the Predictive Agricultural Land Classification Map identifies grades 1, 2 or 3a, site promoters will be required to undertake an Agricultural Land Classification Survey to determine Grades present and in what proportion.

### 8.3.7. Minerals Resources (*stage 2 criteria*)

Minerals Buffer Zones and Minerals Safeguarding Areas	<b>Green</b>	The site is not within a mineral safeguarding area, or the proposal would not unnecessarily sterilize a safeguarded mineral resource. The site is not within a minerals buffer zone or is not classified as a sensitive use within a buffer zone.
	<b>Amber</b>	The site is within a mineral safeguarding area however prior extraction could have unacceptable impacts on important environmental features. Site is within a minerals buffer zone but does not prejudice the operation of the mineral extraction site.
	<b>Red</b>	The site is within a mineral safeguarding area and would result in the unnecessary sterilization of the mineral resource. Site allocates a sensitive use within a Mineral Buffer Zone.

#### 8.3.7.1. Explanation:

The safeguarding of mineral resources and the inclusion of land within a Minerals Safeguarding Area does not give a presumption for mineral working development to be permitted. The mineral safeguarding maps demonstrate the likely concentration or occurrence of minerals within the earth’s crust. These are finite resources which are essential to society and future generations, therefore, planning policy safeguards these resources in order to prevent the sterilisation of the mineral resource by other forms of permanent development. However, the Mineral Safeguarding Maps do not provide definitive information on the quantity, quality, environmental constraints associated with extraction and the economic viability of extraction.

Consequently, additional detail is required in mineral safeguarding areas to demonstrate that the proposed allocation would not cause the unnecessary sterilisation of important mineral resources. The Council has produced a Minerals Safeguarding SPG under the current adopted LDP which provides additional details on how to demonstrate a development would not unnecessarily sterilize safeguarded mineral resources. Although the SPG was adopted under the current LDP, it is considered that the information provided in the SPG is still relevant and ensures proposed allocations appropriately demonstrate an allocation is in accordance with national policy contained within PPW.

The Minerals Safeguarding SPG sets out 4 potential considerations which would appropriately demonstrate an allocation within a Mineral Safeguarding Area is appropriate, these include:

- Any reserves of minerals can be economically extracted prior to the

- commencement of the development; or
- Extraction would have an unacceptable impact on environmental or amenity considerations; or
- The development would have no significant impact on the possible working of the resource by reason of its nature or size; or
- The resource in question is of poor quality / quantity.

An allocation must include a Mineral Assessment which considers at least one of the considerations outlined above. The amount of information provided should be proportionate to the scale of development, further information on how to consider each of the points is outlined in the Minerals SPG (Section 5 refers) (<https://www.valeofglamorgan.gov.uk/Documents/Living/Planning/Policy/Minerals-Safeguarding-SPG-2018.pdf>)

Mineral buffer zones are required around permitted and allocated mineral extraction sites. Within the buffer zone, no new sensitive development or mineral extraction should be allocated. Sensitive development is any building occupied by people on a regular basis and includes housing areas, hostels, meeting places, schools and hospitals where an acceptable standard of amenity should be expected. Sensitive development could also include specialised high technology industrial development where operational needs require high standards of amenity.

Allocations could be considered in a buffer zone where the proposed use would not prejudice the operation of the mineral extraction site.

The Council's Minerals Officer will be invited to comment on individual sites, and identify those sites affected by Minerals and Waste policies. Where a site is in direct conflict with a minerals policy the site may be rejected on this basis.

### 8.3.8. Green Wedge Designations (*stage 2 criteria*)

Green Wedge	<b>Green</b>	The proposal is not within a Green Wedge
	<b>Amber</b>	The site is in a Green Wedge, but the proposed development would not harm the integrity of the designation
	<b>Red</b>	The proposal is within a Green Wedge and would harm the integrity of the designation and increase settlement coalescence

#### 8.3.8.1. Explanation:

Green wedge designations prevent urban sprawl safeguarding the openness of land and can be used to restrict the spread of build development beyond settlement boundaries, safeguard important views into and out of an area, prevent the coalescence of settlements, or to provide a buffer between the settlement edge and statutory designations. Green Wedges can also provide an important function in nature conservation by providing green corridors between urban areas and in developing green infrastructure networks enabling access for informal leisure and recreation around settlements.

