

CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** held in Committee Room 1, Council Offices, High Street North, Dunstable on Tuesday, 1 September 2009

PRESENT

Cllr J N Young (Chairman)
Cllr A R Bastable (Vice-Chairman)

Cllrs	D J Gale	Cllrs	Mrs M Mustoe
	Mrs R B Gammons		P Snelling
	J Kane		P Williams
	Ms C Maudlin		

Members in Attendance: Cllrs I Dalgarno
J G Jamieson
D McVicar
T Nicols
Miss A Sparrow
J Street
Mrs C Turner,
Mrs C F Chapman MBE

SCOSC/09/23 **Minutes**

RESOLVED

that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 4 August 2009 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

SCOSC/09/24 **Members' Interests**

(a) **Personal Interests:-**

None notified.

(b) **Personal and Prejudicial Interests:-**

None notified.

(c) **Prior Local Council Consideration of Applications:-**

None notified.

SCOSC/09/25 Chairman's Announcements and Communications

The Chairman read a statement setting out the Committee's role with regard to the Local Development Framework and Development Planning Documents. He referred in particular to the need to select sites for over 65,000 new homes in Central Bedfordshire and provide additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers. He also referred to the creation of a Task Force by the Committee to assist it in its role and then advised the meeting that the Task Force would be composed of the following Members:

Cllrs: P Snelling (Chairman)
P N Aldis
L Birt
D J Gale
Mrs R B Gammons
R Johnstone
J Kane
Mrs C Turner
P Williams

Named Substitutes:

Cllrs: Mrs A Barker
A D Brown
Ms A M W Graham

A copy of the statement is attached as Appendix A to these minutes.

SCOSC/09/26 Petitions

No petitions were received from members of the public in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure as set out in Annex 2 of Part A4 of the Constitution.

SCOSC/09/27 Questions, Statements or Deputations

No questions, statements or deputations from members of the public were received in accordance with the Public Participation Procedure as set out in Annex 1 of Part A4 of the Constitution.

SCOSC/09/28 Call-In

No matters were referred to the Committee for a decision in relation to the call-in of a decision.

SCOSC/09/29 Requested Items

No items were referred to the Committee for consideration at the request of a Member under Procedure Rule 3.1 of Part D2 of the Constitution.

SCOSC/09/30 Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document for the Former Mid Bedfordshire Area - Site Selection Criteria

The Committee received a report which sought its views on proposed criteria for the assessment of Gypsy and Traveller sites. The meeting noted that the criteria included a proposed scoring system to establish the appropriateness of each site. In addition Members had before them an addendum to the report which set out additional criteria and an amended scoring system.

Members were aware that additional sites were necessary in order that the pitch requirement for the former Mid Bedfordshire District Council area could be met. The meeting noted that local authorities were required by Government, through the Housing Act 2004, to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers alongside the settled population. Local authorities were also required by the Act to develop a strategy to address any unmet need that was identified. In the former Mid Beds area this was the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (DPD). The Council's progress on meeting this statutory duty was regularly and rigorously monitored by central Government.

Members noted that there were practical reasons for providing sufficient sites. If there was a lack of authorised sites then unauthorised sites, and the problems associated with them, would continue. The report also made clear that if the Council did not allocate sufficient sites for Gypsy and Traveller need then the Planning Inspector at the Public Examination of the DPD was likely to find the document 'unsound'. This could result in either the Council being required to begin the site search process again or the Inspector allocating sites from those previously considered by the Council. As the Inspector's report was binding there would be no further opportunity for Members to influence the outcome of the DPD.

Members then sought clarification on a number of issues. It was noted that sites could be both inside or outside rural settlement areas though it was preferable for them to be close facilities such as schools. Sites in the Green Belt would not be permitted in the former Mid Beds area. Sites could be on either Council or privately owned land and if the site was run by a private landlord then he or she would fund the site. The Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development stated that a limited amount of Government funding was available towards the development of an identified site. If suitable land

became available the Council was free to consider buying it and applying for government assistance.

It was noted that the presence of flight paths had not prevented the development of the settled communities' settlements so this lack of 'acoustic privacy' was unlikely to affect the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites. A Member queried whether the Gypsy and Traveller community had been given the opportunity to consider and comment on the selection criteria and scoring system as he understood most did not want to live in towns and urban areas. In response the Portfolio Holder stated that the guidance issued by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) had been drawn up in consultation with both Gypsies and Travellers and the Regional Assembly though, individually, the former would have their own preferences. However, the Member referred to sites identified by another local authority using the ODPM guidance which had been rejected as unsuitable by Gypsies and Travellers. In response the officer stated that choice, like that for the settled community, was based on personal preference and supply and demand. The Council could merely make the sites available.

