



Cyngor Castell-nedd Port Talbot  
Neath Port Talbot Council

# Replacement Local Development Plan 2021 - 2036

**Candidate Sites Assessment  
Methodology**  
(January 2022)



## Introduction

<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>6</b>
1.1 Context .....	6
1.2 Candidate Sites and the RLDP Process .....	6
1.3 Document Structure .....	6

## Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

<b>2 Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology</b> .....	<b>10</b>
2.1 Methodology Overview .....	10
2.2 Step 1: Call for Candidate Sites .....	11
2.3 Step 2: Preparation of Candidate Sites Register .....	14
2.4 Step 3: Candidate Sites Register .....	15
2.5 Step 4: Informal Community Feedback on Candidate Sites Register .....	15
2.6 Step 5: Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Assessment .....	15
2.7 Step 6: Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment Additional Information Request .....	17
2.8 Step 7: Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment .....	18
2.9 Step 8: Preferred Strategy Consultation .....	21
2.10 Step 9: Post Preferred Strategy Consultation .....	21
2.11 Step 10: Deposit Plan Consultation .....	21
2.12 Step 11: Post Deposit Plan Consultation .....	22

## Guidance Notes

<b>3 Introduction</b> .....	<b>24</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	24
<b>4 Key Dates and Important Considerations before Submission</b> .....	<b>25</b>
4.1 Key Dates .....	25
4.2 When Can Sites Be Submitted? .....	26

# Contents

4.3	What Uses Can Sites Be Submitted For? .....	26
4.4	How Can Sites Be Submitted? .....	27
4.5	Important Considerations Before Submission .....	27
4.6	Candidate Sites Publicity .....	28
<b>5</b>	<b>Information Required For Submission .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Completing the Candidate Site Form .....</b>	<b>31</b>
6.1	Section A: Contact Details .....	31
6.2	Section B: Site Location .....	31
6.3	Section C: Existing Use .....	32
6.4	Section D: Proposed Use .....	34
6.5	Section E: Planning History .....	39
6.6	Section F: Fundamental Constraints .....	39
6.7	Section G: Deliverability .....	40
6.8	Section H: Viability .....	43
<b>7</b>	<b>Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites .....</b>	<b>47</b>
7.1	Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Assessment .....	47
7.2	Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment .....	50

## Appendices

<b>A</b>	<b>Integrated Sustainability Appraisal .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Site Suitability .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Infrastructure Providers .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Candidate Sites Submission Form .....</b>	<b>65</b>
D.1	Introduction .....	65
D.2	Section A: Contact Details .....	65
D.3	Section B: Site Location .....	66
D.4	Section C: Existing Use .....	66
D.5	Section D: Proposed Use .....	67
D.6	Section E: Planning History .....	68

D.7	Section F: Fundamental Constraints .....	69
D.8	Section G: Deliverability .....	69

# Contents

## Introduction

# 1 . Introduction

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Context

**1.1.1** Neath Port Talbot Council (NPTC) adopted its Local Development Plan (LDP) in January 2016. The Plan provides a clear vision for the County Borough setting out where, when and how much new development will take place over the plan period (2011-2026).

**1.1.2** In accordance with Section 69 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulation 41 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development Plan) Regulations 2005 as amended in 2015, in January 2020, given that four years had passed since the adoption of the LDP, NPTC commenced a review of its LDP. Following public consultation January-March 2020, the LDP Review Report<sup>(1)</sup> was approved for publication in July 2020.

**1.1.3** Following approval of the Delivery Agreement (DA) for the Replacement LDP (RLDP) by Council in December 2021, and subsequent agreement by Welsh Government (WG) in January 2022, the Council has started to prepare its RLDP.

**1.1.4** As part of the preparation of the RLDP, the Council will re-consider all aspects of the current LDP, including all current policies and site-specific allocations. The RLDP will set out where, when and how much growth will take place over the next 15 years (2021-2036).

### 1.2 Candidate Sites and the RLDP Process

**1.2.1** As set out in the DA, one of the key stages in the preparation of the RLDP, is the submission and consideration of Candidate Sites for site specific allocations, for a range of development types. The key principle of the Candidate Sites assessment process is to gather suitable evidence from site promoters to robustly demonstrate the suitability, deliverability and financial viability of sites for inclusion in the RLDP.

**1.2.2** The 'Call for Candidate Sites' is the first formal stage in the preparatory stages of the RLDP following agreement and publication of the DA. As part of the Call, site promoters are able to submit sites to be considered for inclusion in the RLDP.

**1.2.3** Sites will then be assessed, and a determination made as to whether each site is suitable, deliverable and financially viable.

### 1.3 Document Structure

**1.3.1** This document sets out:

- Part 1: Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology
- Part 2: Candidate Site Submission Guidance

---

1 Available at: <https://www.npt.gov.uk/media/13823/ldp-review-report-july-2020.pdf?v=20200709084011>

**1.3.2** The document has been prepared to ensure compliance with legislative requirements, national planning policy<sup>(2)</sup> and national guidance<sup>(3)</sup> as appropriate. It will ensure that the identification of suitable sites for allocation is founded on a robust, transparent and credible assessment of land submitted.

- 
- 2 As contained within Future Wales: The National Plan 2040 (available at: <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2021-02/future-wales-the-national-plan-2040.pdf>) and Planning Policy Wales (PPW) (Edition 11, 2021) (available at: [https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2021-02/planning-policy-wales-edition-11\\_0.pdf](https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2021-02/planning-policy-wales-edition-11_0.pdf)).
  - 3 As set out in the Development Plans Manual (DPM) (Edition 3, 2020) (available at: <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2020-03/development-plans-manual-edition-3-march-2020.pdf>)

# 1 . Introduction

# Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

### 2 Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

#### 2.1 Methodology Overview

**2.1.1** The diagram below provides an overview of the Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology and anticipated timeframes for each step.

**Table 2.1.1 Candidate Sites Overview**

Step 1: Call for Candidate Sites	March - May 2022
Step 2: Preparation of Candidate Sites Register	March - June 2022
Step 3: Publication of Candidate Sites Register	June 2022
Step 4: Informal Community Feedback on Candidate Sites Register	June - August 2022
Step 5: Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Assessment	July 2022
Step 6: Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment Additional Information Request	August 2022
Step 7: Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment	September - October 2022
Step 8: Preferred Strategy Consultation	March - April 2023
Step 9: Post Preferred Strategy Consultation Review of Information Submitted	May - June 2023
Step 10: Deposit Plan Consultation	March - April 2024
Step 11: Post Deposit Plan Consultation	May - August 2024

**2.1.2** In accordance with national guidance (DPM (Edition 3, 2020, Paragraph 3.65)), the Council will undertake a two stage assessment process:

- Staged 1: Initial Candidate Sites Assessment
- Staged 2: Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment

**2.1.3** To be as effective as possible, the Candidate Sites Assessment will incorporate the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA) for Candidate Sites to avoid assessment duplication. A refined set of sustainability indicators and a transparent scoring system has been included within Appendix A to allow prospective site promoters to consider the likely performance of their candidate site against the assessment criteria.

**2.1.4** In addition to these sustainability indicators, a number of other site suitability criteria will need to be taken into consideration in site selection. These are provided within Appendix B.

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

### 2.2 Step 1: Call for Candidate Sites

**The Call for Candidate Sites is the appropriate time to submit sites for potential inclusion in the Plan.**

**2.2.1** The Call for Candidate Sites is the first formal stage in the preparatory stages of the RLDP following the agreement and publication of the DA.

**2.2.2** Through the Call for Candidate Sites, the Council will invite developers, landowners, site promoters, public bodies, service providers and others with an interest in land to submit sites which they wish to be considered as a potential allocation for either development or protection.

**2.2.3** Sites can be submitted for a variety of uses including, but not limited to:

- Housing;
- Employment;
- Community facilities;
- Tourism;
- Green Infrastructure;
- Waste;
- Education;
- Social care;
- Gypsy and travellers pitch provision;
- Retail;
- Recreation;
- Renewable Energy;
- Biodiversity;
- Transport infrastructure;
- Minerals; and
- Protection

**2.2.4** As part of the Call for Candidate Sites, each site promoter will be required to submit a Candidate Sites Submission Form which should be completed as fully and accurately as possible.

**Please note that failure to submit a suitably completed Candidate Sites Submission Form will result in the Candidate Site not being registered.**

**2.2.5** Residential and employment-led sites will also be required to submit a high-level viability appraisal using the Mid and South West Wales Development Viability Model, for which there are the following fees:

- Sites 1 to 9 residential units: £195

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

- Sites 10-50 residential units: £345
- Sites 51-100 residential units: £495
- Sites 100 or more residential units: £ to be agreed with Council depending on size and complexity of the proposal, but no less than £495
- Employment: £ to be agreed with the Council depending on size and complexity of the proposal.

**2.2.6** The Council will charge £50 for an initial copy of the model to enable the submission of the high-level viability appraisal at the Call for Candidate Sites stage. The remainder of the fee will be required prior to the Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment for successfully filtered sites (see Steps 6 and 7 below). Site promoters will be required to contact the Council prior to the submission of their sites to obtain a copy of the site-specific Development Viability Model by email (LDP@npt.gov.uk) or phone (01639 686 821).

**2.2.7** The high-level viability appraisal will be required to be accompanied by a high-level viability statement providing information and evidence regarding assumptions made. Viability information submitted as part of the Call for Candidate Sites will be used to help inform the Council's High-Level Viability Assessment.

**2.2.8** Please note that following discussions with the Council's Legal Team and the development industry, in accordance with national planning guidance (DPM, Edition 3, 2020, Paragraph 5.95), the Council will apply an 'open book' approach to viability information submitted to ensure transparency of evidence.

**2.2.9** Information submitted during the Call for Candidate Sites will not be made publicly available and instead will be used to inform assumptions as part of the high level viability work. This information may however need to be made publicly available should the Council receive a request via the Environmental Information Regulations or Freedom of Information Act. Should the Council receive such a request, the Council will discuss the request with the developer.

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

**2.2.10** To enable the completion of the high-level viability appraisal, in accordance with national guidance (DPM (Edition 3, 2020, Paragraph 3.50)), the Council has prepared Viability Guidance Notes which are available on the Council's website: <https://www.npt.gov.uk/29464>.

**Please note:**

- **Failure to provide a viability appraisal for residential and employment-led sites will result in the site being considered unviable and therefore not progress any further in the Candidate Sites assessment process.**
- **The Council will only accept viability appraisals submitted using the Mid and South West Wales Development Viability Model.**
- **Each copy of the Development Viability Model is site-specific.**
- **A detailed viability report will not be provided for site promoters.**
- **The fees do not allow for either completion of the model by Council Officers or engagement between Council officers and site promoters with regards to assumptions/ completion of the model etc. Detailed guidance notes, user guide and videos will be provided to aid completion of the model.**

**2.2.11** Any other relevant studies, reports and information to support the Candidate Sites submission should also be provided. This should be proportionate to the nature and scale of the development proposed.

