Caerphilly County Borough
2nd Replacement Local Development Plan 2020-2035

EB46: Candidate Site Methodology

October 2026

CAERPHILLY COUNTY BOROUGH COUNCIL
CYNGOR BWRDEISTREF SIROL CAERFFILI

Caerphilly County Borough 2nd Replacement Local Development Plan 2020-2035

EB46 Candidate Site Methodology

October 2026

Introduction

A key early stage in the preparation of the 2nd Replacement Local Development Plan (2RLDP) is a stringent assessment of sites to determine their suitability for allocation within the 2RLDP. The sites submitted as part of this process are referred to as candidate sites.

A submission form is available for site promoters to provide detailed information in respect of their site, and Candidate Sites Guidance Notes have been issued alongside the form in order to aid the completion of the form, by signposting site promoters to key information sources to allow the form to be completed robustly.

Site promoters are also advised to consider the assessment procedure outlined in this paper, which is designed to ensure that there is a clear, transparent and objective assessment procedure in place, which makes the process accessible to all interested persons and organisations. The assessment procedure can be categorised into a number of stages, each of which will be examined in more detail in the following sections.

This methodology paper has been prepared having regard for the South East Wales Strategic Planning Group's methodology paper (July 2018), which was prepared to provide consistency for local planning authorities in the South East Wales region in undertaking site assessments, and the Development Plans Manual (March 2020, Edition 3), which provides detailed guidance on the candidate sites process.

Call for Candidate Sites

A candidate site is a site submitted to the Council by an interested party (e.g. developer or landowner) for potential inclusion as an allocation in the 2RLDP. These guidance notes provide information on the process for submitting candidate sites.

What types of sites can be submitted?

Landowners/proposers are welcome to submit sites for the range of uses that the plan makes provision for. This includes, but is not limited to, land for Housing; Employment; Retail; Community Facilities; Tourism and Recreation; Renewable Energy; Gypsy and Traveller sites; Transport Infrastructure; Waste; Education; Health, Education and Social Care; Biodiversity; Green infrastructure; Minerals.

Threshold for Candidate Sites

The Council will only seek to allocate sites for housing that have the capacity to accommodate 10 or more dwellings or are a minimum of 0.5 Ha in gross site area. This aligns with the definition of 'major development' in the Town and Country Planning legislation.

For other uses, the threshold will be that the site can accommodate a building with a minimum floor space of 1,000sq m and/or the site is 1 Ha or greater in gross site area.

Sites under the 10 dwelling/0.5 Ha threshold for residential or 1,000 sq m floorspace/ 1Ha for other uses will be classified as 'small sites'. All small sites that are submitted will be included within a Candidate Sites Register.

Small sites will be subject to an initial filtering exercise to assess them against major constraints. Small sites that adjoin or lie in close proximity to existing LDP settlement boundaries will be considered as part of a settlement boundary review to determine if they are appropriate for inclusion within the settlement boundary, having regard to the 2RLDP development strategy. Small sites that are proposed for housing and pass the initial assessment will also be included within the local authority's register of suitable sites for RSLs, SMEs and the custom and self-build sector.

Site submitted as part of the Adopted LDP (Up to 2021) or Withdrawn Replacement LDP (Up to 2031)

Any candidate sites submitted as part of the call for candidate sites for the Adopted LDP in 2005/6 or Replacement LDP in 2013/14 will need to be resubmitted as part of the review. This will include the re-submission of any sites currently allocated in the Adopted LDP that have not yet been developed. If existing sites in the Adopted LDP are not re-submitted, they will not be considered further.

If a candidate site was ruled out previously, or the site was allocated but has not been developed, the new submission should consider the reasons why the site was not taken forward and provide any additional information (e.g. surveys) to explain how any constraints can be overcome and why the site is suitable for allocation.

What types of sites are likely to be acceptable?

The Council will only allocate sites that adhere to national planning guidance as set out in Welsh Government Planning Policy Wales (PPW) and the Technical Advice Notes (TANs).