PPW (3.64-3.78) states that proposals within green wedges must be carefully controlled and should only be permitted where they maintain the openness of the

Green Belt or green wedge where they do not conflict with the purposes of the designation. Exceptions to this are in relation to either:

- Justified rural enterprise needs.
- essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, cemeteries, and other uses of land which maintain the openness of the Green Belt or green wedge and which do not conflict with the purpose of including land within it.
- limited extension, alteration, or replacement of existing dwellings; or
- small scale diversification within farm complexes where this is run as part of the farm business.

Other forms of development may be appropriate provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:

- mineral extraction.
- renewable and low carbon energy generation.
- engineering operations; and
- local transport infrastructure.

Where sites are proposed within a green wedge designation the Council shall consider the proposal in relation to the following factors-

- Is the proposed use consistent with exception set out in national policy?
- Will the proposal prejudice the open nature of the land?
- Will the proposal impact on the setting of built-up area?
- Will the proposal increase coalescence of settlements?
- Will the proposal impact on biodiversity connectivity or loss of green infrastructure opportunities?

Where the proposal would impact on one or more of the criteria the site shall result in a red score being assigned to the site.

### 8.3.9. Special Landscape Area and Glamorgan Heritage Coast Designations (stage 2 criteria)

Special Landscape Areas and The Glamorgan Heritage Coast	<b>Green</b>	The site is not located within a Special Landscape Area/ The Glamorgan Heritage Coast
	<b>Amber</b>	The site is located within a Special Landscape Area/The Glamorgan Heritage Coast and the development may result in little or no change in character and little or no significant effect on landscape character and visual amenity.
	<b>Red</b>	The site is located within a Special Landscape Area/The Glamorgan Heritage Coast and development is likely to result in a substantial change in character and/or significant adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity.

#### 8.3.9.1. Explanation:

Development proposals within Special Landscape Areas and the Glamorgan Heritage Coast will be required to fully consider the impact of the proposal on the designation

through the submission of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The assessment must consider the site and its relationship to the designation and acceptability in terms of scale and prominence. The Council shall also undertake an assessment of sites as part of the Placemaking Site Appraisal (Section 5 below) and shall enable the Council to eliminate sites where the impacts are significant mitigation.

### 8.3.10. Tree Preservation Orders, Hedgerows and Woodlands (*stage 2 criteria*)

Tree Preservation Orders Hedgerows and Woodlands.	<b>Green</b>	No TPOs present on site, and the proposals would not lead to significant tree loss
	<b>Amber</b>	TPOs present on site but development would not lead in significant tree loss and trees can be safeguarded through site layout
	<b>Red</b>	TPO present on the site and would result in significant loss of tree cover or place constraints on the development that would impact on development

#### 8.3.10.1. Explanation:

Whilst the presence of a protected tree on a site is not necessarily a constraint to development significant loss of protected trees should be avoided and site layout should seek to safeguard existing mature trees and hedgerows. Consideration to trees present on the site should inform the layout and site densities, and site access. In assessing the impact on TPOs the Council shall consider the extent to which development shall have on tree loss in accordance with the criteria matrix.

### 8.3.11. Contaminated Land (*stage 1 criteria*)

Contamination	<b>Green</b>	The site is not contaminated
	<b>Amber</b>	Part or all the site is contaminated but evidence has been provided to indicate that remediation would be possible and viable.
	<b>Red</b>	Contamination is a significant constraint and would be difficult to deal with/unlikely to be viable or insufficient evidence has been provided to show how remediation can be achieved

#### 8.3.11.1. Explanation:

Whilst land contamination may not necessarily render a site unsuitable for development, the added cost and time in remediating contamination could impact upon a site's viability and deliverability. Therefore, potentially contaminated sites will be scored negatively unless evidence is provided to indicate that site remediation can be undertaken without impeding on site viability.