**2.2.12** The information submitted will help to enable the Council to assess whether:

- The site is in a **sustainable** location and it can be freed from all fundamental constraints
- The site is capable of being **delivered**
- The site is **viable**

**2.2.13** Information on how sites can be submitted, timeframes for submission and further guidance on how to complete the Candidate Sites Submission Form is provided within the Guidance Section of this document.

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

**2.2.14** To assist in the submission of Candidate Sites, the Council has provided an interactive constraints map on its website (<https://www.npt.gov.uk/29464>). Cadw's Archwilio Historic Environment Records of Wales Map can also be used to check whether there are any sites of historic interest within the proposed candidate site boundary ([https://www.archwilio.org.uk/her/chi1/arch.html?county=Neath Port Talbot&lang=eng](https://www.archwilio.org.uk/her/chi1/arch.html?county=Neath%20Port%20Talbot&lang=eng)).

Candidate Site Submissions should be submitted to the Council's Planning Policy Team using the Candidate Sites Submission Form:

- Online: via the Council's Consultation portal: <https://neath-porttalbot-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/>
- By email to: [LDP@npt.gov.uk](mailto:LDP@npt.gov.uk)
- By post to: Mr Ceri Morris, Head of Planning and Public Protection, Neath Port Talbot Council, The Quays, Brunel Way, Baglan Energy Park, Neath. SA11 2GG.

### 2.3 Step 2: Preparation of Candidate Sites Register

**2.3.1** Following the submission of sites and closure of the Call for Candidate Sites, the Council will prepare a Candidate Sites Register. The Candidate Sites Register will record all sites submitted with the following information:

- Spatial area
- Ward
- Candidate site number (for example, RLDP/AMV/0001)
- Candidate site name
- Site area (ha)
- Current use (existing use, greenfield/ brownfield)
- Proposed use
- Site promoter
- OS map detailing site boundary

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

### 2.4 Step 3: Candidate Sites Register

**2.4.1** The Council will then publish the Candidate Sites Register on the Council's website<sup>(4)</sup> and make available at the Deposit Venues<sup>(5)</sup>.

**Please note that the inclusion of a site on the Candidate Sites Register does not imply a commitment to its suitability for inclusion within the plan.**

### 2.5 Step 4: Informal Community Feedback on Candidate Sites Register

**2.5.1** Following publication of the Candidate Sites Register, the Council will undertake a 9 week period of informal consultation on the Candidate Sites Register. During this period, the general public, Council Members and stakeholders will be able to provide comments about the sites on the Candidate Sites Register. The Council will also hold informal drop-in sessions for ward Members to discuss sites within their wards. Comments received will be treated informally and will not be responded to<sup>(6)</sup>. Comments received will be used to inform the Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment and discussions with statutory consultees / key stakeholders.

### 2.6 Step 5: Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Assessment

**2.6.1** The Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Assessment will include the following three stage desk-based assessment of all submitted sites.

**Table 2.6.1 Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Stage 1 Assessment Filter**

Site Size Filter
Fundamental Constraints Filter
Deliverability Filter

#### Site Size Filter

4 <https://www.npt.gov.uk/ldp>

5 Neath Civic Centre, Neath, SA11 3QZ; Port Talbot Civic Centre, Port Talbot, SA13 1PJ; and The Quays, Brunel Way, Baglan Energy Park, Neath, SA11 2GG

6 During the Preferred Strategy Consultation, the Council will invite formal comments on the Candidate Sites Register.

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

**2.6.2** Residential sites will initially be filtered according to whether they meet the site size threshold of 10 units<sup>(7)</sup> Sites below this threshold may not be allocated for development; they will however still be included on the Candidate Sites Register and will be used to inform the windfall analysis, urban capacity assessment and settlement boundary review.

**2.6.3** Sites submitted for other uses will not be filtered according to their size. Instead, the Council will use its discretion as to whether allocation is appropriate. The approach taken will be clearly detailed in the Candidate Sites Register.

### Fundamental Constraints Filter

**2.6.4** GIS software will then be used to filter sites according to whether they have any of the following fundamental constraints:

- Site overlaps with or is within:
  - Ramsar; and/or
  - Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and/or
  - Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); and/or
  - National Nature Reserve (NNR); and/or
  - Class 1 Agricultural Land Classification (ALC); and/or
  - Scheduled Monument (SM); and/or
  - Historic Park and Gardens; and/or
  - Development proposed by the private sector on common land <sup>(8)</sup>; and/or
  - The site proposes highly vulnerable development (TAN15 (December 2021)) within Flood Zone 3<sup>(9)</sup>.

**2.6.5** If the constraint forms part of the site boundary, further consideration will be given as to whether the impact of the development could be mitigated.

### Deliverability Filter

**2.6.6** Sites will then be filtered according to their deliverability.

**2.6.7** Consideration will be given to whether:

- The site is being promoted for development in its entirety;

---

7 This is in line with the threshold in the current LDP; previously agreed thresholds as part of the JHLAS work; and is reflective of planning permissions granted since the beginning of the Plan period.

8 In the absence of further deliverability information, the proposal is likely to not be viable. Sites promoted by NPTC on common land will not be excluded on this basis, as their public ownership provides a delivery mechanism.

9 For the purposes of Candidate Site submissions, the Council will use TAN15 (December 2021) and Flood Map for Planning in accordance with the approach detailed in the Letter from Welsh Government dated 15 December 2021.

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

- The site being promoted for development is in more than one landownership, and whether all of the landowners are promoting the site for the type and scale of development envisaged;
- The site is being promoted by the current landowner(s)/ on their behalf. Or whether the site promoter/their client has an option agreement or equivalent to purchase the site from the landowner(s);
- There are any constraints to development such as ransom strips or covenants that are not in the process of being resolved/ removed;
- The site will be brought forward for development within the Plan period;
- Viability information has been provided to accompany the Candidate Site submission<sup>(10)</sup>; and
- If the site is in public ownership, it has been identified in a published disposal strategy and/or through Council resolution if the land is to be retained/ sold by the Council.

**2.6.8** National guidance (DPM (Edition 3, 2020, Table 18) is clear that existing LDP allocations should not automatically be 'rolled forward' into RLDPs. In line with national guidance, there will need to be a substantial change in circumstances to demonstrate that sites can be delivered and justified before being included in the RLDP. Existing allocation sites will need to be re-submitted and re-appraised as part of this Candidate Sites assessment process; demonstrate that they are sustainable and compatible with the preferred strategy (when formulated); and provide clear evidence that they are deliverable, including information with regards to what has changed since the previous allocation/ how previous constraints to delivery have been overcome. If the site has been previously allocated in the existing NPT LDP, as part of this deliverability filter, consideration will be given to whether:

- The site promoter has provided a clear explanation of why the site has not been brought forward for development to date and justification of how and when this will be overcome going forward (including detailed viability information where required); and
- Evidence has been provided to demonstrate that there is a clear commitment to bring the site forward within the Plan period, including where relevant, identified/ committed funding streams.

**2.6.9** A summary of the findings will be reported in the Candidate Sites Register published as part of the Preferred Strategy consultation.

### 2.7 Step 6: Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment Additional Information Request

#### Viability Appraisal

**2.7.1** Prior to the Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment, the Council will contact site promoters of filtered employment and residential-led sites and ask them to pay the remaining viability appraisal fee and submit a detailed viability assessment (viability appraisal plus statement providing evidence to justify assumptions).

---

10 Residential and employment-led sites only.

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

**2.7.2** The detailed viability assessment will need to include the high-level assumptions that the Council will provide following receipt of the remaining fee. Failure to either provide a detailed viability assessment or take into consideration the assumptions will result in the site being considered unviable and undeliverable and will result in the site being filtered out of the Stage 2 Assessment.

**2.7.3** Please note that the fee does not include any allowances for discussion between the Council Officers and site promoters. Whilst a high-level review of the appropriateness of the information submitted will be undertaken by the Council, this will only be made available as part of the viability evidence at the Preferred Strategy consultation. Neither this nor a detailed viability report will be provided to the site promoter.

**2.7.4** As stated in Paragraph 2.2.8 above, please note that following discussions with the Council's Legal Team and the development industry, in accordance with national planning guidance (DPM, Edition 3, 2020, Paragraph 5.95), the Council will apply an 'open book' approach to ensure transparency of evidence.

**2.7.5** Information submitted during this detailed request will be made publicly available on the Council's website as part of our viability evidence base. This will include the detailed viability appraisals submitted using the DVM given that these should use the high level viability assumptions provided or other site-specific assumptions.

**2.7.6** Please note that any information the Council receives may need to be made publicly available should the Council receive a request via the Environmental Information Regulations or Freedom of Information Act. Should the Council receive such a request, the Council will discuss the request with the developer.

**Please note that the Council will not accept detailed viability appraisals submitted using other viability models and that failure to provide a detailed viability appraisal will result in the site being filtered out of the Stage 2 Assessment.**

### ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment

**2.7.7** Depending on the level of information provided during the Call for Candidate Sites, the Council may contact site promoters and ask them to submit more information to enable the completion of the ISA and Candidate Sites Suitability Assessment. This will be considered on a site-by-site basis.

**2.7.8** Please note that failure to provide sufficiently detailed information will result in the site not being considered any further in the assessment process.

### 2.8 Step 7: Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment

**2.8.1** A Stage 2 Candidate Sites Assessment will be undertaken of all filtered sites. The Stage 2 Candidate Sites Assessment will involve:

- Viability appraisal;

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

- ISA assessment (qualitative and quantitative) and Candidate Site Suitability assessment; and
- Engagement with infrastructure providers.

### Viability Appraisal

**2.8.2** The Council will review the information submitted and initially complete a high-level review of the appropriateness of the information submitted, using the agreed regional Candidate Site Financial Viability Appraisal High-Level Review. The Council will then appraise sites according to the following framework:

**Table 2.8.1 Viability Appraisal Filter**

Has a detailed viability appraisal been submitted using the Mid and South West Wales Development Viability Model?	Yes/ No
Does the viability appraisal submitted show the type and scale of development proposed to be financially viable?	Yes/ No
Does the viability appraisal submitted use the assumptions the Council has provided (for example with regards to affordable housing/ infrastructure/ other policy costs)?  If not, is evidence provided to justify why different assumptions have been used? and does the Council consider that the viability appraisal, including assumptions, submitted is appropriate?	Yes/ No
If the site is financially viable, has the site promoter confirmed that there is sufficient uplift for the landowner to release their site for development?	Yes/ No
If the site is financially viable, has the site promoter confirmed that there is sufficient value/ return on the development to provide an adequate profit margin for the developer?  If there is no developer interest in the site to date, it will automatically be assumed that there is.	Yes/ No
If the site is not financially viable, does the site promoter/ landowner have access to any funding mechanisms that would make the site financially viable (for example, Registered Social Landlords and Social Housing Grant)?	Yes/ No
Is the Council satisfied that the site is viable?	Yes/ No

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

### ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment

**2.8.3** The Council will then undertake detailed ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment of all filtered sites.