Before submitting candidate sites, site promoters should be aware of the following considerations. New house building and other new development (retail, employment etc) in the open countryside, away from established settlements, should be strictly controlled. Sites proposed in isolated locations away from defined settlements are unlikely to be acceptable; Sites that are subject to international or national designations for biodiversity (Special Area of Conservation, Site of Special Scientific Interest or National Nature Reserve) will not be acceptable; Proposals for highly vulnerable development (which includes housing, public buildings and emergency services) within the highest risk areas of the flood plain will not be permitted.

In selecting sites, PPW is clear on the types of location that will be acceptable for built development. Specifically, it states that in identifying sites to be allocated in development plans, local planning authorities should follow a search sequence, prioritising previously developed land (brownfield) and/or underutilised sites within settlements in the first instance; then suitable and sustainable greenfield sites within or on the edge of settlements. Sites in the open countryside, including new settlements, must only be considered in exceptional circumstances.

Whilst the Council will still seek to allocate deliverable brownfield land and buildings in the first instance, it should be noted that many of the large brownfield sites allocated in the current Adopted LDP have now been developed. The Council will therefore need to consider the release of greenfield sites on the edge of settlements where insufficient deliverable brownfield sites are available to meet future requirements.

Candidate Site Assessment Procedure

Publication of the Candidate Sites

After the close of the Candidate Sites Submission period, a register of submitted sites will be prepared. This site register will be made available for public inspection as part of the evidence base for the 2RLDP.

It is important to note that the submission of a Candidate Site does not represent a commitment on the part of the Council to take sites forward into the 2RLDP. Sites will be subject to a robust assessment and only those that score highly in respect of sustainability, deliverability and are in accordance with the 2RLDP Strategy will be allocated.

Stage 1 Initial Filtering Exercise

The assessment methodology applies to sites that are proposed for built development (e.g. housing, employment, retail). If sites are put forward for protection, these will be subject to a separate assessment and will be considered as part of the green infrastructure assessment.

The Assessment Procedure is set out in Appendix 2. The Initial Filtering Exercise will consider the size of site; relationship to existing settlement; and conflict with national

planning policy – flood risk or internationally or nationally import areas for biodiversity.

Only sites that meet the high-level policy considerations will proceed to Stage 2.

Stage 2A Detailed Assessment

The information provided by each site promoter will be verified by a team of planning officers, in consultation with other service areas of the Council. The detailed assessment will consider the following categories:

Planning (Section B);

Ownership (Section C);

Site Suitability (Section D), including site condition, Pollution, Flood Risk, Natural Heritage, Landscape and Open Spaces, Public Rights of Way, Minerals, Heritage, Utilities, Highways and Transportation, Climate Change, Economic Benefits;

Site Deliverability and Viability (Section E)

A traffic light system for scoring the site will be used, as explained in Appendix 2. Where insufficient information has been submitted sites will be scored grey. The Council considers that the level of information submitted at the call for candidate sites stage should be proportionate and, at this initial site submission stage, it is not expected that the candidate site submission should be accompanied by the level of information that would be expected to support a planning application, although inclusion of such detail at this point will assist in the processing of the submission.

However, if a site promoter is aware of a significant constraint (e.g. part of the site is within the flood plain, or the site has ecological value, or it is within a high-risk coal mining area) then 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.

Sites included in the 2RLDP must be realistic, appropriate and be founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and therefore the more information that can be submitted to demonstrate that a site is suitable, the greater the likelihood of a site being included.

Where insufficient information has been submitted, the Council may request additional information such as ecological surveys, arboricultural surveys, strategic flood consequences assessments, drainage studies, coal mining risk assessments, traffic impact assessments, air quality impact assessments, and any other information that may be required to demonstrate that a site is deliverable. The responsibility of undertaking relevant technical work to support a sites inclusion in the plan, including financial costs, resides with the site promoter.

Stage 2B Consultation with External Infrastructure Providers

The Council will consult with statutory agencies sites such as Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water, Natural Resources Wales, The Coal Authority, Glamorgan Gwent

Archaeological Trust, Western Power and National Grid on those sites that are deemed suitable for further consideration following the Stage 2A detailed assessment.

