Date: January 2022

Note Title: NPT RLDP ISA Candidate Site Assessment Scoring Criteria

# Site Assessment Scoring Methodology

Table 1.1: General SA Site Assessment Scoring Key

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Effect Definition** | **Symbol** |
| Major Positive (Significant Beneficial) | ++ |
| Minor Positive | + |
| Neutral | 0 |
| Minor Negative | - |
| Major Negative (Significant Adverse) | -- |

Table 1.2 Flood Risk Assessment Scoring Keys- TAN15 Compliant

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Effect Definition** | **Symbol** |
| Within Zone 1/ Compliant with TAN15 | ++ |
| Within Defended Zone (Highly Vulnerable/Less Vulnerable Dev) | ? |
| Within Zone 2 (Highly Vulnerable/Less Vulnerable Dev) | ?? |
| Within Zone 3 (Less Vulnerable Development Only) | - |
| Within Zone 3 (Highly Vulnerable Development Only) | -- |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Vulnerable Development** | **Symbol** |
| Within Zone 1 | ++ |
| Within Defended Zone | ? |
| Within Zone 2 | ?? |
| Within Zone 3 | -- |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Less Vulnerable Development** | **Symbol** |
| Within Zone 1 | ++ |
| Within Defended Zone | ? |
| Within Zone 2 | ?? |
| Within Zone 3 | - |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Water Compatible** | **Symbol** |
| Within Zone 1 | ++ |
| Within Defended Zone | ++ |
| Within Zone 2 | ++ |
| Within Zone 3 | ++ |

# Table 2: Full SA Site Assessment Scoring Criteria1

Table 2(a): SA Objective N/A Criteria: Common Land *Sustainability implications:*

The Commons Act 2006 restricts the use of Common Land and requires applications for the release of Common Land exceeding 200m to be accompanied by proposals for replacement land (i.e., land cannot be released for development without this requirement being fulfilled). The loss of Common Land could result in local amenity and environmental impacts, which may or may not be adequately offset by the defined proposals for replacement Common Land. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any instances of sites promoted by the LPA which constitute common land will not be excluded solely on this basis. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the extent of Common Land lost and the scale of development proposed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Site on common land | **--** |
| Site not on common land | **0** |

1 ‘Showstopper’ criteria highlighted in bold.

Table 2(b): SA Objective 1 Health and Wellbeing Criteria 1(a): Proximity to Existing Active Travel Routes *Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to active travel routes is not a fundamental constraint, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 400m of existing route | ++- |
| Within 800m of existing route | + |
| 800-1200m from existing route | - |
| Beyond 1200m from existing route | -- |

Criteria 1(b): Proximity to Health Facilities

*Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to healthcare facilities is not a fundamental constraint, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 400m of a healthcare facility | ++- |
| Within 800m of a healthcare facility | + |
| 800-1200m of a healthcare facility | - |
| Beyond 1200m from a healthcare facility | -- |

Criteria 1(c): Proximity of New Health Facilities and/or Active Travel Routes

*Sustainability implications:*

Depending on the scale of development, health needs should be met through onsite provision and/or contributions as appropriate, including provision of active travel opportunities which directly contribute to positive health outcomes. The absence of this would indicate the physical and mental health needs of residents/users may not be fully met.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposal to provide healthcare facility within site or develop section of identified active travel route within the site. | ++- |
| Proposal to contribute to off-site health facility or active travel improvements | + |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No new health facilities or active travel routes / contribution being proposed at this stage | 0- |

Table 2(b): SA Objective 2: Equality and Social Inclusion Criteria 2(a): Proximity to Community Facilities/ Public Services *Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to community facilities is not a fundamental constraint, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 400m of a community facility (community hall, library, council leisure facility or council service centre) | ++- |
| Within 800m of a community facility | + |
| 800 - 1200m from a community facility | - |
| Beyond 1200m from a community facility | -- |

Criteria 2(c): Provision of New Community Facilities/ Services

*Sustainability implications:*

Depending on the scale of development, social needs should be met through onsite provision and/or contributions as appropriate. The absence of this would indicate the social and wellbeing needs of residents/users may not be fully met, resulting in potential lack of community cohesion and social isolation (for vulnerable groups in particular).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposal to provide community facility within site | ++- |
| Proposal to contribute to off-site community facility improvements | + |
| No new community facilities proposed at this stage | 0- |

Table 2(c): SA Objective 3: Transport and Communications

Criteria 3(a): Proximity to Public Transport Network (bus stops and train stations)

*Sustainability implications:*

Lack of proximity to public transport would lock in car dependency for residents/users (e.g. employees), resulting in traffic and Green House Gas (GHG) impacts, and increase isolation for those without car ownership. This is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 400m of a bus stop or train station | ++- |
| Within 800m of a bus stop or train station | + |
| 800 - 1200m from a bus stop or train station | - |
| Beyond 1200m from a bus stop or train station | -- |

Criteria 3(b): Proximity to Strategic Road Network (motorways and trunk roads)

*Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to the strategic road network is not a fundamental constraint, it must be considered as part of determining site accessibility (all modes). This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 500m of strategic road network | ++- |
| Within 500m - 1km of strategic road network | + |
| 1km - 2km from strategic road network | - |
| Beyond 2km from strategic road network | -- |

Criteria 3(c): Proximity to Existing Active Travel Network

*Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to active travel routes is not a fundamental constraint, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 400m of existing route | ++- |
| Within 800m of existing route | + |
| 800 - 1200m from existing route | - |
| Beyond 1200m from existing route | -- |

Criteria 3(d): Proximity to Congestion Pinch Points

*Sustainability implications:*

Proximity to congestion hotspots could further increase traffic delays, resulting in adverse air quality, amenity and climate impacts. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from pinch point | ++- |
| 1km - 2km from pinch point | + |
| Within 500m - 1km of pinch point | - |
| Within 500m of pinch point | -- |

Criteria 3(e): Availability & Capacity of Transport & Utilities Infrastructure (Water and Sewage)

*Sustainability implications:*

The provision or absence of adequate transport infrastructure to accommodate development could impact on the capacity and functioning of the surrounding transport network (all modes), leading to congestion/delays, adverse air quality impacts and/or inhibiting sustainable modal shift. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Existing Connection or Infrastructure established | ++- |
| Upgraded / new infrastructure required to accommodate development | - |
| No information available | 0 |

Criteria 3(f): Drainage Management and Site Capacity

*Sustainability implications:*

Strategic infrastructure may be needed to address non-localised (e.g. cumulative) infrastructure impacts. The provision/funding or absence of strategic infrastructure could therefore influence the delivery and phasing of development sites to meet identified needs and resulting environmental/amenity impacts. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site

allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. . These will be considered in the later stages of the process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Welsh Water confirms no issue with site capacity | ++- |
| Site promoter outlines measures to address drainage at site. | + |
| Welsh Water confirms limited capacity. | - |
| Welsh Water confirms no Capacity | -- |
| No information available | 0 |

Criteria 3(g): Provision of New/ Upgraded Transport or Communications Infrastructure

*Sustainability implications:*

Strategic infrastructure may be needed to address non-localised (e.g. cumulative) infrastructure impacts. The provision/funding or absence of strategic infrastructure could therefore influence the delivery and phasing of development sites to meet identified needs and resulting environmental/amenity impacts. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. . These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposal to provide non-local transport or utilities infrastructure within site | ++- |
| Proposal to contribute to off-site transport or utilities infrastructure improvements | + |
| No new non-local transport or utilities infrastructure proposed at this stage | 0 |

Table 2(d): SA Objective 4: Employment Capacity Criteria 4(a): Employment Capacity *Sustainability implications:*

The loss of employment land2 (where retention recommended by future version of the NPT Employment Land Review could undermine the RLDP employment land strategy.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| 5ha or more land for employment use | ++- |
| Up to 5ha land for employment use | + |
| No employment use proposed/ no employment land | 0 |
| Removal of existing employment land for other uses | - |
| Removal of existing employment land for other uses where NPT ELR recommends retention. | -- |

Criteria 4(b): Mixed Use Suitability

*Sustainability implications:*

Mixed use development has the potential to deliver high densities and more sustainable outcomes. The absence of mixed use development is not a fundamental constraint but must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site

2 Definition of employment land to be specified in emerging NPT Employment Land Review.

allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposed for mixed use development | ++- |
| Site has potential to accommodate mixed use development | + |
| Site not likely to accommodate mixed use development | - |

Criteria 4(c): Proximity to Key Employment Locations

*Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to employment opportunities (existing main employment areas) is not a fundamental constraint, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 500m of key employment location | ++- |
| Within 500m - 1km of key employment location | + |
| 1km - 2km from key employment location | - |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Beyond 2km from key employment location | -- |

Criteria 4(d): Proximity to Primary Education Infrastructure

*Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to primary education infrastructure is not a fundamental constraint, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 400m of primary school | ++- |
| Within 800m of primary school | + |
| 800 - 1200m from primary school | - |
| Beyond 1200m from primary school | -- |

Criteria 4(e): Proximity to Secondary Education Infrastructure

*Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to secondary education infrastructure is not a fundamental constraint, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 400m of secondary school | ++- |
| Within 800m of secondary school | + |
| 800 - 1200m from secondary school | - |
| Beyond 1200m from secondary school | -- |

Criteria 4(f): Education Infrastructure Capacity

*Sustainability implications:*

Inadequate education infrastructure capacity to accommodate development could place NPTC in breach of statutory education duties and would not be compatible with sustainable development. Adequate mitigation would be required.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| NPTC Education Department confirms no capacity issue affecting site delivery | ++- |
| Proposal includes measures/facilities to address education capacity constraints | + |
| No information available regarding education capacity constraints affecting site delivery | - |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Beyond 1200m from secondary school | -- |

Criteria 4(g): Provision of New Education Infrastructure

*Sustainability implications:*

Depending on the scale of development, net additional education needs should be met through onsite provision and/ or contributions as appropriate. The absence of this would indicate that the education needs of residents may not be fully met and could place NPTC in breach of statutory education duties. This would not be compatible with sustainable development and adequate mitigation would be required.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposal to provide education infrastructure within site | ++- |
| Proposal to contribute to off-site education infrastructure improvements | + |
| No new education infrastructure proposed at this stage | 0 |