**2.8.4** See Appendices A and B for more information, including detailed site assessment criteria.

### Engagement with Infrastructure Providers

**2.8.5** The Council will engage with the infrastructure providers provided within Appendix C to identify infrastructure constraints.

**2.8.6** Following engagement with infrastructure providers, the Council may request further information from site promoters. This will be site-specific and may include discussions regarding mitigation methods and further viability work.

**2.8.7** Following the ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment and engagement with infrastructure providers, the Council will complete the following table for each site.

**Table 2.8.2 ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment and Infrastructure Providers Engagement Filters**

Has a detailed ISA been undertaken?	Yes/ No
Has the site been appraised against the Candidate Site Suitability Assessment criteria and is it considered to be suitable for development?	Yes/ No
Does the site contribute towards achieving the overall objectives of the Plan?  i.e. Does the site have a positive impact in the context of its environment in relation to the objectives of the ISA?	Yes/ No
Have any infrastructure constraints been identified?	Yes/ No
If infrastructure constraints have been identified, have mitigation measures been proposed which are acceptable, achievable and do not impact on the overall viability of the site and has this been confirmed by the site promoter?	Yes/ No
Is the Council satisfied that the site is not contrary to the ISA and objectives of the Plan and that any infrastructure constraints can be viably mitigated?	Yes/ No

**2.8.8** A summary of the findings will be reported in the Candidate Sites Register published as part of the Preferred Strategy consultation.

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

### 2.9 Step 8: Preferred Strategy Consultation

**2.9.1** As part of the Preferred Strategy consultation, the public and stakeholders will have the opportunity to:

- Comment on any policies and sites proposed at this stage;
- Indicate which of the Tests of Soundness they consider the plan fails;
- Submit representations requesting an amendment of any proposed allocation boundaries;
- Propose the deletion or addition of sites; and
- Comment on the updated Candidate Sites Register and Initial ISA and Candidate Site Assessment Suitability Report.

**2.9.2** Sites promoted through the Preferred Strategy consultation will be required to undertake a Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Assessment and Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment and align with the Preferred Strategy (see Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites chapter for more information).

### 2.10 Step 9: Post Preferred Strategy Consultation

**2.10.1** Following the Preferred Strategy consultation, the Council will:

- Consider representations received (including those promoting new sites and those commenting on the Tests of Soundness);
- Review Stage 1 and Stage 2 assessments of newly submitted sites and sites for which additional information has been received;
- Update and re-publish the Candidate Sites Register to detail additional sites submitted and additional information submitted;
- Undertake further ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment where required<sup>(11)</sup>;
- Identify sites to be allocated in the Deposit Plan;
- Prepare final site allocations; and
- Prepare the Initial Consultation Report which will include a schedule of individual site related comments and suggestions for new site allocations.

### 2.11 Step 10: Deposit Plan Consultation

**2.11.1** The Deposit Plan consultation provides an opportunity for the public and stakeholders to:

- Comment on the policies and sites proposed in the Deposit Plan;

---

11 As most of the technical work will have been completed in preparing the Initial ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Report, the Report will only be updated if necessary to include: the results of assessing any revised or new options resulting from public consultation; any further ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment work undertaken (for example where new data has been released); any representations received on the Initial ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Report at Preferred Strategy; and any new policies added/ amended.

## 2 . Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology

- Indicate which of the Tests of Soundness they consider the Plan fails;
- Comment on the updated Candidate Sites Register, Initial ISA and Candidate Site Assessment Suitability Report (including Stage 1 and Stage 2 Candidate Sites Assessment), Initial Consultation Report and any other relevant background information;
- Submit representations requesting amendments to proposed allocation boundaries and settlement limits; and
- Propose the deletion or addition of new sites.

**2.11.2** Sites promoted through the Deposit Plan consultation will be required to undertake a Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Assessment and Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment and align with the Preferred Strategy (see Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites chapter for more information).

### 2.12 Step 11: Post Deposit Plan Consultation

**2.12.1** Following the Deposit Plan consultation, the Council will:

- Consider all duly made representations<sup>(12)</sup>, including any new sites proposed and conclude whether any amendments to the Plan are necessary; and
- Undertake an appropriate level of assessment to enable an accurate and effective response to any potential questions from the appointed Inspector at examination.

**2.12.2** A copy of all duly made representations, the findings of any assessment undertaken and the Council's formal view on sites submitted will be recorded within the Consultation Report.

---

12 See DA for more information on what constitutes a 'duly made' representation

## Guidance Notes

### 3 Introduction

#### 3.1 Introduction

**3.1.1** This part of the document provides the following guidance for the submission of Candidate Sites. Information is provided with regards to:

- Key dates and important considerations before submission;
- Information required for submission;
- Guidance on how to complete the Candidate Sites Submission Form; and
- Information required for sites submitted as part of either the Preferred Strategy or Deposit Plan consultations.

## 4 . Key Dates and Important Considerations before Submission

### 4 Key Dates and Important Considerations before Submission

#### 4.1 Key Dates

**4.1.1** The table below details key dates for Candidate Sites. More information is available in the DA.

**Table 4.1.1 Key Dates for the Submission of Candidate Sites**

Stage	Key Dates
Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology Targeted Stakeholder Consultation	November 2021
Call for Candidate Sites	March - May 2022
Preparation of CSR	March - June 2022
Publication of CSR	June 2022
Informal CSR Community Feedback	June - August 2022
Stage 1 Candidate Sites Assessment	July 2022
Stage 2 Candidate Sites Assessment Additional Information Request	August 2022
Stage 2 Candidate Sites Assessment	September - October 2022
Prepare Preferred Strategy, HRA Screening and ISA	June - December 2022
Preferred Strategy Consultation	March - April 2023
Assessment, consideration and reporting of responses received on the Preferred Strategy, Interim ISA and HRA Screening Report	May - July 2023
Publication of Preferred Strategy, Interim ISA and HRA Screening Report and Initial Consultation Report	August 2023
Prepare draft Deposit Plan, ISA and HRA Reports	August 2023 - January 2024
Deposit Plan Consultation	March - April 2024

## 4 . Key Dates and Important Considerations before Submission

Stage	Key Dates
Assessment and consideration of the representations received in respect of the draft Deposit LDP, ISA and HRA Reports	May - August 2024
Prepare and report on the Consultation Report	August - October 2024
Reporting of representations to the Deposit LDP, ISA and HRA Reports. Approval to submit to WG.	September - October 2024
Submission to WG	October 2024

### 4.2 When Can Sites Be Submitted?

**4.2.1** The Call for Candidate Sites is the appropriate time for the submission of Candidate Sites. Sites submitted will help to inform the preparation of the Preferred Strategy and ensure successful 'frontloading' of the RLDP preparation.

**4.2.2** In line with national guidance, sites can be submitted as part of the Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan consultations. Such sites will however need to align with the Preferred Strategy/ Deposit Plan strategy and will need to submit further details. Sites brought forward after the Preferred Strategy are unlikely to be considered for inclusion in the Plan.

### 4.3 What Uses Can Sites Be Submitted For?

**4.3.1** Sites can be submitted for a variety of uses including, but not limited to:

- Housing;
- Employment;
- Community facilities;
- Tourism;
- Regeneration;
- Green infrastructure;
- Waste;
- Health;
- Education;
- Social care;
- Gypsy and travellers;
- Retail;
- Recreation;
- Renewable energy;
- Biodiversity;
- Transport infrastructure;

## 4 . Key Dates and Important Considerations before Submission

- Minerals; and
- Protection

### 4.4 How Can Sites Be Submitted?

#### Call for Candidate Sites

**4.4.1** During the Call for Candidate Sites, the Council encourages sites to be submitted using our online Consultation Portal<sup>(13)</sup>.

**4.4.2** The Council will also accept submissions by:

- Email to: [ldp@npt.gov.uk](mailto:ldp@npt.gov.uk)
- Post to: Mr Ceri Morris, Head of Planning and Public Protection, Neath Port Talbot Council, The Quays, Brunel Way, Baglan Energy park, Neath. SA11 2GG

#### Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Consultations

**4.4.3** Sites submitted as part of either the Preferred Strategy (also known as Pre-Deposit Plan consultation) or Deposit Plan consultations, will be required to submit sites as representations to the Plan. Representations can be submitted via the Consultation Portal, email or post. Information will be provided as part of the Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan consultations.

### 4.5 Important Considerations Before Submission

**4.5.1** Please note:

- In order to demonstrate compliance with the tests of soundness<sup>(14)</sup>, it is essential that the land allocated for development in the RLDP meets the objectives and requirements of the Plan and is suitable for and capable of being developed.
- There is no guarantee that a Candidate Site proposal will be accepted and form part of the Plan.
- The inclusion of a Candidate Site within the Candidate Sites Register does not imply that a site is suitable for development.
- Sites not identified for development in the Preferred Strategy may be introduced later in the Plan preparation process.
- The responsibility of undertaking relevant technical work to support a site's inclusion in the Plan, including all financial costs, resides solely with the site promoter.
- The Candidate Sites assessment process will take place over a number of years, it is therefore important that you inform us of any changes to the landowner and site promoters contact details. Failure to do so may result in the site being filtered out of the Candidate Sites Assessment.
- In accordance with national guidance (DPM, (Edition 3, 2020, Paragraph 5.1 and Tables 18 and 22)), existing site allocations in the NPT LDP which have not progressed as anticipated (i.e. are partly developed/ have not been brought forward for

13 [Available at: https://neath-porttalbot-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/](https://neath-porttalbot-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/)

14 As specified in Table 7 DPM

## 4 . Key Dates and Important Considerations before Submission

development) will not automatically be 'rolled forward' into the RLDP. Sites will only be 'rolled forward' where there is clear evidence to demonstrate that there has been a substantial change in circumstances. As part of the initial Call for Candidate Sites, where the Council has up-to-date contact information, we will contact the site promoters of such sites and encourage them to resubmit their sites as part of the Call for Candidate Sites. Detailed information regarding delivery will need to be provided (see Deliverability Guidance section).

**4.5.2** In order to avoid the submission of sites which are fundamentally inappropriate, we would suggest reading the detailed Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology in order to understand the filtering process.

### 4.6 Candidate Sites Publicity

**4.6.1** The Council will publicise the Candidate Sites process in accordance with the DA.

**4.6.2** Prior to the Call for Candidate Sites, in February 2022 the Council will invite developers, agents, landowners, other site promoters and interested community members to a workshop to inform them of the process for submitting sites.

**4.6.3** The Council will also invite developers, agents, landowners, other site promoters and interest community members to a workshop at the beginning of the Call for Candidate Sites to provide guidance on how to complete Candidate Site submissions.

**4.6.4** If you wish to attend either workshop, please email your name, email address and telephone number to [ldp@npt.gov.uk](mailto:ldp@npt.gov.uk) or phone 01639 686821.