In determining site contamination, the Council's Environmental Health Team shall be consulted in identifying where previous / historic uses could have implications for future development. In assessing sites there may be some instances where it is desirable to allocate a contaminated site for development to bring about its remediation. The Environmental Health team's assessment is likely to provide greater clarity in such circumstances.

Sites which include historic landfills identified by NRW must demonstrate how the allocated site would consider these contamination issues by providing additional evidence that indicate remediation would be possible.

### 8.3.12. Amenity and compatibility with adjacent uses (*stage 2 criteria*)

Amenity Impact-adjacent uses	<b>Green</b>	No impact on amenity from noise, odour, light or dust pollution/ the proposed use is compatible with existing uses <b>or</b> the proposed development replaces an existing use which is creating a negative amenity impact.
	<b>Amber</b>	Potential sources of noise, dour, light and/or dust pollution impacts identified can be mitigated / the proposal would be compatible with adjoining uses using mitigation measures
	<b>Red</b>	Noise, from one or more sources is a significant constraint to development and appropriate mitigation is unlikely to be achievable/ the proposal would be incompatible with adjoining uses and in despite of any potential mitigation measures.

#### 8.3.12.1. Explanation:

Site assessments will consider if a proposed development site is located close to any existing use(s) that would create a nuisance or amenity impact. The types of uses that may create a nuisance or amenity impact include:

- Major roads and railway
- Waste facilities (including transfer and recycling facilities)
- Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW)
- Certain industrial uses and Employment Sites

The above uses have the potential to create pollution including noise, air, light and odour. Industrial uses can also result in vibration, and specific forms of air pollution including dust, grit, fumes, smoke soot and ash.

In addition, the Council shall also consider the compatibility of the proposal on adjacent uses where present and whether any adverse impacts will result from the proposal on adjacent users/uses.

### 8.3.13. Existing Physical Site Constraints (*stage 1 criteria*)

Existing Physical Site Constraints	<b>Green</b>	The site is free from constraints.
	<b>Amber</b>	There are constraints on site, but this is unlikely to preclude development
	<b>Red</b>	The site has significant constraints that are likely to preclude development or the HSE advises against development.

### 8.3.13.1. Explanation:

There are several on-site physical infrastructure constraints which may restrict the availability of a site or stop it coming forward completely. This assessment does not consider topography or existing buildings, it solely focuses on infrastructure constraints.

The types of infrastructure considered in this assessment question are items that are run or operated by third party agencies and are split into major and minor constraints.

- Minor constraints include small scale power or phone lines which could be easily mitigated.
- Major constraints include major electricity pylons, the middle or outer Health and Safety Executive zones

If a site is fully within the HSE Inner Zone it will be excluded for residential use – but would not be excluded for non-housing uses such as employment and retail. The HSE’s land use planning methodology advises against residential development in Inner Zones but notes that employment uses could be acceptable.

### 8.3.14. Topography and Site Conditions (*stage 1 criteria*)

Topography and Site Conditions	<b>Green</b>	The site is free from constraints
	<b>Amber</b>	There are physical constraints on site, but this is unlikely to preclude development
	<b>Red</b>	The site has significant physical constraints that are likely to impact on the development of the site or its deliverability

#### 8.3.14.1. Explanation:

As with physical site features, the land condition itself may present issues for development. For example, the site topography, site stability or the presence of invasive species could have a bearing on development or site layout. Site promoters should provide details of such constraints and any mitigation measures proposed to overcome them.

<b>Environmental and Physical Constraints Site Assessment Outcome</b>	
No physical or other constraints	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constraints identified that require mitigation/policy intervention- Further consideration required	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major constraint to development or contrary to national policy or not enough information provided	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 8.4. Site Location: Accessibility and Proximity to Services and Facilities

### 8.4.1. Location – Residential Proposals (*stage 1 criteria*)

Settlement Hierarchy	<b>Green</b>	The site is within or adjoins the existing settlement boundary of either the Key Settlement of Barry, Service Centres, Primary Settlements or Minor Rural Villages.
	<b>Amber</b>	The site is within or adjoining a rural hamlet or small village not identified within the existing settlement hierarchy (refer to settlement list in the Sustainable Settlements background study) with preference to affordable housing exception sites in the 1 <sup>st</sup> instance
	<b>Red</b>	The site is located within the countryside (not applicable to gypsy and traveller sites)

#### 8.4.1.1. Explanation:

The existing adopted LDP contains a “settlement hierarchy”, which will be reviewed as part of the evidence base for the RLDP. The settlement hierarchy ranks settlements, taking account of their population size and range of services and facilities.