Infrastructure providers will be asked to assess the sites and identify any potential issues and what mitigation measures are likely to be necessary in order to overcome these issues. If the infrastructure issue cannot be addressed, or the cost of addressing it would significantly impact on the viability and deliverability of a site, then the site will not be considered further.

Stage 2C Assessment against the Preferred Strategy and Integrated Sustainability Assessment

Candidate Sites will also be assessed against the Preferred Strategy and the Integrated Sustainability Assessment (ISA) objectives.

Stage 3 Preferred Strategy Consultation

As part of the evidence base for the Preferred Strategy, the Council will publish a summary of the draft site assessments for all sites submitted through the Call for Candidates Sites. At this stage, it will be necessary to submit further information including viability assessments for those sites which are considered suitable for further consideration, and which comply with the Preferred Strategy. Further guidance on the requirements for the viability assessment will be published separately.

It will be possible for new candidate sites to be submitted at this stage, but site submissions should include all relevant information to demonstrate that they are deliverable and viable.

Any new sites submitted with be assessed against the criteria set out within this paper

Deposit 2nd Replacement LDP

The Deposit 2nd Replacement LDP will identify those sites that are considered to be suitable for allocation following the completion of the candidate site assessment process.

Appendix 1 Overview of the Candidate Sites Process and Anticipated Timescales

Jan - Aug 2021	Initial Call for Candidate Sites. Site promoters to complete submission form.
Sept 2021	Publication of Candidate Sites Register following closing of call for candidate sites.
	STAGE 1 - Initial filtering exercise. Is the site above the site size threshold? If yes, continue assessment. If no, consider as part of the SB review where appropriate
	STAGE 1 - Initial filtering exercise. Does the site satisfy the initial high-level assessment? If Yes, continue assessment. If no, sites with insurmountable constraints will not be considered further.
May – Dec 2021	STAGE 2 - LPA to verify the information on the submission form and consult internal and external stakeholders.
Sept 2021 – Mar 2022	Assessment against the Preferred Strategy and ISA objectives.
Nov 2022	Consultation on Preferred Strategy and publication of initial site assessment. New sites could be submitted at this stage. Request for further detailed information (where not previously submitted) on sites in conformity with the Preferred Strategy.
Jan 2023	Pause Plan preparation to consider Welsh Government objections.
Jan 2025	Consultation on revised Preferred Strategy and publication of initial site assessment. New sites could be submitted at this stage. Request for further detailed information (where not previously submitted) on sites in conformity with the Preferred Strategy.
Mar 2025	Publish updated Candidate Sites Register incorporating any new site submissions.

Mar 2025 – Mar 2026	Consult with key and statutory stakeholders on sites in conformity with the Preferred Strategy.
Mar – Jul 2026	Finalise allocations for inclusion in the Deposit 2nd Replacement LDP based on site assessment criteria.
Oct – Dec 2026	Consultation on the Deposit 2nd Replacement LDP. Publication of candidate site assessments.

Appendix 2 – Assessment Procedure and Scoring

STAGE 1 - INITIAL FILTERING EXERCISE

The assessment methodology applies to sites that are proposed for built development (e.g. housing, employment, retail). If sites are put forward for protection, these will be subject to a separate assessment and will be considered as part of the green infrastructure assessment.

Is the site a small site (under 0.5 Ha for housing or 1 Ha for other uses)?

No	
Yes, out of settlement	Include in CSR. No further assessment.
Yes, edge of settlement	Include in CSR and assess as part of settlement boundary review.
Yes, within existing settlement	Include in CSR and register of small sites. No further assessment.

Relationship to existing settlement:

Within existing settlement
Rounding off settlement
Edge of settlement
Out of settlement

If a site is defined as out of settlement and is proposed for a use such as housing, employment or retail, it will not be subject to any further assessment, as it would be contrary to national planning policy on development in the countryside.