### 5 Information Required For Submission

**5.0.1** Each Candidate Site is required to submit a Candidate Sites Submission Form which should be completed as fully and accurately as is possible.

**Please note that failure to submit a suitably completed Candidate Sites Submission Form will result in the Candidate Site not being registered.**

**5.0.2** Residential and employment-led sites will also need to submit a viability assessment using the Mid and South West Wales Development Viability Model and a viability statement providing detail and evidence with regards to assumptions included within the appraisal. (see 'Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology' chapter and 'Completing the Candidate Site Form' chapter for more information).

**5.0.3** Sites promoted through the Preferred Strategy/ Deposit Plan consultations will also need to submit a Stage 1 and Stage 2 Candidate Sites Assessment (see 'Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites' Chapter for more information).

**5.0.4** Any other relevant studies, reports and information to support the Candidate Sites submission should also be provided. This should be proportionate to the nature and scale of the development proposed.

# 5 . Information Required For Submission

### 6 Completing the Candidate Site Form

**6.0.1** The following guidance has been produced to help site promoters to complete the Candidate Sites Submission Form as comprehensively as possible. The guidance follows the format of the Candidate Sites Submission Form. Not all questions relate to all proposals, where not applicable, please leave blank.

**6.0.2** Site promoters should use the Council's interactive constraints map available on the Council's website (<https://www.npt.gov.uk/29464>) to assist in the completion of the Candidate Site Form. Cadw's Archwilio Historic Environment Records of Wales interactive map can also be used to check whether there are any historic/ heritage sites within the proposed candidate site ([https://www.archwilio.org.uk/her/chi1/arch.html?county=Neath Port Talbot&lang=eng](https://www.archwilio.org.uk/her/chi1/arch.html?county=Neath%20Port%20Talbot&lang=eng)).

#### 6.1 Section A: Contact Details

**6.1.1** This section requires the following information to be provided:

- Name;
- Address;
- Email; and
- Telephone number

**6.1.2** Agents contact details should be provided in this section if an agent is promoting the site on behalf of a landowner or developer.

**6.1.3** The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) requires that data protection principles, rights and obligations are applied to any personal data processing (data that the Council collects, holds and analyses) as part of the RLDP preparation process. Contact details provided will be used for all future correspondence to keep site promoters informed of the RLDP process and to request any additional information with regards to Candidate Sites. Please indicate whether you are happy for us to hold your contact details for these purposes.

#### 6.2 Section B: Site Location

**6.2.1** This section requires the following information to be submitted:

- Site address including postcode;
- Grid reference;
- Ordnance Survey (OS) base map; and
- Site area

**6.2.2** Grid references can be accessed using the Grid Reference website<sup>(15)</sup>.

**6.2.3** An up-to-date OS base map should be provided with the site submission. The plan should:

---

15 Available at: <https://gridreferencefinder.com/>

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

- Contain sufficient information to ensure that the site can be easily identified;
- Have the land being promoted edged red and other land in control of the site owner/ site promoter edged blue; and
- Be drawn to a recognised scale (such as 1:2,500 or 1:1,250)

**6.2.4** Please note that a site will not be processed without an appropriate location plan. Plans can be purchased from the Planning Portal website<sup>(16)</sup>.

**6.2.5** Site area should be measured in hectares (ha).

**6.2.6** A site name (such as Site A/ Site 1) should be provided if you are submitting multiple submissions for the same site as this will help to avoid any confusion.

### 6.3 Section C: Existing Use

**6.3.1** This section of the Candidate Sites Submission Form requires information to be provided with regards to the existing use of the site and the extent of the site greenfield/ brownfield.

#### Existing Site Use

**6.3.2** Information should be provided regarding either:

- What the site is currently used for, for example, car showroom or agricultural field; or
- What the site was most recently used for, for example, a school.

**6.3.3** If there is more than one use, please specify all uses and the extent of each use in net and gross areas. If appropriate, please provide a map delineating the extent of each use.

#### Greenfield/ Brownfield

**6.3.4** Information should be provided regarding the extent of greenfield/ brownfield land (gross and net in hectares).

16 Available at: [https://www.planningportal.co.uk/homepage/4/buy\\_a\\_planning\\_map](https://www.planningportal.co.uk/homepage/4/buy_a_planning_map).

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

**6.3.5** In order to identify the proportion of greenfield/ brownfield land, consideration should be given to the following definition of previously developed land in PPW (Edition 11, 2021, pp.37):

*"Previously developed (also known as brownfield) land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure (excluding agricultural or forestry buildings) and associated fixed surface infrastructure. The curtilage (see note 1 below) of the development is included, as are defence buildings and land used for mineral extraction and waste disposal (see note 2 below) where provision for restoration has not been made through development management procedures.*

*Excluded from the definition are:*

- *Land and buildings currently in use for agricultural or forestry purposes;*
- *Land which has not been developed previously, for example parks, recreation grounds, golf courses and allotments, even though these areas may contain certain urban features such as paths, pavilions and other buildings;*
- *Land where the remains of any structure or activity have blended into the landscape over time so that they can reasonably be considered part of the natural surroundings;*
- *Land which is species rich and biodiverse and may qualify as Section 7 habitat' or be identified as having nature conservation value in the Environment Act; and*
- *Previously developed land subsequently put to an amenity use.*

*Notes:*

1. *The curtilage is defined as the area of land attached to a building. All of the land within the curtilage of the site will also be defined as previously developed. However this does not mean that the whole area of the curtilage should therefore be redeveloped. For example, where the footprint of a building only occupies a proportion of a site of which the remainder is open land (such as a hospital) the whole site should not normally be developed to the boundary of the curtilage. The planning authority should make a judgement about site layout in this context, bearing in mind other planning considerations such as policies for the protection of open space, playing fields or development in the countryside. They should consider such factors as how the site relates to the surrounding area and requirements for on-site open space, buffer strips and landscaped areas.*
2. *This relates to minerals and waste sites which would otherwise remain unrestored after use because the planning permission allowing them did not include a restoration condition. All other such sites will be restored to greenfield status, by virtue of the planning condition. It should be recognised, however, that non-hazardous landfills may not be able to accommodate built development without significant investment and long-term monitoring.*
3. *Nature conservation value may be identified through Green Infrastructure assessments".*

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

**6.3.6** If the site includes both greenfield and brownfield land, please provide an indication of the area of each (gross and net, ha) and a map delineating greenfield and brownfield land.

### 6.4 Section D: Proposed Use

**6.4.1** This section of the Candidate Sites Submission Form requires information to be provided with regards to:

- The type of use you wish the site to be considered for development (for example, residential or employment); and
- The scale of development (for example, 25 homes or 2,500sqm office block)

**6.4.2** Where mixed uses are proposed (for example, 200 homes, 1 shop and open space), a detailed mix should be provided including the number and/ or size of each use. A map should be provided to detail mixed uses where appropriate.

### Residential

**6.4.3** For residential sites, site capacity should be informed by:

- Future Wales<sup>(17)</sup> Strategic Placemaking Principle (pp.66) for new developments in urban areas to aim to have a density of at least 50 dwellings per hectare (net), with higher densities in more central and accessible locations<sup>(18)</sup>.
- The existing NPT LDP density requirements:

**Table 6.4.1 NPT LDP Density Requirements**

Strategy Area <sup>(19)</sup>	Locality	Density Requirement (Dwellings per Hectare)
Coastal Corridor Strategy Area	Neath and Port Talbot Spatial Areas	35
Valleys Strategy Area	Afan, Amman, Dulais, Neath, Swansea Valleys and Pontardawe Spatial Areas	30

### Affordable Housing Led Schemes

- 17 Available at: <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2021-02/future-wales-the-national-plan-2040.pdf>
- 18 When considering central and accessible locations, consideration should be given to existing transport hubs (train stations, bus stations, strategic road junctions) and future transport hubs (for example, consideration of the emerging Swansea Bay and West Wales Metro. More information available at: <https://gov.wales/swansea-bay-and-west-wales-metro>.
- 19 The interactive constraints map provided details the strategy areas and spatial areas

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

**6.4.4** Affordable housing led schemes will need to indicate the proportion of affordable housing proposed to be provided.

**6.4.5** Please note, that in accordance with national planning policy (PPW<sup>(20)</sup> (Edition 11, 2021, Paragraph 4.2.32)), affordable housing led schemes should include at least 50% affordable housing.

### Custom and Self Build

**6.4.6** If you are proposing either a custom or self-build scheme, please indicate this within this section.

**6.4.7** Self build schemes are schemes where someone builds their own home. The level of input can vary with a person either carrying out much of the work themselves or employing a builder/ contractor to build it for them. Guidance regarding self build schemes, including purchasing land and property, project planning and financing is available on the Planning Portal website<sup>(21) (22)</sup>.

**6.4.8** Custom build schemes are self build schemes where a developer is involved in some way. It could be that an individual commissions a builder to build a one off house for them, or a group of homes are built by a developer where the individual is able to design the home to their own specifications. Guidance regarding custom build housing is available on the Home Building website<sup>(23)</sup>.

### Student Accommodation

**6.4.9** If you are proposing student accommodation, please indicate this within this section.

**6.4.10** Please provide as much information about the nature of the proposal and the scale of development, including for example:

- Whether it is intended that accommodation is provided as Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) or purpose built student accommodation;
- Number of bed spaces proposed; and
- The nature of any facilities proposed.

---

20 Available at: [https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2021-02/planning-policy-wales-edition-11\\_0.pdf](https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2021-02/planning-policy-wales-edition-11_0.pdf)

21 Available at: [https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common\\_projects/49/self-build\\_homes](https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/49/self-build_homes)

22 Please note that this is different to the WG Self Build Wales scheme (<https://selfbuild.wales/>).

23 Available at: <https://www.homebuilding.co.uk/advice/what-is-custom-build>

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

### Specialist Accommodation

**6.4.11** Please indicate in this section if you are promoting a site for specialist accommodation (housing for older people, those with support needs, other specialist accommodation). Please provide information regarding the type of specialist accommodation and the scale of the specialist accommodation.

### Community

**6.4.12** Please indicate in this section if you are proposing a site for community uses.

**6.4.13** Please note that in view of the current financial constraints on the Council it is unlikely that ownership or management of any such proposals suggested by private individuals/ residential site promoters would be adopted by the Council. Information should therefore be provided regarding:

- What is being promoted;
- Why it is being promoted;
- How it will be funded; and
- How it will operate once open.

**6.4.14** If it is anticipated that a local community council or group will run the facility, please provide evidence of such discussions and evidence to demonstrate agreement.

### Healthcare/ Education

**6.4.15** Due to the nature of funding and planning for healthcare and education facilities, healthcare/ education facilities should only be promoted for development:

- By a healthcare/ education provider; or
- By a site promoter where they have evidence to demonstrate that there is an interested healthcare or education provider (evidence to demonstrate this should be provided).

### Commercial/ Retail/ Employment

**6.4.16** Commercial, retail and/or employment submissions should provide an estimate of the amount of floorspace proposed in square metres (sqm).