Criteria 4(h): Suitability of Industrial/ Economic Use

*Sustainability implications:*

Overprovision of employment land could dilute effectiveness of RLDP employment land and wider spatial strategies (i.e. directing employment generating development to the most appropriate and sustainable locations, and growing key economic sectors). Conversely, local underprovison or a failure to meet a specific locational need could restrict economic growth, restrict sectoral growth and limit employment opportunities. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site

allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| NPT ELR indicates site is preferred for industrial/ economic use | ++- |
| NPT ELR indicates site is suitable for industrial/ economic use but with marketability constraints | + |
| NPT ELR indicates site has some physical constraints affecting industrial/ economic use OR not preferred due to adequate (more suitable) supply of employment land already identified | - |
| NPT ELR indicates site is not suitable for industrial/ economic use | -- |

Criteria 4(i): Neighbouring Uses & Potential Agglomeration Effects

*Sustainability implications:*

Integration or conflicts with neighbouring (and wider surrounding) land uses could result in amenity, social or economic impacts. Co-location of employment/industrial uses could also generate agglomeration effects and catalyse economic growth. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposed use would integrate with neighbouring uses | ++- |
| No land use integration or conflicts likely | 0 |
| Proposed use likely to conflict with neighbouring uses | -- |

Criteria 4(i): Proximity to Strategic Road and Rail Network

*Sustainability implications:*

Proximity to strategic road network could affect the efficiency and environmental impacts of freight movements (materials delivery and product distribution) and well workforce. Whilst lack of proximity to the strategic road network is not a fundamental constraint, it must be considered as part of determining site accessibility (all modes). This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 500m of strategic road or rail network (inc. passenger rail services) | ++- |
| Within 500m - 1km of strategic road or rail network (inc. passenger rail services) | + |
| 1km - 2km from strategic road or rail network (inc. passenger rail services) | - |
| Beyond 2km from strategic road or rail network (inc. passenger rail services) | -- |

Table 2(d): SA Objective 5: Housing Criteria 5(a): Housing Capacity of the Site *Sustainability implications:*

The provision of net additional housing would contribute to meeting local and authority wide housing needs, as well as supporting population growth and delivery of the RLDP spatial strategy. Conversely, the loss of existing housing land could undermine the RLDP spatial strategy and exacerbate housing pressures (availability, affordability, etc.). This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| 5ha or more land for housing | ++- |
| Up to 5ha land for housing | + |
| No residential use proposed / no residential land | 0 |
| Removal of existing housing land up to 10ha for other uses | - |

Criteria 5(b): Deliverability of Affordable Housing

*Sustainability implications:*

The provision of affordable housing (at or above policy expectations) would contribute to meeting local and authority wide affordable housing needs, deliver mixed tenure developments with diverse communities, enable population growth and support delivery of the RLDP spatial strategy. Conversely, inadequate provision of affordable housing would exacerbate housing affordability pressures, limit household growth and underline delivery of the RLDP spatial strategy. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability

of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Direct affordable housing proposal (100% AH) | ++- |
| Indirect affordable housing delivery through market housing proposal | + |
| Site promoter contends non-viability of affordable housing within market housing | 0 |

Criteria 5(c): Mixed Use Suitability

*Sustainability implications:*

Mixed use development has the potential to deliver high densities and more sustainable outcomes. The absence of mixed-use development is not a fundamental constraint but must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposed for mixed use development | ++- |
| Site has potential to accommodate mixed use development | + |
| Site not likely to accommodate mixed use development | - |

Criteria 5(d): Neighbouring Uses

*Sustainability implications:*

Integration or conflicts with neighbouring (and wider surrounding) land uses could result in amenity, social or economic impacts. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposed use would integrate with neighbouring uses | ++- |
| Site has potential to accommodate mixed use development | 0 |
| Proposed use likely to conflict with neighbouring uses | - |

Criteria 5(e): Proximity to Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) Sites

*Sustainability implications:*

Development in close proximity to COMAH installations (i.e. within Health and Safety Executive (HSE) notification zones) would introduce additional HSE risks. The acceptability of such risks requires to be considered when determining the feasibility of development, taking account of site characteristics and the type of development/land use proposed. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Outside COMAH / HSE Notification Zone | 0 |
| Within 500m of COMAH / HSE Notification Zone | - |
| Within COMAH / HSE Notification Zone | -- |

Criteria 5(f): Proximity to Sites Designated in National Site Network3 (vulnerable to recreational pressures)

*Sustainability implications:*

Population growth arising from housing development could result in increased recreational pressure (and other types of effects), resulting in Likely Significant Effects on the qualifying interests of Designated sites in the National Site Network (NSN). This could generate adverse effects on the achievement of Conservation Objectives and/or integrity of NSN Sites. To comply with the HRA Regulations, any Likely Significant Effects must be assessed (in the absence of mitigation) and development of the site must not have an adverse effect on sites integrity or conservation objectives (taking account of mitigation) which are designated in National Site Network. This is an important