If an acceptable use in the countryside location is proposed e.g. wind turbines, recreational development etc the site will be considered further.

Conflict with national planning policy:

Majority of site within high risk flood risk area and proposed for highly vulnerable use
Any of site within an international or nationally important area for biodiversity

Conclusion:

Site is suitable for further consideration, or
Site is NOT suitable for further consideration

STAGE 2 – DETAILED ASSESSMENT

Section B - Planning

Current planning status (B1)		Green – Use would be acceptable in principle (unallocated, within existing settlement boundary). Amber – Site is designated for another use/outside settlement boundary, but this could be reconsidered, or site is allocated for the same use but has not been brought forward. Red – site is designated for another use and it is unlikely that an alternative would be acceptable (e.g. primary employment site, primary retail area, area of international or national importance for biodiversity etc). Grey – Insufficient information submitted/ further clarification required.
Site planning history (B2 and B3)		Green – Positive pre-app discussions on the proposal/site has planning permission and it is demonstrated that it will be implemented. Amber – Site has previously had planning permission, but this has not been implemented/uncertainty over implementation of current permission. Red – Site has been refused permission previously for proposed use. White – No relevant planning history. Grey – Insufficient information submitted/ no planning history.

Previous candidate site (B4)		Green – Site has previously been considered as a candidate site and no significant constraints were identified. Amber – Site has previously been considered as a candidate site – constraints identified but could be addressed. Red – Site has been previously considered as a candidate site and was ruled out due to constraints. Grey – Site has not previously been considered as a candidate site.

Section C – Ownership

Summary of Land ownership (C1 to C3)		Green – Site is owned by a single landowner who supports the site promotion or if in multiple ownership there is an agreed Heads of Terms. If public land, it is in a published disposal strategy. Amber – Site is owned by multiple landowners with no evidenced agreement to work together, or if public land, it is not yet within a published disposal strategy. Red – There is uncertainty regarding ownership of all or part of the site. There is evidence that landowners are unaware of or do not support the site promotion. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.
Legal Constraints (C4)		Green – No restrictive covenants are in place. Amber – A restrictive covenant is in place on part or all of the land, but it is unlikely to affect its allocation in part or as whole. Red – A covenant is in place that will restrict the development of the site for its proposed use. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.

Section D – Site Suitability

Site Condition			
Previously developed land (D1)		In accordance with PPW, previously developed land and buildings should be used in preference to greenfield land. Greenfield status would not	To be completed by assessor

		automatically preclude a site where there are no alternatives and it accords with the strategy. This is reflected in the scoring. Green – The majority or all of the site is brownfield. Amber – The majority or all of the site is greenfield. Red – N/A. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	
Physical or topographical constraints (D2 and D3)		Green – Site is free from physical or topographical constraints. Amber – There are constraints on site, but this is unlikely to preclude development. Red – Site has significant constraints that are likely to preclude development. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor. Assessor to consult Landscape Architect
Demolition of buildings (D4)		Green – No demolition required. Amber – Demolition of buildings required on site. Red – N/A. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor. Assessor to Consult ecologists to determine any survey requirements
Loss of formal leisure or community facilities (D5)		Green – No loss of formal leisure or community facilities. Amber – The proposal would result in a loss of formal leisure or community facilities, but they are surplus to requirements or it is considered that they can be replaced elsewhere. Red – The proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of formal leisure or community facilities. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor

Pollution			
Contamination (D6)		Green – Site is not contaminated. Amber – Part or all of the site is contaminated, but it is considered that remediation would be possible and viable. Red – Contamination is a significant constraint and would be difficult to deal with/unlikely to be viable. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to Consult Environmental Health
Impact on site from neighbouring uses (D7)		Green – No amenity concerns from noise, odour, light or dust. Amber – Concerns regarding pollution from one or more sources, but likely that effects can be mitigated. Red – Pollution from one or more sources is a significant constraint to development and appropriate mitigation unlikely to be achievable. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to Consult Environmental Health and Countryside
Impact of proposed use on neighbouring uses (D8)		Green – No amenity concerns from the proposed use. Amber – Concerns regarding impact of proposed use on neighbouring uses, but likely that effects can be mitigated. Red – Proposed use would significantly affect neighbouring uses and appropriate mitigation unlikely to be achievable. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to Consult Environmental Health and Countryside
Air Quality Management Area (D9)		Green – The site is not within 2km of an AQMA. Amber – The site is within 2km of an AQMA, but an AQIA has been submitted and the impact on air quality can be addressed through	Assessor to Consult Environmental Health