### Tourism

**6.4.17** Submissions for tourism development should provide as much information regarding the proposed development, including for example:

- The nature of the proposal (e.g. holiday cottages, adventure park, theme park etc.)
- The scale of each component (e.g. 20 holiday chalets, 500sqm restaurant accommodation etc.)

### Renewable Energy

**6.4.18** Renewable energy proposals should provide as much information as possible regarding the type and nature of the proposal. An estimation of the Megawatt generating capacity (MW) should also be provided.

**6.4.19** Consideration should be given to Future Wales Policy 17 'Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and Associated Infrastructure' and Policy 18 'Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments of National Significance'. The Pre-Assessed Areas for Wind Energy are detailed on the Council's interactive constraints map.

### Waste Sites - treatment and/or disposal

**6.4.20** Waste site proposals should provide information regarding the volume and capacity of the site in cubic metres. Information should also be provided with regards to the type of waste, for example whether or not it is hazardous.

### Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

**6.4.21** Proposals for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation should provide information regarding:

- The number of pitches and/or plots proposed; and
- The nature of any communal facilities/ other uses proposed

**6.4.22** Planning Aid Wales Gypsies and Travellers, including Travelling Showpeople Guidance provides further guidance for the submission of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation<sup>(24)</sup>.

### Infrastructure

**6.4.23** Information should be provided regarding the nature of the proposed infrastructure provision.

**6.4.24** For residential and employment-led schemes, information should be provided as to whether the provision of the infrastructure has been included within the Viability Statement and if so whether it demonstrates that the development can viably provide the level of infrastructure proposed.

### Biodiversity/ Green Infrastructure/ Protection

**6.4.25** Sites being promoted for biodiversity, green infrastructure and/or protection are only required to provide information regarding the type of use you wish the site to be considered for and future management and maintenance.

**6.4.26** Sites promoted for biodiversity, green infrastructure or protection may include sites being promoted for:

---

24 Available at: <https://planningaidwales.org.uk/gtguide/>

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

**Table 6.4.2 Sites Promoted for Biodiversity/ Green Infrastructure/ Protection**

Nature Stepping Stones or Corridors	Local landscape features that are of importance for biodiversity, such as trees, woodland, hedgerows and other field boundaries, watercourses, wetlands and ponds and green lanes
Amenity greenspace	Informal recreation spaces, communal green spaces in and around housing and village greens
Natural and semi-natural open space	Woodland, scrub, grassland, wetlands, open and running water
Green Wedges	<p>Green Wedges are local designations which essentially have the same purpose as Green Belts but are reviewed as part of the preparation of replacement LDPs. They may be used to provide a buffer between the settlement and statutory designations and safeguard important views into and out of the area.</p> <p>Within a Green Wedge there is a general presumption against development which is inappropriate in relation to the purposes of the designation.</p> <p>(PPW, Paragraphs 3.64-3.78).</p>

**6.4.27** If you are not the landowner of such sites, information should be provided regarding landownership. Including where possible, information regarding landowner's intentions to bring forward the site for such uses.

**6.4.28** In submitting a site, there should be clear and evidenced reasons for doing so, it should not be seen simply as an opportunity to prevent a parcel of land from being developed. You will need to evidence and explain why, if you want a site excluded from development, what it is that warrants protection, and there may be a number of reasons you have for this opinion. This should be appropriately evidenced.

**6.4.29** When proposing sites for Green Wedges, consideration should be given to national planning policy (PPW (Edition 11, 2021, Paragraph 3.64)) which says that proposals for Green Wedges should only be employed where there is a demonstrable need to protect the urban form and alternative policy mechanisms, such as settlement boundaries, would not be sufficiently robust.

### 6.5 Section E: Planning History

**6.5.1** This section of the Candidate Sites Submission Form requires information to be provided with regards to the planning history of the site.

**6.5.2** The following information should be provided:

- Current planning status:
  - Is the site allocated in the existing LDP/ does the site form part of an existing site allocation;
  - Does the site benefit from an extant planning permission?
  - Does the site have a lapsed planning permission;
- Overview of relevant planning history; and
- Whether pre-application discussions have taken place to date?

**6.5.3** Please provide as much detail as possible where relevant/ appropriate, including for example relevant planning application reference and/or site allocation reference.

**6.5.4** Where relevant/ appropriate, please indicate whether any relevant site surveys have been undertaken and provide a copy of relevant surveys/ reports.

**6.5.5** Planning history can be obtained using the Planning Application Search Facility on the Council's website: <https://planningonline.npt.gov.uk/online-applications/>

### 6.6 Section F: Fundamental Constraints

**6.6.1** This section of the Candidate Sites Submission Form requires information to be submitted with regards to fundamental constraints.

**6.6.2** Using the interactive constraints map provided by the Council, please indicate the extent of the site within the following fundamental constraints:

- Ramsar; and/or
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC); and/or
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); and/or
- National Nature Reserve (NNR); and/or
- Class 1 Agricultural Land Classification (ALC); and/or
- Scheduled Monument (SM); and/or
- Historic Park and Gardens; and/or

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

- Development proposed by the private sector on common land <sup>(25)</sup>; and/or
- The site proposes highly vulnerable development (TAN15 (December 2021)) within Flood Zone 3<sup>(26)</sup>.

Highly vulnerable development defined in the now postponed updated TAN15 as *"development where the ability of occupants to decide on whether they wish to accept the risks to life and property associated with flooding, or be able to manage the consequences of such a risk, is limited. It also includes those industrial uses where there would be an attendant risk to the public and the water environment should the site be inundated"*.

Types of development include:

- All residential premises (including hotels, Gypsy and Traveller sites and caravan parks and camping sites);
- Schools and childcare establishments, colleges and universities;
- Hospitals and GP surgeries;
- Especially vulnerable industrial development (e.g. power generating and distribution elements of power stations, transformers, chemical plants, incinerators), and waste disposal sites;
- Emergency services, including: ambulance stations, fire stations, police stations, command centres, emergency depots; and
- Buildings used to provide emergency shelter in time of flood.

### 6.7 Section G: Deliverability

**6.7.1** This section of the Candidate Sites Submission Form requires information to be provided with regards to deliverability.

**6.7.2** The following information should be provided in order to demonstrate site deliverability for all residential and employment sites. For all other uses, please use the questions below/ in the Candidate Sites Submission Form to guide a response to the indicative deliverability of the site. Please note that national policy and guidance stress the importance of demonstrating deliverability and 'will the plan deliver' is the third Test of Soundness<sup>(27)</sup>.

25 In the absence of further deliverability information, the proposal is likely to not be viable. Sites promoted by NPTC on common land will not be excluded on this basis, as their public ownership provides a delivery mechanism.

26 For the purposes of Candidate Site submissions, the Council will use TAN15 (December 2021) and Flood Map for Planning in accordance with the approach detailed in the Letter from Welsh Government dated 15 December 2021.

27 More information regarding Tests of Soundness is provided within the DPM (Edition 3, 2020, pp.165-167).

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

- Landownership contact details: Name, postal address, email address and telephone number of all landowners
- Whether the site is in single or multiple landownership?
  - If the site is in more than one landownership, please provide a map delineating landownership
- Whether all of the landowners are willing to sell their land for the type and scale of development envisaged?
- Whether the site promoter is the current landowner/s or acting on behalf of the current landowner/s (i.e. agent)?
- Or if the site promoter is not the current landowner/s or acting on their behalf, whether the site promoter has an option agreement or equivalent to purchase the site from the landowner/s?
- Whether there are any issues which need to be overcome in order to deliver the site?
  - For example, ransom strips, restrictive covenants, known infrastructure and/or utility constraints. Please provide as much detail as possible.
- How the site is intended to be delivered?
  - Please provide as much information as possible, for example:
    - By the landowners as a self-build project
    - By the landowners (a developer)
    - Sold to a developer who has an option agreement to buy the site following allocation
    - Sold to a developer (currently unknown) following allocation
    - Sold to a developer (currently unknown) following obtaining planning permission etc.
- Whether there has been any developer interest in the site to date?
  - If there has been developer interest in the site, please provide as much information as possible. For example:
    - Is the site owned by a developer?
    - Does a developer have an option agreement on the site?
    - Has a developer expressed an interest in purchasing the site (and if so how long ago was this)?
    - Has the site been marketed for development?
    - Has there been any interest in the marketing of the site for development? etc.
- Whether the site is in public ownership?
- If the site is in public ownership:
  - Whether the site has been identified in a published disposal strategy; and/or
  - Whether there is a Council resolution if the land is to be retained/ sold by the public body

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

- Broad time frames for delivery:
  - Please provide as much information as possible, including for example:
  - Whether the site is intended to be brought forward for development within the Plan period (2021-2036)
  - Broad time frames for the sale of land, Pre-Application Consultation (PAC), obtain planning permission, lead in times and build out rates
  - Whether it is intended that the site is brought forward in single or multiple phases
- Viability: See section below
- If the site was allocated in the existing LDP and has not been brought forward as intended and/or has a lapsed planning permission, please provide the following:
  - A clear explanation of why the site has not been brought forward for development to date;
  - Information on what has changed in order for the site to come forward for development within this plan period (i.e. ransom strip purchased, viability constraints overcome etc.); and
  - Evidence to show that there is a clear commitment to bring the site forward at a point in time within the Plan period, including where relevant, identified/ committed funding streams
- If the site has an extant planning permission please provide as much information as possible with regards to the anticipated delivery of the site, including:
  - Extant planning permission reference; and
  - Why the site has not been brought forward to date; and
  - Whether you intend to bring forward the site for the development granted in the extant planning permission; and
  - Information on what has changed in order for you to now bring forward the site for development; and
  - If you do not intend to bring forward the site, whether you intend to bring forward the site for other uses? If so, please provide anticipated time frame and as much information as possible for us to understand when it is intended that the site will be brought forward for development

**6.7.3** With regards to existing site allocations, national guidance (DPM (Edition 3, 2020, Paragraph 5.1, Table 18 and Table 22)) is clear that existing site allocations which have not progressed as anticipated should not automatically be 'rolled forward' into the RLDP. In accordance with the guidance provided in the manual, sites will only be 'rolled forward' where there is clear evidence to demonstrate that there has been a substantial change in circumstances. As much information should be provided as possible in order to demonstrate the deliverability of such sites. This information will also help to inform the housing and employment trajectories and the infrastructure delivery plan for the RLDP.

**6.7.4** Sites in public ownership includes land owned by the Council, WG, NRW, Health Boards and other Government Departments.

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

**6.7.5** GDPR requires that data protection principles, rights and obligations are applied to any personal data processing (data that the Council collects, holds and analyses) as part of the RLDP preparation process. Contact details provided in this section will be added to the Council's Candidate Sites database. Contact details will also be added to the Planning Policy Consultation Database in order to keep you informed of the RLDP process and any other emerging planning policy work (i.e. preparation of supplementary planning guidance). Please indicate whether all landowners are happy for their contact details to be kept for these purposes.