3 Including Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs)

consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from Designated NSN Site | ++- |
| Within 1km - 2km of Designated NSN Site | + |
| Within 500m - 1km of Designated NSN Site | - |
| Within 500m of Designated NSN Site | -- |

Table 2(d): SA Objective 6: Air Quality

Criteria 6(a): Proximity to Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)

*Sustainability implications:*

Proximity to AQMAs could exacerbate existing poor air quality in localised areas, with adverse health, amenity and environmental consequences. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from AQMA | ++- |
| Within 1km - 2km of AQMA | + |
| Within 1km of AQMA | - |
| Within AQMA | -- |

Criteria 6(b): Proximity to Congestion Pinch Point

*Sustainability implications:*

Proximity to congestion hotspots could further increase traffic delays, resulting in adverse air quality impacts. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from pinch point | ++- |
| 1km - 2km from pinch point | + |
| Within 500m - 1km of pinch point | - |
| Within 500m of pinch point | -- |

Criteria 6(c): Potential Operational Emissions

*Sustainability implications:*

All land use activities have the potential to generate operational phase GHG emissions, whether directly from industrial processes (employment sites) or indirectly from energy consumption (domestic, non-domestic or transport related). The emerging NPT RLDP must respond to the climate emergency, including planning to support a low carbon economy and to minimise emissions from development (in pursuit of net zero targets). Consideration of likely operational GHG emissions must therefore be taken into account in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposed operational use likely to generate non-domestic GHG emissions | - |
| No information available regarding potential operational emissions | 0 |

Table 2(d): SA Objective 7: Climate Change

Criteria 7(a): Onsite provision of Low/Zero Carbon Energy Generation

*Sustainability implications:*

National policy (PPW11 & Future Wales 2040) makes clear there is a need for additional renewable energy and low/ zero carbon energy generation capacity in order to support the transition to a low carbon economy and achieve net zero climate targets. The emerging NPT RLDP must respond to the climate emergency, including planning to support a low carbon economy and providing an appropriate policy framework for the installation of low/ zero carbon energy generation and renewable energy developments. Any options for the provision of low/ zero carbon energy generation within candidate sites must therefore be taken into account in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Candidate site form/ response indicates likely provision of Low/ Zero Carbon Energy Generation | ++- |
| No information provided by site promoter | 0 |
| Within 1km of AQMA | - |
| Within AQMA | -- |

Criteria 7(b): Proximity to Public Transport Network

*Sustainability implications:*

Lack of proximity to public transport would lock in car dependency for residents/ users (e.g. employees), resulting in traffic and GHG impacts. This is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 400m of a bus stop or passenger train | ++- |
| Within 800m of a bus stop or passenger train | + |
| 800-1200m from a bus stop or passenger train | - |
| Beyond 1200m from a bus stop or train station | -- |

Criteria 7(c): Incorporation of Climate Change Adaptation Measures

*Sustainability implications:*

Development needs to be sited and designed to adapt to/ cope with the effects of climate change. There is also a need for increased resilience within the natural environment to respond to climatic and associated environmental changes. The provision of adaptation measures as part of site allocations would therefore enhance the capacity of built and natural environments to respond to climate change. . Conversely, the absence of such measures within development sites could increase risks to life, property and livelihoods, as well as reducing ecosystem resilience. This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations.

Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposal includes Climate Change Adaptation Measures | ++- |
| Proposal doesn’t include information regarding potential Climate Change Adaptation Measures | ?- |

Table 2(d): SA Objective 8: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Soil Criteria 8(a): Proximity to National Site Network Sites (SAC/SPA) *Sustainability implications:*

Development could generate a range of pressures and environmental effects, resulting in impact pathways and the potential for Likely Significant Effects on the qualifying interests of National Site Network (NSN)Sites. This could generate adverse effects on the achievement of Conservation Objectives and/or integrity of (NSN) Sites. To comply with the HRA Regulations, any Likely Significant Effects must be assessed (in the absence of mitigation) and development of the site must not have an adverse effect on National Site Network Site (NSN) integrity or conservation objectives (taking account of mitigation). The potential for likely significant effects on a NSN Designated Site is a very important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from Designated NSN Site | ++- |
| Within 1km - 2km of Designated NSN Site |  |
| Within 500m - 1km of Designated NSN Site | - |
| Within 500m of Designated NSN Site | -- |

## Criteria 8(b): Proximity to SSI

*Sustainability implications:*

Development could generate a range of pressures and environmental effects, resulting in impact pathways and the potential for Likely Significant Effects on the qualifying interests of National Site Network (NSN)Sites. This could generate adverse effects on the achievement

of Conservation Objectives and/or integrity of (NSN) Sites. To comply with the HRA Regulations, any Likely Significant Effects must be assessed (in the absence of mitigation) and development of the site must not have an adverse effect on National Site Network Site (NSN) integrity or conservation objectives (taking account of mitigation). The potential for likely significant effects on a NSN Designated Site is a very important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from SSSI | ++- |
| Within 1km - 2km of SSSI |  |
| Within 1km of SSSI | - |
| Within SSSI | -- |