		appropriate mitigation. Red – Impact on air quality is a significant constraint that is unlikely to be resolved through mitigation. Grey – Insufficient information submitted	
Proximity to landfill sites (D10)		Green – Not within 500m of a former landfill site, or within 500m but gas migration not considered to be a risk. Amber – Within 500m of a landfill site and gas migration considered to be a risk. Red – Gas migration considered to be a significant constraint. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to Consult Environmental Health

Flood Risk			
TAN 15 Flood Risk (D11)		Green – Site within a TAN 15 very low risk flood risk area (Zone A/B in TAN 15 (2004) or Zone 1 in draft TAN 15 (2019)). Amber – In a higher risk flood area (Zone C in 2004 TAN 15 or Zones 2 or 3 in draft 2019 TAN 15) but acceptable in accordance with justification tests. Red – Within Zone C2 (2004) or Zone 3 (2019) and proposed for highly vulnerable development. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor
Susceptibility to surface water flooding (D12)		Green – Low susceptibility to surface water flooding or flooding from other sources. Amber – Intermediate/high susceptibility to surface water flooding and/or at risk of flooding from other sources but potential for mitigation. Red – Intermediate/high susceptibility	Assessor to Consult Drainage

		to surface water flooding and/or at risk of flooding from other sources – unlikely to be resolved through mitigation. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	
Culverts, ordinary watercourses or main rivers (D13)		Green – No culverts, ordinary watercourses or rivers on or adjacent to the site. Amber – Culverts, ordinary watercourses or river on or adjacent to the site, but potential for constraint to be addressed as part of site design. Red - Culverts, ordinary watercourses or river on or adjacent to the site are a significant constraint. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to Consult Drainage and Ecology

Natural Heritage			
Areas of international or national importance for biodiversity (D14)		Green – No impact on SAC or SSSI. Amber – Minor impact upon SAC or SSSI but appropriate mitigation could be achieved so as not to affect the features of the site. Red – Development will significantly affect an area of international or national importance for biodiversity. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to consult Ecology/ Countryside
Locally designated sites for biodiversity (D15)		Candidate sites to be assessed against current designations in the adopted LDP, whilst recognising that these designations may be amended through the 2RLDP process. Green – No impact on locally designated sites. Amber – Potential impact upon SINC or	Assessor to consult Ecology/ Countryside

		LNR but would not preclude development if appropriate mitigation is put in place. Red – Development will significantly affect a locally designated site. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	
Protected or priority species, habitats, stepping stones or wildlife corridors (D16 and D17)		Green – No impact on protected or priority species or habitats, stepping stones or wildlife corridors, or potential for enhancement. Amber – Potential impact but would not preclude development if appropriate mitigation is put in place. Red – Development will significantly affect a protected or priority species or habitats, stepping stones or wildlife corridor. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to consult Ecology/ Countryside

Landscape and Open Spaces			
Local Landscape designations (D18)		Candidate sites to be assessed against current designations in the adopted LDP, whilst recognising that these designations may be amended through the 2RLDP process. Green – Site is not within an area designated as SLA or VILL in the adopted LDP, or the proposed use is one that would be compatible with this designation. Amber – Potential impact on an area designated as SLA or VILL in adopted LDP but would not preclude development if appropriate mitigation is put in place. Red – Development would significantly harm the	Assessor to consult Landscape Architects/ Countryside