### 6.8 Section H: Viability

**Viability information is only required for residential and employment-led sites.**

**6.8.1** As part of the Candidate Sites Form, please indicate:

- Whether a high-level general viability statement has been provided? (Yes/ No)<sup>(28)</sup>
- If the site is financially viable, whether there is sufficient uplift for the landowner to release their site for development and if relevant, sufficient value/ return on the development to provide an adequate profit margin for the developer?
- If the site is not financially viable, whether the site promoter is aware of any funding mechanisms available to make the site financially viable and whether they have access to such funding mechanisms (i.e Registered Social Landlord and Social Housing Grant)?

**6.8.2** Viability assessments will need to be submitted using the Mid and South West Wales Development Viability Model, for which there are the following fees:

- Sites 1 to 9 residential units: £195
- Sites 10-50 residential units: £345
- Sites 51-100 residential units: £495
- Sites 100 or more residential units: £ to be agreed with Council depending on size and complexity of the proposal, but no less than £495.
- Employment: £ to be agreed with the Council depending on size and complexity of the proposal.

**The Council will NOT accept Viability Statements prepared using other viability models.**

**6.8.3** Sites promoted as part of the Call for Candidate Sites are required to:

28 If the site is being promoted through the Preferred Strategy or Deposit Consultation where a detailed viability assessment is required, please just tick 'yes'

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

- Submit an **high-level general viability assessment** (viability appraisal and statement detailing assumptions made and providing evidence to justify the assumptions made) as part of the Call for Candidate Sites; and
- If successfully filtered, prior to the Stage 2 Candidate Sites Assessment, submit a **detailed viability assessment** (viability appraisal and statement) using the Council's high-level viability assumptions/ justifying in the statement why other values are considered appropriate. (See 'Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology' chapter for more information).

**6.8.4** For sites submitted as part of the Call for Candidate Sites, the Council will charge:

- £50 for a copy of the model to enable a high-level viability assessment to be prepared; and
- The remainder of the fee for successfully filtered sites, to obtain a copy of the Council's high-level viability assumptions to enable the completion of the detailed appraisal work.

**6.8.5** Sites submitted as part of either the Preferred Strategy or Deposit Plan consultations will be required to submit a detailed viability assessment, for which the full charge will be required.

### Please note:

- **The model is site specific.**
- **The charges cover the administration and review of the viability assessment. The charges do not include allowances for engagement between site promoters and Council Officers with regards to viability assumptions; completion of the model; or the production of a detailed viability report for the site promoter.**
- **Should insufficient information be submitted, the site will be considered unviable. The Council will not ask site promoters to provide additional information.**

**6.8.6** The Council encourages site promoters to provide as much detail as possible and as much evidence as possible to justify assumptions made. Information submitted during the Call for Candidate Sites will be used to help to inform the Council's High-Level Plan Wide Viability Appraisal.

**6.8.7** To obtain a copy of the Development Viability Model, please:

## 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

- Email: LDP@npt.gov.uk
- Telephone: 01639 686821

### Please note:

- **Following discussions with the Council's Legal Team and the development industry, in accordance with national planning guidance (DPM, Edition 3, 2020, Paragraph 5.95), the Council will apply an 'open book' approach to viability information submitted to ensure transparency of evidence.**
- **Information submitted during the Call for Candidate Sites will not be made publicly available and instead will be used to inform assumptions as part of the high level viability work. This information may however need to be made publicly available should the Council receive a request via the Environmental Information Regulations or Freedom of Information Act. Should the Council receive such a request, the Council will discuss the request with the developer.**
- **Information submitted during the detailed request for successfully filtered sites will be made available on the Council's website as part of our viability evidence base. This will include the detailed viability appraisals submitted using the DVM given that these should use the high level viability assumptions provided, or other site specific assumptions.**
- **Any information the Council receives may need to be made publicly available should the Council receive a request via the Environmental Information Regulations or Freedom of Information Act. Should the Council receive such a request, the Council will discuss the request with the developer.**

# 6 . Completing the Candidate Site Form

### 7 Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites

**7.0.1** Sites promoted during either the Preferred Strategy or Deposit consultations will be required to submit:

- A Candidate Sites Form; and
- Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Assessment; and
- Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment.

**7.0.2** Residential and employment-led sites will be required to provide a detailed viability assessment (appraisal and statement).

**7.0.3** Failure to provide all of the above will result in the site not being progressed any further.

#### 7.1 Stage 1 Initial Candidate Sites Assessment

**7.1.1** Site promoters will be required to undertake the following three stage iterative filter:

- Filter 1: Site size filter
- Filter 2: Fundamental constraints filter
- Filter 3: Deliverability filter

**7.1.2** The findings of the filters should be clearly documented and evidenced in the following tables which will be provided as an interactive form/ word document as part of the Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan consultations.

#### Filter 1: Site Size Filter

**Table 7.1.1 Site Size Filter**

Does the site contain residential units?	Yes/ No
If yes, does the site contain 10 or more residential units	Yes/ No

#### Filter 2: Fundamental Constraints Filter

**Table 7.1.2 Fundamental Constraints Filter**

Is the site located within/ overlap with Ramsar Site?	Yes/ No
Is the site located within/ overlap with Special Area of Conservation (SAC)?	Yes/ No
Is the site located within/ overlap with Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?	Yes/ No

## 7 . Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites

Is the site located within/ overlap with National Nature Reserve?	Yes/ No
Is the site located within/ overlap with Class 1 Agricultural Land Classification (ALC)?	Yes/ No
Is the site located within/ overlap with Scheduled Monument (SM)?	Yes/ No
Is the site located within/ overlap with Historic Park and Gardens?	Yes/ No
Is development proposed by the private sector on common land?	Yes/ No
Is highly vulnerable development (as defined in TAN15 (December 2021)) proposed within Flood Zone 3?	Yes/ No

**7.1.3** An interactive constraints map will be provided on the Council's website in order to enable site promoters to undertake this assessment. An extract (screen shot) of the site with all of the fundamental constraints turned on should be provided as part of the Stage 1 Candidate Sites Assessment.

### Filter 3: Deliverability Filter

**Table 7.1.3 Deliverability Filter**

Is the site being promoted for development in its entirety?	Yes/ No
Is the site being promoted for development in more than one landownership?  If yes, are all of the landowners promoting the site for the type and scale of development envisaged?	
Is the site being promoted by the current landowner/s or on their behalf?  Or if the site is being promoted by a site promoter who has an option agreement or equivalent to purchase the site from the landowner/s?	
Are there any constraints to development such as ransom strips or covenants which are not in the process of being resolved/ removed?	Yes/ No

## 7 . Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites

Will the site be brought forward for development within the Plan period?	Yes/ No
Has viability information been provided to accompany the Candidate Site submission (residential and employment led sites)?  <i>Given that a detailed viability assessment is required to be submitted as part of the Stage 2 Detailed Viability Appraisal which is also required to be submitted for sites submitted as part of the Preferred Strategy/ Deposit Plan consultation, please just indicate whether viability information has been provided.</i>	Yes/ No
If the site is in public ownership, has it been identified in a published disposal strategy and/or through Council resolution if the land is to be retained/ sold by the Council?	Yes/ No

**7.1.4** If the site has been previously allocated in the existing NPT LDP, the following filters will also apply:

**Table 7.1.4 Additional Deliverability Filter**

Has a clear explanation of why the site has not been brought forward for development to date been provided, including justification of how and when this will be overcome going forward (including detailed viability information where required)?	Yes/ No
Has evidence been provided to demonstrate that there is a clear commitment to bring the site forward within the Plan period, including where relevant, identified/ committed funding streams?	Yes/ No

**7.1.5** Please note that the Council will review the information submitted and will discount sites which we do not consider to be deliverable. As much information as possible should therefore be provided.

**Please note that failure to provide sufficiently detailed information will result in the site being considered undeliverable.**

## 7 . Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites

### 7.2 Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment

**7.2.1** The Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment is a detailed site appraisal including:

- Detailed Viability Appraisal;
- Detailed ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment; and
- Engagement with infrastructure providers

#### Viability Appraisal

**7.2.2** Site promoters of residential and employment-led sites will be required to submit a detailed viability assessment (appraisal and statement).

**7.2.3** The detailed viability appraisal will need to be submitted using the Mid and South West Wales Development Viability Model, for which the following charges apply:

- Sites 1 to 9 residential units: £195
- Sites 10-50 residential units: £345
- Sites 51-100 residential units: £495
- Sites 100 or more residential units: £ to be agreed with Council depending on size and complexity of the proposal, but no less than £495
- Employment: £ to be agreed with the Council depending on size and complexity of the proposal.

**7.2.4** Site promoters will need to contact the Council via email (LDP@npt.gov.uk) or telephone (01639 686821) to obtain a copy of the site-specific Development Viability Model. The Council will provide guidance and videos to enable the completion of the model and will provide high-level viability assumptions which will need to be taken into consideration in the preparation of the viability assessment.

**7.2.5** A viability statement will need to be provided to accompany the viability appraisal. This should detail and provide evidence for all assumptions used. Robust evidence should be provided where assumptions are used differ from the Council's high-level viability assumptions.

#### **Please note:**

- **The Council will not accept detailed viability appraisals submitted using other viability models.**
- **Failure to provide a detailed viability appraisal or sufficient evidence to justify assumptions will result in the site being considered unviable.**
- **Each copy of the Development Viability Model is site-specific.**
- **A detailed viability report will not be provided for site promoters.**
- **The fees do not allow for either completion of the model by Council Officers or engagement between Council Officers and site promoters with regards to assumptions/ completion of the model etc.**

## 7 . Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites

**7.2.6** As part of the Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment, site promoters will also be required to provide information to enable the Council to complete the following table. This should include:

- If the site is financially viable, confirmation:
  - That there is sufficient uplift for the landowner to release their site for development; and
  - That there is sufficient value/ return on the development to provide an adequate profit margin for the developer (If there is no developer interest in the site to date, it should be assumed that there is)
- If the site is not financially viable, site promoters should confirm whether the site promoter/ landowner has access to any funding mechanisms that would make the site financially viable (i.e. Registered Social Landlords and Social Housing Grant).

**7.2.7** The table will be provided as part of an interactive form/ word document as part of the Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan consultations.

**Table 7.2.1 Viability Appraisal Filter**

Has a detailed viability appraisal been submitted using the Mid and South West Wales Development Viability Model?	Yes/ No
Does the viability appraisal submitted show the type and scale of development proposed to be financially viable?	Yes/ No
Does the viability appraisal submitted use the assumptions the Council has provided (for example with regards to affordable housing/ infrastructure/ other policy costs)?  If not, is evidence provided to justify why different assumptions have been used? and does the Council consider that the viability appraisal, including assumptions, submitted is appropriate?	Yes/ No
If the site is financially viable, has the site promoter confirmed that there is sufficient uplift for the landowner to release their site for development?	Yes/ No
If the site is financially viable, has the site promoter confirmed that there is sufficient value/ return on the development to provide an adequate profit margin for the developer/  If there is no developer interest in the site to date, it will automatically be assumed that there is.	Yes/ No

## 7 . Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites

If the site is not financially viable, does the site promoter/ landowner have access to any funding mechanisms that would make the site financially viable (for example, Registered Social Landlords and Social Housing Grant)?	Yes/ No
Is the Council satisfied that the site is viable?	Yes/ No

### ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment

**7.2.8** Site promoters will be required to undertake a qualitative and quantitative ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment for the site using the assessment criteria specified within Appendices A and B.