Criteria 8(c): Proximity to Ancient Woodland

*Sustainability implications:*

In the absence of mitigation (siting, design, construction and operational techniques), development in proximity to Ancient Woodland (or where Ancient Woodland is present within the site) could result in unacceptable habitat loss or deterioration. Development could also generate a range of pressures and environmental effects, resulting in indirect impact pathways and the potential for adverse effects on Ancient Woodland. In accordance with PPW11, loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats effects must be avoided unless, in wholly exceptional circumstances, evidence demonstrates that significant and clearly defined public benefits outweigh adverse impacts. Significant harm to biodiversity must also be avoided, including through adoption of the mitigation hierarchy where required. The potential for adverse impacts on Ancient Woodland is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site

allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. . These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 1km from Ancient Woodland | ++- |
| Within 500m - 1km of Ancient Woodland |  |
| Within 500m of Ancient Woodland | - |
| Site includes Ancient Woodland | -- |

## Criteria 8(d): Proximity to NNR

*Sustainability implications:*

Development could generate a range of pressures and environmental effects, resulting in impact pathways and the potential for adverse effects on the features and integrity of a NNR. PPW11 sets out a presumption against development resulting in adverse effects on the features for which a site has been designated. In accordance with this, adverse effects must be avoided unless, in exceptional circumstances, evidence demonstrates development benefits outweigh adverse impacts. The potential for adverse impacts on a NNR is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. . These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from NNR | ++- |
| Within 1km - 2km of NNR |  |
| Within 1km of NNR | - |
| Within NNR | -- |

Criteria 8(e): Proximity to RIGS4

*Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 requires planning authorities to protect the features and qualities for which Geoparks and RIGS have been designated, as well as encouraging the incorporation of geological features within the design of development, particularly where relevant evidence is provided by Green Infrastructure Assessments. Development could generate a range of direct and indirect environmental effects, resulting in impact pathways and the potential for adverse impacts on the features and qualities of a RIGS. The potential for adverse impacts on a RIGS is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. . These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

4 Regionally Important Geodiversity Site (RIGS)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 1km from RIGS | ++- |
| Within 500m - 1km of RIGS |  |
| Within 500m of RIGS | - |
| Within RIGS | -- |

Criteria 8(f): Proximity to LWS/SINC/LNR5

*Sustainability implications:*

Development could generate a range of pressures and environmental effects, resulting in impact pathways and the potential for adverse effects on the features and integrity of a LWS. PPW11 sets out a presumption against development resulting in adverse effects on the features for which a site has been designated. In accordance with this, adverse effects must be avoided unless evidence demonstrates development benefits outweigh adverse impacts. The potential for adverse impacts on a LWS is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. .These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

5 Local Wildlife Sites/ Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation/Local Nature Reserve

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 1km from LWS / SINC/ LNR | ++- |
| Within 500m - 1km of LWS / SINC/ LNR |  |
| Within 500m of LWS / SINC/ LNR | - |
| Within LWS / SINC/ LNR | -- |

Criteria 8(g): Potential Effects on Designated Sites6

*Sustainability implications:*

Development could generate a range of pressures and environmental effects, resulting in impact pathways and the potential for adverse effects on the features and integrity of a designated site. PPW11 sets out a presumption against development resulting in adverse effects on the features for which a site has been designated. In accordance with this, adverse effects must be avoided unless evidence demonstrates development benefits outweigh adverse impacts. The potential for adverse impacts on a designated site is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. . These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

6 As identified in the Designated Sites Hierarchy in Figure 12, PPW (11th Edition); Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area, Ramsar Sites UNESCO Biosphere Reserve, Site of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserve, Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, Local Nature Reserve & Local Wildlife Sites.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Potential minor adverse ecological effects on designated site | - |
| Likely significant adverse ecological effects on designated sites - mitigation required | -- |
| No information available regarding potential ecological effects | 0 |

Criteria 8(h): Presence of Important Trees, Hedgerows or Tree Protection Orders (TPOs)?

*Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 requires planning authorities to protect trees, hedgerows, groups of trees and areas of woodland where they have ecological value, contribute to the character or amenity of a particular locality, or perform a beneficial and identified green infrastructure function. In the absence of mitigation (siting, design, construction and operational techniques), development in proximity to trees/woodland or hedgerows (or where present within the site) could result in adverse biodiversity impacts including habitat loss or deterioration. Development could also generate a range of pressures and environmental effects, resulting in indirect impact pathways and the potential for adverse effects on woodland. The potential for adverse impacts on trees/woodland and hedgerows is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. . These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Site does not include TPO, Important Trees or Hedgerows | 0 |
| Site includes TPO, Important Trees or Hedgerows | -- |