All settlements could potentially play a role in meeting the Vale of Glamorgan’s future growth needs and may form part of the Council’s Preferred Strategy. Generally, higher order settlements provide the most sustainable locations for growth, due to the greater access to services and facilities they offer. Conversely, development in the open countryside is likely to have poorer access to services and facilities, and the greatest potential for environmental harm (to be explored through other assessment criteria). However, the Council will also give preference to rural exception sites which propose 100% affordable within settlements presently outside of the LDP settlement hierarchy where it is evidenced that the site would meet a specific need that currently cannot be met in existing settlement hierarchy settlements.

In selecting sites, the Council shall also apply a sequential approach to identification of sites for development, with preference given to brownfield sites with or adjoining existing settlements, followed by sustainable greenfield sites on the edge of settlements.

### 8.4.2. Location – Employment and Retail Proposals (*stage 2 criteria*)

Location- Employment and Retail Uses	<b>Green</b>	The site is within, or adjoins an existing employment sites or town, local or neighbourhood retail centre.
	<b>Amber</b>	The site located outside an existing employment site or edge of centre (retail).
	<b>Red</b>	The site is located within the countryside or out of town contrary to national policy.

#### 8.4.2.1. Explanation

The Council shall consider proposals for employment and retail uses in accordance with the sequential test set out in national policy. Generally, employment proposals will be favoured within or adjoining existing employment sites identified within the present LDP, as well as strategically important sites of regional or local importance aimed at attracting inward investment or specific industries. Consideration will also be given to

the Council's review of employment needs that will be undertaken in support of the RLDP.

In respect of new retail proposals, sites will be assessed against the sequential test for retail as set out in national Policy - this specifically requires town centres to be the focus for retail development and applies all other uses complementary to retail and commercial centres. These include financial and professional services (A2), food and drink (A3), offices (B1), hotels (C1), and leisure (D2).

Promoters of retail sites of 2,500 sq. metres or more gross floorspace that are proposed on the edge of or outside designated retail and commercial centres will be required to submit a retail impact assessment. In determining the appropriateness of such sites the Council shall also draw upon the updated retail evidence to determine the need for additional retailing floorspace over the RLDP period and depending on the evidence may require proposals smaller than 2,500 sq. metres to undertake a retail impact assessment.

### 8.4.3. Access to Services and Facilities (*stage 2 criteria*)

Access to Services and Facilities	Green	Within 800 m of site (10-minute walk)
	Amber	Within 1200m of site (15-minute walk)
	Red	Greater than 1200m (+15-minute walk)

#### 8.4.3.1. Explanation:

National policy highlights the importance of sustainable placemaking ensuring that new developments have access to a range of services/ facilities by a range of transport means particularly by walking and cycling. Consequently, the relative distance to existing facilities, public transport, including the level and frequency of public transport provision is an important factor in determining site suitability.

However, national policy also recognises that for rural areas the opportunities to reduce car use and increase walking, cycling and use of public transport are more limited than in urban areas (PPW Edition 11, paragraph 3.39 refers). Consequently, in rural areas consideration shall be given to the Council's Sustainable Settlements Review and the role and function and relationship of settlements as part of the site assessment and selection process.

For residential proposals only, the assessment will firstly examine the location of the site proposal in terms of whether it is located within, adjacent to or outside a settlement, and secondly the ease of pedestrian and cycle access to key services listed below. In the case of retail, employment, and leisure proposals, sites will be categorised according to whether they are located in the town centre, edge of centre, out of centre or out of town, (the sequential test).