**7.2.9** The Council will provide an interactive constraints map to assist in the process. Further guidance will be provided within the Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan ISA Reports.

### Engagement with Infrastructure Providers

**7.2.10** The Council does not expect site promoters to engage directly with infrastructure providers.

**7.2.11** Prior to the Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan consultations, the Council will engage with the infrastructure providers detailed within Appendix C in order to understand infrastructure requirements and constraints. Information will be provided to assist in the Initial/ Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) as part of the evidence provided at Preferred Strategy/ Deposit Plan consultations. Consideration should be given to these documents as part of Candidate Site submissions.

**7.2.12** Where appropriate, the Council will engage with infrastructure providers following the submission of sites, and where appropriate, may then subsequently engage with the site promoter/ request additional information from the site promoter.

**7.2.13** Sufficient information should be provided as part of the Stage 2 Detailed Candidate Sites Assessment to enable the Council to complete the following table. The table will be provided as part of an interactive form/ word document as part of the Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan consultations.

**Table 7.2.2 ISA and Candidate Site Suitability Assessment and Infrastructure Providers Engagement Filters**

Has a detailed ISA been undertaken?	Yes/ No
Does the site contribute towards achieving the overall objectives of the Plan?  i.e. Does the site have a positive impact in the context of its environment in relation to the objectives of the ISA?	Yes/ No

## 7 . Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites

Has the site been appraised against the Candidate Site Suitability Assessment criteria and is it considered to be suitable for development?	Yes/ No
Have any infrastructure constraints been identified?	Yes/ No
If infrastructure constraints have been identified, have mitigation measures been proposed which are acceptable, achievable and do not impact on the overall viability of the site and has this been confirmed by the site promoter?	Yes/ No
Is the Council satisfied that the site is not contrary to the ISA and objectives of the Plan and that any infrastructure constraints can be viably mitigated?	Yes/ No

# 7 . Preferred Strategy and Deposit Plan Submitted Sites

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Integrated Sustainability Appraisal

#### Background

**A.1** Under Section 62(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), emerging LDPs need to be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which is statutorily required to guide the selection and development of policies and proposals for inclusion in LDPs/RLDPs in terms of their potential social, environmental and economic effects. The SA required for the LDP Review will need to build upon the SA, incorporating SEA, prepared for the NPT LDP 2011-2026 (adopted January 2016). As the 'Full Review' procedure is being used, the LDP Review will effectively mirror the original LDP preparation process and will result in the preparation and adoption of a RLDP (rather than the existing LDP only being subject to individual changes).

**A.2** When undertaking a SA, the WG asks Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to consider the value and opportunities for an integrated assessment approach to preparing an LDP. Paragraph 4.5 of the DPM (Edition 3, 2020) considers that *"the integration of statutory and key elements such as the Well Being of Future Generations Assessment (WBFGA) 2015 requirements, Equalities Act, Welsh language and Health Impact Assessment (HIA) (when relevant) into a single ISA will enable a more transparent, holistic and rounded assessment of the sustainability implications of growth options, objectives, policies and proposals"*. Accordingly, to achieve these benefits whilst meeting applicable statutory requirements, an ISA is to be carried out for the NPT LDP Review. The ISA Scoping Report<sup>(29)</sup> represents the first stage of this process.

**A.3** To enable the ISA to be undertaken in a proportionate and targeted manner the ISA Framework detailed in this appendix will be used. It is comprised of:

- Proposed ISA Objectives;
- A suite of relevant Guide Questions relating to each ISA Objective which will be used in a qualitative assessment of each emerging substantive component of the RLDP, and any identified reasonable alternatives, to proportionately identify their likely significant effect (LSE)); and
- A suite of sustainability indicators which will be considered in the assessment of candidate sites. These indicators are designed to guide the site assessment process. They support a legally compliant ISA that identifies statutory impacts assessment requirements.

#### ISA of Candidate Sites

**A.4** An integrated site assessment process will be carried out by NPT Council (NPTC) to satisfy ISA requirements (including SEA) and to select site allocations for inclusion in the RLDP. This will identify the strategic sites needed to deliver the RLDP Preferred Strategy.

**A.5** Owing to the strategic level and nature of the Candidate Site allocations that are likely to be included within the RLDP Pre-Deposit Document, it may be appropriate in some cases to adopt the same approach as for the RLDP proposed spatial strategies and policies in terms of focusing on their compatibility with the ISA Framework. However, the ISA will seek to identify site-specific and relevant sustainability issues, disproportionate effects on groups with protected characteristics, those vulnerable to social exclusion or poverty and those facing socio-economic disadvantage, and appropriate mitigation or enhancement measures which should be incorporated within candidate strategic site allocations as they are developed further for the RLDP Deposit Document (see Paragraph 6.5.2 ISA Scoping Report for more information). Where possible, the ISA of the candidate strategic site allocations will determine whether they are likely to result in any significant effects.

**A.6** The assessment criteria specified in the ISA Framework relate to the sustainability indicators and ISA objectives within the ISA Framework. The ISA Reports accompanying the LDP Pre-Deposit and LDP Deposit Documents will demonstrate that the site assessment criteria and process adopted by NPTC satisfy statutory ISA requirements and sufficiently relate to the ISA Objectives identified within the ISA Framework for the LDP Review.

**A.7** An iterative desktop-based appraisal utilising GIS software and relevant assessment criteria will be undertaken of all Candidate Sites excluding those discounted from further consideration owing to being below minimum site sizes to determine whether their allocation would have any LSEs. All Candidate Sites submitted to NPT within the defined RLDP Call for Sites period and not discounted due to site size will then be subject to a proportionate level of ISA using the pre-determined appraisal criteria and scoring system specified in the Framework below, with the findings detailed within the ISA Reports for the RLDP Pre-Deposit and Deposit Documents.

**A.8** All sites submitted to NPTC during the RLDP Call for Candidate Sites and not rejected on grounds of deliverability during the intended RLDP period will be treated as 'reasonable alternatives' and thus subject to an equal level of assessment up to RLDP Pre-Deposit stage. At this point the preferred RLDP Vision and Objectives will be published for consultation, meaning that any further site assessment carried out for the RLDP Deposit Document would only need to consider Candidate Sites which align with the RLDP Vision and Objectives (as all other sites would then be 'not reasonable').

**A.9** At both RLDP Pre-Deposit and Deposit stages a second level qualitative assessment will also be undertaken to test the ability of all identified reasonable alternative sites at each stage, and at Deposit stage of the combined suite of proposed site allocations, to address WBFGA 2015, Equality Act 2010, Welsh language and HIA requirements.

### Framework

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 Criteria<sup>1</sup>**

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	<b>--</b>
Site not on common land	<b>0</b>

<sup>1</sup> 'Showstopper' criteria highlighted in bold.

## Information Note

### 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.

## Information Note

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-
--	----

## Information Note

### 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).

## Information Note

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	--

## Information Note

### 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

## Information Note

### Table 2(d): SA Objective 4: Employment Capacity

#### Criteria 4(a): Employment Capacity

##### Sustainability implications:

The loss of employment land<sup>2</sup> (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

<sup>2</sup> 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	-

## Information Note

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.

## Information Note

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 underprovision 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)	--

## Information Note

### 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 Network<sup>3</sup> (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

<sup>3</sup> 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	--

## Information Note

### 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.

## Information Note

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	--

## Information Note

### 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	?-

## Information Note

### 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 RIGS<sup>4</sup>

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.

<sup>4</sup> 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/LNR<sup>5</sup>

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.

<sup>5</sup> 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 Sites<sup>6</sup>

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.

<sup>6</sup> As identified in the Designated Sites Hierarchy in Figure 12, PPW (11<sup>th</sup> 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	

## Information Note

### 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

## Information Note

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	--

## Information Note

### 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 for 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

## Information Note

### 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	--

## Information Note

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	--

## Information Note

### 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 assets<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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 Area <sup>8</sup>	--
Proposal for less than 100 residential units/ Proposal for employment uses under 1000 sq.m in Welsh Language Sensitive Area.	0

<sup>8</sup> 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.

## Information Note

### Table 2(d): SA Objective 13: Proximity to SLA<sup>9</sup> or Heritage Coast

#### Criteria 13(a): Proximity to SLA<sup>10</sup> 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	--

<sup>9</sup> Special Landscape Areas

<sup>10</sup> Special Landscape Areas

## Information Note

### 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

## Information Note

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

### Appendix B: Site Suitability

**B.1** In addition to the ISA criteria, consideration will also be given to the following in order to identify the suitability of the site:

- Buildings of Local Importance;
- Compatibility with neighbouring uses (light, noise,
- Conservation Areas and their settings;
- Disused railway or freight transport infrastructure;
- Existing use of the site;
- Green wedge;
- Land contamination;
- Land instability;
- Mineral Safeguarding Areas;
- Pre-Assessed Area for Wind Development;
- Quiet areas;
- Safe access to the site for all users;
- Site search sequence (see PPW, Paragraphs 3.41-3.48);
- Sequential approach in national policy (see Future Wales Policy Policy 6 and PPW Paragraphs 4.3.18-4.3.24) for retail, education, health, leisure and public services;
- SuDS;
- Water (including groundwater pollution);
- Whether development would lead to the loss of existing playing fields and/or recreational space?;
- Whether the site would lead to the redevelopment of previously developed land (see PPW, pp. 37)?; and
- Undeveloped coast;

**B.2** Please note that other criteria may be taken into consideration as part of the assessment work. Where this is the case, this will be clearly identified Candidate Sites Assessment work.