Criteria 8(i): Presence of Valued Habitats and Species

*Sustainability implications:*

In accordance with statutory requirements, PPW11 requires development not to result in disturbance or harm to Protected Species or its habitat and to ensure the range and population of the species is sustained. Significant harm to biodiversity must also be avoided, including through adoption of the mitigation hierarchy where required. In the absence of mitigation (siting, design, construction and operational techniques), development in proximity to Protected Species' habitats could result in unacceptable disturbance effects or harm. Development could also generate a range of pressures and environmental effects, resulting in indirect impact pathways and the potential for adverse effects on Protected Species. The potential for adverse impacts on Protected Species and associated habitats is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. . These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposal includes onsite habitat enhancement proposals | ++- |
| Potential minor adverse effects on valued habitats and species | - |
| Likely significant adverse ecological effects on valued habitats and species | -- |
| No information available regarding potential ecological effects | ? |

Criteria 8(j): Standardised Ecological Summary (incorporating NRW Scoring & other information)

*Sustainability implications:*

Development could generate a range of pressures and environmental effects, resulting in impact pathways and the potential for adverse effects on the features and integrity of a designated site. PPW11 sets out a presumption against development resulting in adverse effects on the features for which a site has been designated. In accordance with this, adverse effects must be avoided unless evidence demonstrates development benefits outweigh adverse impacts. The potential for adverse impacts on a designated site is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proximity to ecological designations: no other constraints found | ++- |
| No known ecological constraints |  |
| Proximity to ecological designations: species assumed present | - |
| No known ecological designations: species assumed present | -- |

## Criteria 8(k): Agricultural Land Classification (ALC)

*Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 requires the best and most versatile agricultural land to be conserved as a finite resource for the future. The loss of such land (including degradation of high-quality soils for agriculture) could result in both reduced agricultural capacity and degraded ecosystem services. PPW11 requires RLDP site selection to afford considerable weight to protecting such land from development, because of its special importance. This means it is necessary for candidate sites involving the loss of ALC 1-3 land to demonstrate an overriding need for development, including taking account of other candidate sites and their environmental sensitivities.

The ALC V2 dataset (Dec 2019) will be used pending any future dataset updates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| ALC Class 5 | ++- |
| ALC Class 4 |  |
| ALC Class 2 or 3 | - |
| ALC Class 1 | -- |
| No ALC Classification |  |

Table 2(d): SA Objective 9: Water and Flood Risk Criteria 9(a): Proximity to Flood Risk Zones *Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 and TAN15 require that development reduce, and must not increase, flood risk arising from river and/or coastal flooding. Highly vulnerable development (HVD) in high-risk areas is not compliant with the requirements of TAN15.Any flooding consequences associated with highly vulnerable development are not considered to be acceptable. Plan allocations must not be made for such development and planning applications not proposed. Further TAN15 policy tests are required to be met for HVD in both the Defended Zone and Zone 2, while Less Vulnerable Development proposals are required to meet further TAN 15 policy tests for the Defended Zone, Zone 2 and Zone 3. Water Compatible Development is compliant with TAN15 in all circumstances.

These are a very important considerations which must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability, viability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. The full definitions of Highly Vulnerable, Less Vulnerable and Water Compatible are provided within TAN15.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highly Vulnerable Development** | **Symbol** |
| Within Zone 1 | ++ |
| Within Defended Zone | ? |
| Within Zone 2 | ?? |
| Within Zone 3 | -- |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Less Vulnerable Development** | **Symbol** |
| Within Zone 1 | ++ |
| Within Defended Zone | ? |
| Within Zone 2 | ?? |
| Within Zone 3 | - |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Water Compatible** | **Symbol** |
| Within Zone 1 | ++ |
| Within Defended Zone | ++ |
| Within Zone 2 | ++ |
| Within Zone 3 | ++ |

Criteria 9(b): Proximity to Main Rivers and Lakes

*Sustainability implications:*

Proximity to the water environment could result in direct or indirect impacts (during construction or operation) on water quality and water environment features. Having regard to statutory requirements including those arising from the Water Framework Directive, this must be

taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from Main River or Main Lake | ++- |
| Within 1 - 2km of Main River of Main Lake |  |
| Within 500m - 1km of Main River or Main Lake | - |
| Within 500m of Main River or Main Lake | -- |

Criteria 9(c): Utilities Capacity (Power, Water Supply and Drainage)

*Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 requires planning authorities to protect water features, foster sustainable water management and consider the adequacy of utilities infrastructure when allocating development sites and making planning decisions. Development could exacerbate existing localised infrastructure constraints (potentially leading to adverse environmental effects including flooding) or require the installation of new/upgraded infrastructure where utilities networks are not already present or are insufficient to accommodate additional development of the scale proposed. In accordance with PPW11, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations following discussions with utilities infrastructure providers. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Surplus water utilities capacity available to service development and no mitigation required | ++- |
| Development likely to require only minor mitigation - e.g., local pipe diversion/connection |  |
| Development would create a capacity shortfall - major mitigation required (e.g., treatment works) | - |
| Existing capacity shortfall which development would exacerbate | -- |

Table 2(d): SA Objective 10: Materials and Waste Criteria 10(a): Proximity to Community Recycling Centres *Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to waste management facilities is not a fundamental constraint, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 1km of NPTC community recycling centre | ++- |
| Within 1 - 2km of NPTC community recycling centre |  |
| Within 2 - 5km of NPTC community recycling centre | - |
| Beyond 5km of NPTC community recycling centre | -- |