		distinctive or characteristic features if the SLA or VILL. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	
Green Wedge (D19)		Candidate sites to be assessed against current designations in the adopted LDP, whilst recognising that these designations may be amended through the 2RLDP process. Green – Not currently within a green wedge, nor within a location where a green wedge may be required in the future. Amber – Currently in a green wedge but the development of this site would not significantly harm the openness and/or result in coalescence between settlements. Red – Development would significant affect the openness and/or result in coalescence between settlements. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to consult Landscape Architects/ Countryside
Tree Preservation Orders (D20)		Green – No TPOs on or adjacent to the site. Amber – Constraints on part of the site which would need to be taken into consideration in future design. Red – Constraints are significant enough to prevent development of the whole site. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to consult Tree Officer
Woodlands, Trees or Hedgerows (D21)		Green – No impact on woodland, trees or hedgerows. Amber – Constraints on part of the site which would need to be taken into consideration in future design. Red – Constraints are significant enough to prevent development of the whole site.	Assessor to consult Tree Officer and Ecology

		Grey – Insufficient information submitted	
BMV Agricultural Land (D22)		Green – Not BMV (Grade 1, 2 or 3a) agricultural land. Amber – Part of the site is BMV agricultural land, but any loss could be mitigated. Red – Development of the site would result in the loss of BMV Agricultural land. Grey – Insufficient information submitted	To be completed by assessor.
Informal open spaces (D23)		Green – No loss of useable informal open spaces within the settlement boundary. Amber – The proposal would result in a loss of useable informal open space, but it is surplus to requirements or could be replaced elsewhere. Red – The proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of useable informal open space. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor. Countryside and Parks to be consulted

Public Rights of Way			
Public Rights of Way or Claimed Rights of Way (D24)		Green – No impact on PROWs or Claimed Rights of Way. Amber – PROWs or Claimed Rights of Way on or adjacent to the site that could be a constraint to development. Red – PROWs or Claimed Rights of Way are a significant constraint that is likely to preclude development. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to consult Rights of Way Officer/ Countryside

Minerals			
Coal Mining Development Referral Areas (D25)		Green – Not in a Coal Mining Development Referral Area. Amber – In a Coal Mining Development Referral Area but it has been demonstrated that the risks are low and/or can be mitigated. Red – In a Coal Mining Development Referral Area and it has not been demonstrated that the risks are low and/or can be mitigated. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor.
Minerals Resources (D26)		Green – Not within a safeguarding area (sandstone or limestone), an area of protection of sand and gravel or a minerals buffer zone. Amber – Within a safeguarding area (sandstone or limestone), an area of protection for sand and gravel, or a minerals buffer zone for a dormant quarry. Red – The proposal would affect a minerals buffer zone of an active or inactive quarry. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor.

Heritage			
Listed buildings (D27)		Green - No listed buildings or those listed by virtue of curtilage within or in close proximity to the site. Amber – Listed buildings or those listed by virtue of curtilage within or in close proximity, but the impact could be mitigated. Red – The development of the site would significantly harm the settings of a listed building (s) or those listed by virtue of	To be completed by assessor. If listed buildings on or near site consult conservation officer and Ecology

		curtilage. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	
Conservation areas (D28)		Green – Site is not within or in close proximity to a conservation area or would not affect its setting. Amber – Site is within or in close proximity to a conservation area or its setting but the impacts on the harm to the conservation area or its setting could be mitigated. Red – The development of the site would significantly harm the character or appearance of the conservation area or its setting. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor. If in or near conservation area on or near site consult Conservation Officer. If any Trees within a Conservation area likely to be affected, consult Tree Officer
Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM) (D29)		Green – No SAM within or in close proximity to the site. Close proximity is defined by CADW (Cadw (2017) Setting of Historic Assets in Wales) as: Within 0.5km of perimeter of SAM, within 1km if site area is 0.2 Ha or more, within 2km if site area is 0.5 Ha or more, within 5km if site area is 1 Ha or more. Amber – SAM within or in close proximity, but the impact could be mitigated. Red – The development of the site would significantly harm a SAM. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor. If SAM on or near site consult Conservation Officer
Register of Landscapes, Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales? (D30)		Green – Site not within or in close proximity to areas identified on the Register. Amber – Potential impact but would not preclude development if appropriate mitigation is put in place. Red – Development will significantly affect an area on the Register of Landscapes,	To be completed by assessor. If Landscape, Park or Garden on Register on or near site consult Conservation Officer

		Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in Wales. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	

Utilities			
Utilities (D31)		Green – No constraints identified in the provision of utilities. Amber – Constraints identified, but these can be addressed in the plan period. Red – Significant constraints which are unlikely to be overcome. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor.