In considering a sites proximity to service and facilities, the Council shall adopt the methodology for assessing accessibility originally utilised for its Sustainable Settlements Appraisal Review (2016) and based upon guidelines within 'Sustainable Settlements: A Guide for Planners, Designers and Developers' produced by the University of the West England and the Local Government Management Board.

The availability of and accessibility to services and facilities will also be reviewed as part of the sustainable settlement hierarchy review and methodology. Site assessments will be considering the distances to the following key services<sup>1</sup>:

Facility	Reasonable Accessibility Standards (Max)
Primary School	600m
Secondary School	2000m
Health Services	1000m
Public Transport	800m
Sports Pitches/Playing Fields/Leisure Centres	1000m
Retail-Shops providing basic goods to meet day-to-day needs (town, local and neighbourhood centres)	1000m-2000m
Employment-Distance to existing local employment sites /allocations	Up to 5000m

Whilst it is acknowledged that this is not an exhaustive list of services / facilities, it is considered to represent a reasonable range of typical destinations that would comprise a relatively sustainable neighbourhood and may have a positive impact upon reducing reliance upon car-based travel in accordance with the sustainability and placemaking principles set out in national planning policy.

#### 8.4.4. Access to Green Open Spaces / Green Infrastructure (stage 2 criteria)

Access to Green Open Spaces/Green Infrastructure Network	Green	The site is within 5-to-10-minute walking distance of useable green space, public open space, or open access land
	Amber	The site is between 10-to-20-minute walking distance of useable green space, public open space, or open access land
	Red	The site is more than 20 minutes walking distance from any useable green space, public open space, or open access land.

##### 8.4.4.1. Explanation:

PPW highlights the numerous benefits of green infrastructure as an effective means of enhancing health and well-being, through linking dwellings, workplaces and community facilities and providing high quality, accessible green spaces. There is no standard for access to green spaces identified in local or national planning policy, however, a number of studies have been undertaken which have informed the criteria relating to the accessibility of green spaces as part of the Candidate Site Process. The World Health Organization identifies that urban residents should be a 5 minute walking distance to green spaces of at least 0.5-1ha whereas Fields in Trust consider a general 10 minute walking distance to be an appropriate rule of thumb in all areas. Due to the differences between preferred distances to green spaces it is considered a range of times for each category would represent a reasonable approach to assessing accessibility to green spaces.

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from Sustainable Settlements: A Guide for Planners, Designers and Developers (Barton, Davis and Guise, 1995) and Shaping Neighbourhoods - for local health and global sustainability (2010)

In general, the following distances can be used to determine the average walking time from an allocation to the nearest green space:

- 400m = 5-minute walk
- 800m = 10-minute walk
- 1,200m = 15-minute walk
- 1,600m = 20-minute walk

It should be recognised that when applying these benchmarks, local features and obstacles to pedestrian movement are not considered. However, at this high-level stage of the process it is considered appropriate to apply broad benchmarks with additional detail considered as the site progresses through the candidate site assessment process.

Where sites are not within appropriate distances to green spaces it is expected that appropriate features would need to be included within the site if it is allocated within the RLDP. Consequently, this may affect the density on the site and the viability considerations. Therefore, proposers are expected to include additional assumptions in their density and viability evidence to ensure a realistic allocation is being proposed. This means that if a site is within the amber or red category it will not be discounted immediately but it would be expected to include improvements to green space access through on-site provision.

The quality of usable green space is also an important consideration, although this is difficult to quantify within the parameters of the Candidate Site Form, additional information on the location and quality of green spaces is included within the Council's Green Infrastructure Plan. This document will be used to inform the assessment of this criteria, for example where a site falls within the amber category, but the accessible green space is of a high quality this would rank higher against another site in the amber category with access to lower quality green space.

#### 8.4.5. Sustainable Transport – Public Transport (*stage 2 criteria*)

Sustainable Transport Public Transport	<b>Green</b>	The site is served by public transport connections within 800m walking distance of the site and provides an acceptable minimum frequency of 1 service per hour Mondays to Saturdays plus Sunday service)
	<b>Amber</b>	The site is of a size that could potentially sustain a commercial public transport connection within 800m walking distance of the site (minimum frequency of 1 service per hour Mondays to Saturdays plus Sunday service)
	<b>Red</b>	The site is not served by public transport connections within 800m of the site and is considered incapable of supporting a frequent service by virtue of its size.