Criteria 10(b): Locational Need tor Minerals Extraction

*Sustainability implications:*

Adequate minerals extraction is needed to support construction activity, with extraction closer to end uses resulting in less transport related environmental impacts. However, the working of mineral resources, as a finite resource, without clear evidence of a need for additional extraction, could unnecessarily deplete available resources and result in local adverse environmental impacts (noise, vibration, dust, traffic, etc). This must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate mineral extraction site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of extraction proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Robust locational need for minerals extraction identified | ++- |
| No locational need identified | ? |
| No minerals extraction proposed | 0 |

Table 2(d): SA Objective 11: Sustainable Placemaking Criteria 11(a): Previously Developed Land or Greenfield Land *Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 requires planning authorities to prioritise the use of suitable and sustainable previously developed land and/or underutilised sites for all types of development. This includes considering previously developed land and/or underutilised sites located within existing settlements first, before edge of settlement sites and then Greenfield land (as required to meet identified development needs). The approach recognises both the sustainability benefits of regenerating brownfield land (reduced environmental harm, improved sustainable transport, etc) and the range of adverse environmental effects likely to result from encroachment onto Greenfield land.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Previously Developed Land | ++- |
| Greenfield Land | -- |

Criteria 11(b): Proximity to Existing Active Travel Network

*Sustainability implications:*

Whilst lack of proximity to active travel routes is not a fundamental constraint, this must be taken account of in evaluating the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Within 400m of existing route | ++- |
| Within 800m of existing route |  |
| 800-1200m of existing route | - |
| Beyond 1200m from existing route | -- |

Table 2(d): SA Objective 12: Cultural Heritage (incl. Welsh Language) Criteria 12(a): **Proximity to Scheduled Monuments**

*Sustainability implications:*

In accordance with statutory requirements, PPW11 requires development not to result in direct adverse effects on Scheduled Monuments, unless there are exceptional circumstances. Any predicted indirect or setting effects must also be balanced against the need for development, with any suitable mitigation applied. In the absence of mitigation (siting, design, construction techniques), development in proximity to a Scheduled Monument could result in unacceptable effects on its understanding, appreciation or cultural value. The potential for adverse impacts on Scheduled Monuments is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from Scheduled Monument | ++- |
| Within 1km - 2km of Scheduled Monument |  |
| Within 1km of Scheduled Monument | - |
| Site includes Scheduled Monument | -- |

Criteria 12(b): **Proximity to Scheduled Monuments**

*Sustainability implications:*

In line with statutory requirements, PPW11 set out a general presumption in favour of the preservation or enhancement of a listed building and its setting, which might extend beyond its curtilage. In the absence of mitigation (siting, design, construction techniques), development of or in proximity to a Listed Building could result in unacceptable effects on its understanding, appreciation or architectural value, as well as resulting in wider landscape and visual effects. The potential for adverse impacts on Listed Buildings is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from Listed Building | ++- |
| Within 1km - 2km of Listed Building |  |
| Within 1km of Listed Building | - |
| Site includes Listed Building | -- |

Criteria 12(c): Impacts on Important Archaeological Sites

*Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 sets out a presumption in favour of the physical protection in situ of nationally important archaeological remains unless there are exceptional circumstances. Any direct, indirect or setting effects on archaeological areas must also be balanced against the need for development, with any suitable mitigation applied. In the absence of mitigation (siting, design, construction techniques), development in proximity to an Important Archaeological Area could result in unacceptable effects on its understanding, appreciation or heritage value. The

potential for adverse impacts on an Important Archaeological Area is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| No likely impact on Important Archaeological Site | 0 |
| Likely minor adverse impact on Important Archaeological Site | - |
| Likely major adverse impact on Important Archaeological Site | -- |

Criteria 12(d): Effect on Designated Sites

*Sustainability implications:*

In accordance with statutory requirements, PPW11 sets out multiple requirements for development to avoid direct adverse effects on nationally important historic assets7 and for the need for any development resulting in adverse effects on the historic environment to be robustly justified. In the absence of mitigation (siting, design, construction techniques), development in proximity to a designated heritage asset could result in unacceptable effects on its understanding, appreciation or heritage value. The potential for adverse impacts on designated heritage assets is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

7 For initial reporting on designated historic assets, please cross refer to NPT ISA RLDP Scoping Report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Potential minor adverse effects on designated site | - |
| Likely significant adverse effects on designated sites - mitigation required | -- |
| No information available regarding potential effects | ? |

Criteria 12(e): Re-Use of Historic or Culturally Important Buildings

*Sustainability implications:*

The reuse of historic or culturally important buildings recognises both the contribution of historic assets to a high-quality built environment and the sustainability benefits maximising the use of existing material assets. Development involving the loss of historic or culturally important buildings (where retention and potential restoration is possible) could result in unacceptable effects on the understanding, appreciation or value of the historic environment. The potential for the reuse of historic or culturally important buildings, or adverse effects on their setting or fabric, are important considerations in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations.

Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposed re-use of Historic or Culturally Important Buildings | ++- |
| Proposal includes demolition of Historic or Culturally Important Buildings | -- |
| No information available regarding use or demolition of Historic or Culturally Important Buildings | ? |

Criteria 12(f): Effect on Welsh Language

*Sustainability implications:*

The protection and increased use of the Welsh Language supports social and cultural wellbeing. The need to protect and increase the use of the Welsh Language is enshrined in legislation and Future Wales 2040 & PPW11 requires development planning to take into account the conditions necessary for the Welsh Language to thrive (and for its use not to diminish). Development resulting in demographic changes, economic development or educational changes could all directly or indirectly affect the use of the Welsh Language in existing and new communities. There is also an opportunity for developments to be sited and designed in ways which promote use of the Welsh Language, including by incorporating linguistic considerations into placemaking approaches. This is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposal would add 100 or greater residential units/ Proposal for employment uses over 1000 sq.m in Welsh Language Sensitive Area8 | -- |
| Proposal for less than 100 residential units/ Proposal for employment uses under 1000 sq.m in Welsh Language Sensitive Area. | 0 |

8 NPT LDP has the following Welsh Language Sensitive Areas 1) Amman Valley 2) Swansea Valley, 3) Pontardawe and 4) Community of Crynant in the Dulais Valley. These may be subject to alteration to be defined by the Council at any point.

Table 2(d): SA Objective 13: Proximity to SLA9 or Heritage Coast Criteria 13(a): Proximity to SLA10 or Heritage Coast *Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 defines SLAs as local areas of high landscape importance, which may be unique, exceptional or distinctive to the area, and advises that particular landscapes of the coastline should be recognised and protected where they represent significant characteristics of place. To protect and enhance both high quality landscapes and local distinctiveness, the features and qualities of SLA and Heritage Coasts should therefore be protected from significant adverse effects which undermine their integrity. This is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from SLA or Heritage Coast | ++- |
| Within 1km - 2km of SLA or Heritage Coast |  |
| Within 1km of SLA or Heritage Coast | - |
| Site within SLA or Heritage Coast | -- |

9 Special Landscape Areas

10 Special Landscape Areas

Criteria 13(b): Proximity to Brecon Beacons National Park Boundary/ Dark Skies Area

*Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 defines SLAs as local areas of high landscape importance, which may be unique, exceptional or distinctive to the area, and advises that particular landscapes of the coastline should be recognised and protected where they represent significant characteristics of place. To protect and enhance both high quality landscapes and local distinctiveness, the features and qualities of SLA and Heritage Coasts should therefore be protected from significant adverse effects which undermine their integrity. This is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Beyond 2km from National Park Boundary/ Dark Skies area | ++- |
| Within 1km-2km of Brecon Beacons National Park Boundary/ Dark Skies area |  |
| Within 1km of National Park Boundary/ Dark Skies area | -- |

Criteria 13(c): Visual Amenity Impacts

*Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 defines SLAs as local areas of high landscape importance, which may be unique, exceptional or distinctive to the area, and advises that particular landscapes of the coastline should be recognised and protected where they represent significant characteristics of place. To protect and enhance both high quality landscapes and local distinctiveness, the features and qualities of SLA and Heritage Coasts should therefore be protected from significant adverse effects which undermine their integrity. This is an important consideration in determining the

overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| No evidence of potential adverse visual amenity impact | 0 |
| Evidence of potential minor adverse visual amenity impact |  |
| Evidence of potential major adverse visual amenity impact | -- |

Criteria 13(d): Individual Site Integration/ Coalescence/ Separation Impact

*Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 defines SLAs as local areas of high landscape importance, which may be unique, exceptional or distinctive to the area, and advises that particular landscapes of the coastline should be recognised and protected where they represent significant characteristics of place. To protect and enhance both high quality landscapes and local distinctiveness, the features and qualities of SLA and Heritage Coasts should therefore be protected from significant adverse effects which undermine their integrity. This is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| Proposal would integrate strongly with existing settlement structure | ++- |
| Proposal likely to integrate with existing settlement structure |  |
| Proposal detached from existing settlements or likely to result in coalescence (minor impact) | - |
| Proposal detached from existing settlements or likely to result in coalescence (major impact) | -- |

Criteria 13(e): Spatial Development Effect (incl. cumulative impact)

*Sustainability implications:*

PPW11 defines SLAs as local areas of high landscape importance, which may be unique, exceptional or distinctive to the area, and advises that particular landscapes of the coastline should be recognised and protected where they represent significant characteristics of place. To protect and enhance both high quality landscapes and local distinctiveness, the features and qualities of SLA and Heritage Coasts should therefore be protected from significant adverse effects which undermine their integrity. This is an important consideration in determining the overall sustainability and thus suitability of candidate site allocations. Any sustainability impacts would also depend on the scale of development proposed. These will be considered in the later stages of the process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Symbol** |
| No Change from individual site integration score | Same scoring as Individual Site Integration/Coalescence/separation Impact - |
| Allocation of site will have a cumulative impact | Relevant Comment/scoring |