## Appendix C: Infrastructure Providers

**C.1** The Council will engage with the following where appropriate.

**Table C.0.1 Infrastructure Providers**

Infrastructure Type	Delivery Agency
Biodiversity and Ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>British Geological Survey</li> <li>Cadw</li> <li>Centre for Ecology and Hydrology</li> <li>Neath Port Talbot Biodiversity Forum</li> <li>NPTC Countryside and Wildlife</li> <li>NRW</li> </ul>
Community Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPTC Community Services Team</li> </ul>
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPTC Education</li> <li>Neath Port Talbot Group of Colleges</li> </ul>
Flood risk and surface water management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NRW</li> <li>NPTC SAB and Highway Development</li> <li>WG</li> </ul>
Green Infrastructure and Recreation Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPTC Countryside and Wildlife</li> <li>NPTC Planning Policy (Green Infrastructure and Recreation Space)</li> <li>NPTC Play</li> <li>NRW</li> </ul>
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Health Wales</li> <li>Swansea Bay University Health Board</li> </ul>
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cadw</li> <li>Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust</li> <li>NPTC Environmental Design and Heritage Officer</li> <li>Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Wales</li> </ul>
Natural Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>British Geological Survey</li> <li>Canal and Rivers Trust</li> <li>Coal Authority</li> <li>Dwr Cymru Welsh Water</li> <li>Glamorgan/ Gwent Archaeological Trust</li> <li>NPTC Countryside and Wildlife</li> </ul>

## Appendix C: . Infrastructure Providers

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPTC Highways and Drainage</li> <li>• NRW</li> </ul>
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 B's</li> <li>• First Busses Ltd.</li> <li>• Great First Western</li> <li>• Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd (Western and Wales) Property</li> <li>• Network Rail Ltd</li> <li>• NPTC Active Travel</li> <li>• NPTC Highways and Drainage Services</li> <li>• NPTC Rights of Way</li> <li>• South Wales Trunk Road Agent (SWTRA)</li> <li>• Transport for Wales</li> <li>• WG</li> </ul>
Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• British Gas</li> <li>• BT Group Plc</li> <li>• BT Open Reach HQ</li> <li>• Centrica Energy</li> <li>• Dwr Cymru Welsh Water</li> <li>• Ecoricity</li> <li>• EDF Energy</li> <li>• EE</li> <li>• Good Energy</li> <li>• Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd.</li> <li>• Mid and West Wales Fire Service</li> <li>• National Grid</li> <li>• NPTC Education</li> <li>• O2</li> <li>• Sports Council for Wales</li> <li>• South Wales Fire and Rescue Service</li> <li>• SSE/ SWALEC</li> <li>• Tesco Mobile LMT</li> <li>• Transco</li> <li>• United Utilities</li> <li>• Utilita Energy</li> </ul>

## Appendix C: . Infrastructure Providers

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Virgin Media</li><li>• Vodaphone Group Plc</li><li>• Western Power</li><li>• Wales and West Utilities Ltd</li> <li>• Welsh Ambulance Service</li></ul>
Waste and Recycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• NPTC Waste and Neighbourhood Services</li></ul>

**C.2** In addition to the above, where appropriate, the Council will engage with the key stakeholder groups, specific consultation bodies and general and other consultation bodies detailed in the DA.

# Appendix C: . Infrastructure Providers

### Appendix D: Candidate Sites Submission Form

#### D.1 Introduction

**D.1** Neath Port Talbot (NPT) Council's emerging Replacement Local Development Plan (RLDP) will need to identify land to address the Council's development needs over the Plan period of 2021 to 2036.

**D.2** Candidate Sites can be submitted for a variety of uses including, but not limited to:

- Housing;
- Employment;
- Regeneration;
- Community facilities;
- Tourism;
- Green infrastructure;
- Waste;
- Health
- Education;
- Social care;
- Gypsy and Travellers;
- Retail;
- Recreation;
- Biodiversity;
- Transport infrastructure;
- Minerals; and
- Protection

**Please note that sites should be submitted using this form.**

**D.3** A separate form should be submitted for each Candidate Site submission.

**D.4** Please see the Council's Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology and Guidance Notes for guidance on completing and submitting this form.

**D.5** Should you have any queries, please either:

- Email: LDP@npt.gov.uk
- Telephone: 01639 686 821

#### D.2 Section A: Contact Details

**D.6** Contact details should be provided of those promoting the site (agents contact details if an agent is promoting the site on behalf of the landowner and/or developer).

## Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form

**Table D.2.1 Contact Details**

Name	
Address	
Telephone Number	
GDPR confirmation	Yes/ No

**D.7** The GDPR requires that data protection principles, rights and obligations are applied to any personal data processing (data that the Council collects, holds and analyses) as part of the RLDP preparation process. Contact details provided will be used for all future correspondence to keep site promoters informed of the RLDP process and to request any additional information with regards to Candidate Site submissions. Please indicate whether you are happy for us to hold your contact details for these purposes.

### D.3 Section B: Site Location

**Table D.3.1 Site Location**

Site Name	
Site Address	
Grid Reference	
OS Base Map	Please provide an OS Base Map as per guidance note
Site Area (Ha)	

### D.4 Section C: Existing Use

**Table D.4.1 Existing Use**

Existing use (e.g. car showroom/ agricultural field)	
--	--

## Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form

Extent of site greenfield and/or brownfield	
---	--

### D.5 Section D: Proposed Use

**Table D.5.1 Proposed Use**

Proposed use	
Proposed capacity	
Extent of site greenfield and/or brownfield (Ha)	<p>Brownfield:</p> <p>Greenfield:</p> <p><i>Please provide a map delineating extent of brownfield and greenfield land.</i></p>
Is infrastructure provision (e.g. new school/ health care etc.) proposed?	Yes/ No
<p>If new infrastructure is proposed, how is this proposed to be funded?</p> <p>For residential and employment-led sites, has the provision of this infrastructure been included within the Viability Statement and does the</p>	

## Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form

Viability Statement prepared demonstrate that the development can viably provide the level of infrastructure proposed?	
--	--

### D.6 Section E: Planning History

**Table D.6.1 Planning History**

Is the site allocated in the existing LDP?	Yes/ No
Does the site form part of a site allocation in the existing LDP?	Yes/ No
Please provide as much information as possible regarding the existing allocation if relevant	
Does the site benefit from an extant planning permission?	Yes/ No
Does the site have a lapsed planning permission?	Yes/ No
Please provide an overview of planning history if relevant	
Have pre-application discussions taken place?	Yes/ No
Please provide as much information as possible regarding pre-application discussions	
Have site surveys been done to date?	Yes/ No
Please provide a copy of any relevant surveys/ reports and provide a summary of the findings	

## Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form

### D.7 Section F: Fundamental Constraints

**Table D.7.1 Fundamental Constraints**

Is development proposed by the private sector on common land?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with Site of Special Scientific Interest?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with National Nature Reserve?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with Special Protection Area?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with Special Area of Conservation?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with Ramsar Site?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with Marine Nature Reserve?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with Class 1 Agricultural Land?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with Ancient Woodland?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with Scheduled Monument?	Yes/ No
Is the site within or overlap with Historic Park and Garden?	Yes/ No
Does the development propose a highly vulnerable development (as defined in the now postponed TAN15) within Flood Zone 3?	Yes/ No

### D.8 Section G: Deliverability

**Table D.8.1 Deliverability**

Landowner Name/s:	
Landowner/s Address:	
Landowner/s Email Address	

# Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form

<p>Landowner/s Phone Number</p>	
<p>GDPR confirmation for each landowner</p> <p><i>GDPR requires that data protection principles, rights and obligations are applied to any personal data processing (data that the Council collects, holds and analyses) as part of the RLDP preparation process. Contact details in this section will be added to the Council’s Candidate Sites database. Contact details will also be added to the Planning Policy Consultation Database in order to keep you informed of the RLDP process and any other emerging planning policy work (i.e. preparation of supplementary planning guidance).</i></p> <p><i>Please indicate whether all landowners are happy for their contact details to be kept for these purposes</i></p>	
<p>Landownership Map</p> <p><i>If the site is in more than one landownership, please</i></p>	

## Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form

<p><i>provide a map delineating landownership</i></p>	
<p>Are all of the landowners willing to sell their land for the type and scale of development envisaged?</p> <p><i>Please provide as much information as possible</i></p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>
<p>Is the site promoter the current landowner/s or acting on behalf of the landowner/s (i.e. agent)?</p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>
<p>If the site promoter is not the current landowner/s or acting on their behalf, does the site promoter have an option agreement or equivalent to purchase the site from the landowner/s?</p> <p><i>Please provide as much information as possible</i></p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>
<p>Are there any constraints to development which need to be overcome in order to deliver the site?</p> <p><i>Please provide as much detail as possible</i></p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>

## Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form

<p>How is the site intended to be delivered?</p> <p><i>Please provide as much information as possible</i></p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>
<p>Has there been any developer interest in the site to date?</p> <p><i>Please provide as much information as possible</i></p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>
<p>Is the site in public ownership?</p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>
<p>If the site is in public ownership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Has it been identified in a published disposal strategy?</li> <li>· Is there a Council resolution to dispose of the site/ develop the site?</li> </ul> <p><i>Please provide as much information as possible</i></p>	
<p>Will the site be brought forward for delivery in the Plan period?</p> <p>Please provide as much information as possible with regards to the broad time frames for the delivery of the site</p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>

**Table D.8.2 Deliverability: Viability (Residential and Employment-led sites only)**

Has a high level Viability Statement for residential and employment-led sites been provided with the submission?	Yes/ No
Does the Viability Statement show the site to be financially viable?	Yes/ No
If the Viability Statement shows the site to be financially viable, is there sufficient uplift for the landowner to release the site for development?	Yes/ No
If the Viability Statement shows the site to be financially viable, if relevant, is there sufficient value/ return on the development to provide an adequate profit margin for the developer?	Yes/ No
If the Viability Statement shows that the site is not financially viable, is the site promoter aware of any funding mechanisms which would make the site financially viable, and do they have access to such funding mechanisms (i.e. Registered Social Landlord and Social Housing Grant)? <i>Please provide as much information as possible</i>	Yes/No

**Table D.8.3 Deliverability: Sites Allocated in NPT LDP/ Sites with Lapsed Planning Permission**

NPT LDP Reference	
Lapsed Planning Permission Reference	
Why has the site not been brought forward for the development envisaged to date?  <i>Please provide as much information as possible</i>	
What has changed in order for the site to come forward for development within this Plan period? <i>Please provide as much information as possible</i>	

## Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form

<p>Please provide evidence to show that there is a clear commitment to bring forward the site at a point in time within the Plan period, including where relevant, identified/ committed funding streams</p>	
--	--

**Table D.8.4 Deliverability: Sites with Extant Planning Permission**

Sites with Extant Planning Permission	
Extant Planning Permission Reference	
<p>Why has the site not been brought forward for the development envisaged to date?</p> <p><i>Please provide as much information as possible</i></p>	
Do you intend to bring forward the site for the development granted in the extant planning permission?	Yes/ No
<p>If you do intend to bring forward the site for the development granted in the extant planning permission, what has changed in order for the site to come forward for development within this Plan period?</p> <p><i>Please provide as much information as possible</i></p>	

## Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form

<p>If you do not intend to bring forward the site for the development granted in the extant planning permission, do you intend to bring forward the site for other uses?</p> <p><i>Please provide as much information as possible with regards to uses, anticipated time frame etc.</i></p>	<p>Yes/ No</p>
<p>Other deliverability information</p>	
<p>Other information:</p> <p>Please use this box to provide any other information to support your submission.</p> <p>Information could be provided for example to explain why you are seeking to promote a site for protection</p>	

# Appendix D: . Candidate Sites Submission Form



Click on the QR code below  
for further information



Cyngor Castell-nedd Port Talbot  
Neath Port Talbot Council