##### 8.4.5.1. Explanation:

In assessing a sites' accessibility, consideration will be given firstly to the availability of existing public transport services and proximity to the site. The distance of 800m is consistent with the standard adopted in 3.2 reflecting the maximum acceptable walking distance to access public transport services. The level of service frequency used within the assessment also reflects the methodology adopted in the Council's Sustainable Settlement Appraisal.

Where there is no current provision, or existing provision is greater than 800m from the site, consideration will be given to the potential to enhance service provision and shall involve consultation with the Council's Public Transport Team to determine whether the proposal could sustain a viable service. Sites with no existing services or are deemed unlikely to support a new service and will be scored negatively.

#### 8.4.6. Sustainable Transport- Active Travel (*stage 2 criteria*)

Active Travel Walking and Cycling	<b>Green</b>	The site is connected to an existing or proposed active travel route or is within 800m of an existing/proposed active travel route.
	<b>Amber</b>	The site is not connected to an active travel route, but the site provides the opportunity to create activity travel connections.
	<b>Red</b>	The site is not connected to an active travel route and there is limited or no opportunity to create active travel opportunities.

##### 8.4.6.1. Explanation:

The Council shall consider opportunities for walking and cycling within the authority and the site's potential for connecting to the Council's existing Active Travel Network and proposed additional routes identified within the Vale of Glamorgan Interactive Network. In each case, the availability/ ability of pedestrians and cyclists to reach the Active Travel Network by way of adopted footpaths / cycle paths will be considered against a distance of 800 metres from the site and scored in accordance with the matrix criteria.

#### 8.4.7. Community Facilities (*stage 2 criteria*)

Community Facilities	<b>Green</b>	The site will not result in the loss of an existing community facility.
	<b>Amber</b>	The proposal would result in a loss of a community facility that is surplus or will be replaced as part of the proposals
	<b>Red</b>	The proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of a community facility

##### 8.4.7.1. Explanation:

Community facilities are wide ranging and encompass amenities such as health centres, doctor's surgeries, and educational facilities, social facilities such as community halls, public houses, libraries, and places of worship. Access to and the availability of local services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport can positively impact on health and well-being<sup>2</sup> by increasing opportunities for social interaction and community cohesion.

A key consideration in the assessment of site will therefore be whether the proposal would have a positive impact on community facilities through safeguarding, enhancing

<sup>2</sup> Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) Practical Guides, Guide 8: Creating health-promoting environments. 2017. <https://www.tcpa.org.uk/tcpa-practical-guides-guide-8-health>

existing facilities or new provision. Conversely sites which lead to a loss or no improvement to existing community facilities will be considered less favourably as reflected in the assessment criteria.

<b>Location and Accessibility Assessment Outcome</b>	
Site is in a settlement that offers good accessibility to services and facilities location and accessible by a range of modes	<input type="checkbox"/> <span style="background-color: #90EE90; padding: 2px;"> </span>
Site is in a settlement with some services and can support improved access opportunity to enhance existing transport connections –Further consideration required	<input type="checkbox"/> <span style="background-color: #FFD700; padding: 2px;"> </span>
Site is in an isolated location and would result in high car dependency/contrary to national policy.	<input type="checkbox"/> <span style="background-color: #FF0000; padding: 2px;"> </span>

## 8.5. Infrastructure Availability

### 8.5.1. Connectivity and Capacity (*stage 2 criteria*)

Service connection Water and Sewerage	<b>Green</b>	Existing or evidence of suitable connections
	<b>Amber</b>	Existing or proposed services would be suitable subject to local improvements without impacting on development viability and/or delivery timescales
	<b>Red</b>	Existing or proposed services are a significant constraint to development viability and/or delivery timescales

#### 8.5.1.1. Explanation:

Sites will be assessed against the availability of water connections to the site, in addition to the method of foul sewage disposal from the site. Consultation shall be undertaken with DCWW to determine whether there is sufficient capacity to the wastewater treatments works, and how it links into DCWW's Capital Investment Programme.