Highways and Transportation			
Proximity to public transport stop – bus (D32a)		Green – Within 400m of an operational bus stop. Amber – Between 400m and 800m of an operational bus stop. Red – Over 800m from an operational bus stop. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to consult Highways
Proximity to public transport stop – train (D32b)		Green – Within 500m of a train station. Amber – Between 500m and 2km of a train station. Red – Over 2km from train station. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	
Proximity to existing or proposed		Green – Site is well related to existing or proposed active travel routes (within 400m). Amber – Site is adequately	Assessor to consult Highways

active travel routes (D33)		related to existing or proposed active travel routes (between 400m and 800m). Red – Site is poorly related to existing or proposed active travel routes (over 800m). Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	
Suitability of access (D34)		Green – Existing or proposed access point is suitable. Amber – Existing or proposed access would be suitable subject to local improvements. Red – Existing or proposed access points are a significant constraint to development. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to consult Highways/Rights of Way
Access onto strategic highway network, county road or distributor road (D35)		Green – Site would not require direct access onto the strategic highway network. Amber – Access to the site would be from a county or distributor road. This may affect the design and layout of any development. Red – Access would be required onto strategic highways network. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to consult Highways
Need for additional infrastructure improvements including access (D36)		Green – No additional infrastructure improvements required. Amber – In the level of infrastructure improvements required are significant but these are not likely to preclude development. Red – The level of infrastructure improvements required are significant and there are concerns over viability	Assessor to consult Highways/Rights of Way

		Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	
Generation of significant levels of traffic movement (D37)		Green – No requirement for a TA, or submitted TA found to be acceptable. Amber – Impact on traffic could be addressed through appropriate mitigation. Red – The traffic generation from the development is a significant constraint that is unlikely to be resolved through mitigation. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	Assessor to consult Highways. Highways to advise whether Travel Plan would be required

Climate Change			
Inclusion of low or zero carbon energy generating technologies (D38)		Green – Development proposed to be zero carbon. Amber – Some low or zero carbon energy generating technologies proposed. Red – No low or zero carbon energy generating technologies proposed. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor.
Mitigation against climate change (D39)		Green – Mitigation measures have been identified. Amber – Some consideration has been given to mitigation, but further consideration required. Red – No consideration has been given to mitigation. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor. Assessor to consult Landscape/ Countryside

Economic Benefits			

Economic benefits (D40)		Green – Potential for significant economic benefits from the proposal. Amber – Potential for some economic benefits. Red – Unlikely to provide economic benefits/likely to have adverse economic impact. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor.

Other Matters	
The assessment of this will depend on the nature of the matters raised.	To be completed by assessor.

Section E - Site Deliverability and Viability

Site availability (E1)		Green – Site is available now. Amber – Site is currently occupied, but it is anticipated that it will be available during the plan period. Red – Site is currently occupied, and it is not clear whether it will be available during the plan period. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor.
Timescales for delivery (E2 and E3)		Green – Realistic timescales have been identified for the delivery of the site. Amber – It is anticipated that the site can be delivered during the plan period, but further consideration is needed on proposed timescales. Red – It has not been adequately demonstrated that the site will be delivered during the plan period. Grey –	To be completed by assessor.

		Insufficient information submitted.	
Developer interest (E4)		Green – There is evidence of developer interest. Amber – There is no developer interest identified at this stage. Red – n/a. Grey – Insufficient information submitted.	To be completed by assessor.