Where consultation indicates limited capacity, or the site is located away from a viable connection this may impact on the deliverability/viability of a site should this require significant connection costs or upgrades. Consequently, the Council shall require site proposers to undertake detailed site viability assessment to determine the impact that additional cost shall have on development cost and deliverability timescales.

### 8.5.2. Other Infrastructure (*stage 2 criteria*)

Other Infrastructure connections Electricity, Gas, Broadband and telephone	<b>Green</b>	Existing or evidence of suitable connections
	<b>Amber</b>	Existing or proposed services would be suitable subject to local improvements
	<b>Red</b>	Existing or proposed services are a significant constraint to development

#### 8.5.2.1. Explanation:

Consideration will be given to the impact of other infrastructure requirements on development in terms of their cost. Whilst a site wouldn't be dismissed on this alone, consideration is given to the viability of the development.

### 8.5.3. Highway Accessibility (*stage 2 criteria*)

Highway access Local and Strategic Network	<b>Green</b>	No constraints on highway accessibility, site can provide safe access with minor mitigation measures
	<b>Amber</b>	Minor constraints on highway accessibility which can be reasonably mitigated
	<b>Red</b>	Major highway constraints -Insurmountable safety issues and/or the or cost of mitigation measures likely to render scheme not viable

#### 8.5.3.1. Explanation:

An assessment shall be undertaken by the Council's Highways Officer to determine whether safe access and egress can be achieved from the site. Where the existing site access is acceptable for the proposed use, it will be scored positively. To assist in this assessment site proposers should identify on the submitted plans where the access to the site will be achieved.

Where there is an existing substandard access that can be improved to serve the proposed development, or a new access can be safely achieved the site shall score amber and further details to be provided where necessary and appropriate.

Where unsafe highway access is proposed or existing access cannot be upgraded in accordance with the Council standards, or costs of providing safe access and egress are considered to impact on site viability the site shall be excluded from further consideration.

Infrastructure Availability Assessment Outcome	
Infrastructure capacity available	☐
Limited capacities identified that may be addressed through mitigation - internal/external consultation to be undertaken to verify measures required	☐
Major infrastructure constraints identified	☐

## 8.6. Climate Change, Placemaking and Wellbeing

### 8.6.1. Climate Change (*stage 2 criteria*)

Climate Change	<b>Green</b>	The development shall be zero carbon
	<b>Amber</b>	The development shall incorporate carbon reduction measures and/or energy sources above that required by Building Regulations

	<b>Red</b>	Development proposes no additional low /zero carbon measures above the mandatory building Regulations
--	------------	---

**8.6.1.1. Explanation:**

PPW states that the “The planning system should support new development that has very high energy performance, supports decarbonisation, tackles the causes of the climate emergency, and adapts to the current and future effects of climate change through the incorporation of effective mitigation and adaptation measures.” (paragraph 5.8.1 refers)

Additionally, PPW (paragraph 5.8.7) highlights the role the development industry has in contributing towards climate change, stating that “Developers should take into account future requirements for carbon reduction in new buildings when designing their schemes, as a result of changes to Building Regulations in Wales; being mindful of any future changes will ensure design aspects of requirements are considered as early as possible”. Accordingly, site promoters must ensure that their anticipated timescales for when a site may come forward takes into consideration future changes to building regulations over Plan period and that this is reflected in site viability appraisals.

The Council shall consider how a development proposal shall contribute towards a move towards zero carbon based upon the level of measures considered by site promoters against the criteria matrix. A sites’ contribution towards climate change shall also form part of the ISA assessment.

**8.6.2. Placemaking- Character and Place (stage 2 criteria)**

Placemaking- Character and place	<b>Green</b>	Development of the site has the potential to enhance the character of the area and contribute positively to national sustainability and placemaking principles
	<b>Amber</b>	Development of site is likely to have a neutral / negligible effect on local character and sense of place (subject to the development providing mitigation measures and/or meeting specific policy requirements).
	<b>Red</b>	Development of site will likely be detrimental to local character and sense of place (regardless of mitigation measures and/or meeting specific policy requirements).

**8.6.2.1. Explanation:**

The contribution in which a site may make to place making shall be an important consideration in the final selection of sites and shall be determined through consideration of evidence provided by site promoters at the candidate site submission stage and answers provided in respect of Section 7 of the submission form, as well as additional information requested by the Council/and or RLDP background evidence.

Site visits shall also be undertaken by Council Planning officers who will have regard to matters relating to local character and national placemaking goals and information gathered through the site assessment process. Generally, site visits shall be undertaken for all sites which score positively against the assessment criteria and are considered free from constraints. To avoid duplication existing LDP allocations and sites with extant planning permission will generally not be visited- assessment of these sites would have previously been considered against this criterion. Such sites shall

nevertheless be considered against deliverability and viability information to determine whether a site should be carried forward into the RLDP.

In determining the appropriateness of proposals, site visits shall be guided by the national definition of Placemaking as set out PPW page 14:

*“Placemaking considers the context, function and relationships between a development site and its wider surroundings. This will be true for major developments creating new places as well as small developments created within a wider place. “*

Accordingly, officers will collect evidence and exercise professional judgement on the following criteria:

**Assessment criteria - Character & Place**

**Local context-** how well the development fits with the setting and character of the area:

- Local built character of the surrounding area
- Relationship to and compatibility with existing built form, layout, scale, density, building types
- Visual impact on landscape / streetscape/historic environment
- Significance of the site to the area
- Density of the proposal in relation to existing developments

**Linkages-** How well does the development connect to the surrounding access routes:

- Access to the site- vehicular movement
- Access to public transport, pedestrian/cycle routes
- Relationship to existing green/blue spaces

**Accessibility-** how well the site connects and is accessible to existing open space and community facilities:

- Whether the site appears generally accessible to all users
- Opportunities for enhancing green infrastructure/active travel

Where there are a few sites within a settlement, those which score overall proportionately positively against the criteria shall be ranked above those which result in a disproportionate number of negative scores.

**8.6.3. Health and Wellbeing (stage 2 criteria)**

Health and Wellbeing	<b>Green</b>	The site promoter has submitted a health and checklist setting out how the site will incorporate measures that shall contribute towards improving health and well-being.
	<b>Amber</b>	N.A
	<b>Red</b>	No health and wellbeing checklist has been submitted

### 8.6.3.1. Explanation:

PPW Paragraphs 3.19 to 3.24 Promoting Healthier Places sets out how Local Planning Authorities can assist in maximising opportunities for improving health and well-being. This includes maintaining and creating places that encourage healthy lifestyles, ensuring access to green spaces and community facilities, and promoting walking and cycling. It also highlights the importance of ensuring that the planning process minimises the potential negative impacts that new developments can have on physical and mental health by safeguarding amenity and by reducing exposure to noise and air pollution.

PPW highlights the close links between the built environment and health and well-being and provides guidance on how developers, architects, landscape designers and highway engineers can contribute to physical and mental well-being in the design of new developments. The candidate site guidance therefore encourages site promoters to submit the health and well-being checklist (see guidance notes) to enable opportunities for health and wellbeing to identified at the earliest stages consistent with the approach advocated in PPW:

“Our built and natural environments should be planned to promote mental and physical well-being. The best way of achieving this is to involve and collaborate with others to ensure issues are understood and prevented at the earliest opportunity through effective engagement with those affected by or having an interest in the development concerned.”(Page 17 refers).

The RLDP shall be subject to a health impact assessment (as part of the ISA), and as such preference will be given to sites that consider health and wellbeing at the earliest stages through the submission of a health and wellbeing checklist.

<b>Climate Change, Placemaking and Wellbeing Assessment Outcome</b>	
The proposal is considered complimentary to climate change national; national placemaking outcomes and make a positive contribution to health and well-being objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The proposal would make a limited contribution towards climate change, national placemaking outcomes and make a positive contribution to health and well-being objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The proposal would be contrary to national placemaking outcomes and make a neutral/negative contribution to health and well-being objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>