Queries were raised by Members regarding the cost to the Council of purchasing land and providing services for sites but the officer reminded the meeting that these issues were not directly linked to the issue before the meeting which was to establish Members' views on the methodology to be adopted for the assessment of Gypsy and Traveller sites. However, Members were advised that there would be a financial obligation on the part of the Council and, following further discussion, the meeting noted that the Council was obliged to ensure that sites were available for Gypsies and Travellers and not merely that land was available to purchase. The officer then stressed that should sites not be provided through the DPD then the Council would be exposed to speculative site applications and there was a strong risk of losing planning appeals as no DPD would be in force.

A Member commented on the value of learning from the experiences of other local authorities when dealing with these issues. The Chairman commented that he had passed such information on to the officers for consideration.

In response to a Member's query the meeting was advised that any person or body was welcome to make suggestions for the location of possible sites. Arising from this the Member stressed the importance of discussions with the Gypsy and Traveller community to establish their views on site location. In response to these and other comments the Chairman stated that he expected consultation to be undertaken with the Gypsy and Traveller community. He added, however, that members of the Gypsy and Traveller community held differing views amongst themselves on this issue. He further added that what was considered an 'unsuitable' site location according to Government criteria might be one found acceptable by Gypsies and Travellers.

A Member raised the issue of cost for site provision and the possible requirement for additional funding which could arise through, for example, the need for noise mitigation measures for a site. He queried what level of mitigation for a site was viewed as acceptable. In response the Portfolio

Holder explained that it would be necessary to break down the mitigation costs and then it would be possible to establish where funding would come from. He added that these costs might not need to be paid for by the Council or the Gypsies and Travellers.

A Member expressed concern that the Council could be expected to pay for the provision of services to a site in a location where a house would not be built because of these costs. In response the officer explained that legislation did not restrict the provision of services to any particular person or body. He stressed that Gypsy and Traveller planning applications would be approached in the same way as any other planning application.

Concerns were raised that it was intended to run public consultation during December, at a time when many people would be unavailable. It was felt that officers should consider changing the public consultation period to provide greater opportunities for people to respond.

Consideration was given to the inclusion of Gypsy and Traveller sites within larger planning developments and the use of Section 106 agreements to achieve this aim.

The Portfolio Holder explained that to achieve the number of required sites it was necessary to have large sites with a greater number of pitches. He emphasised that a drop in demand was highly unlikely to occur. He also suggested that, to ensure sufficient provision was made to 2016, the Council should apply the 3% compound rate to determine the growth in pitches from 2011. By doing this, the former Mid Beds part of Central Bedfordshire would need to make provision for 40 pitches from 2006 to 2016. The Portfolio Holder recommended that Members agree this further commitment to a higher pitch figure so that officers could work to accommodate 40 pitches instead of 27 to 2016.

RESOLVED

- 1. that the list of criteria and amended scoring system for the assessment of Gypsy and Traveller sites be amended to include the additional criteria 'Avoid the loss of local community facilities' and the list and scoring system, as set out in Appendices B and C to these minutes, be approved and adopted.**
- 2. that the adopted criteria be applied to all sites previously considered through the Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (DPD) process and any new sites identified through a site search.**
- 3. that during the short listing of sites for Gypsy and Traveller provision sufficient pitch number allocation be made to comply with the Regional Plan requirements between 2011 and 2016.**

SCOSC/09/31 Central Bedfordshire Congestion Strategy

The Committee considered a report by the Assistant Director Highways and Transport which advised Members on the progress made on the development of the Central Bedfordshire Council Congestion Strategy and sought their views on the draft Strategy at this early stage.

Members were aware that traffic congestion was one of the Council's twelve priorities and that the following four guiding principles had been identified as forming the means of Congestion Management:

- Network Management (making better use of the existing road network by identifying the most congested junctions and roads and introducing low cost improvements to increase capacity).
- Smarter Travel Choices (promoting high quality alternatives to private motoring for essential journeys to reduce congestion; the choices to include walking, cycling and, especially, public transport).
- Demand Management (managing the supply of parking to promote short-stay for shoppers in town centres and long stay for commuters in edge of town park and ride).
- Network Enhancement (providing new infrastructure to remove traffic from congested areas).

All four principles were seen as complementary and might need to be applied in a bespoke form to different parts of the Council area. Members noted that the Strategy would form the core policy document for the Highways and Transportation Service.

The meeting also noted that a consultation workshop seminar was due to take place in Autumn 2009 with key stakeholders. The aim of the seminar was to discuss the approach to congestion management as outlined and use the information and opinions gathered to inform the further development of the Strategy before wider consultation. It was envisaged that the final version of the Strategy would go before Executive by March 2010.

The Portfolio Holder for Safer and Stronger Communities referred to the cross cutting nature of the issues raised by a congestion strategy and to the changes in approach that would take place when Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) was introduced as this encouraged greater involvement with adjacent local authorities. In connection with the workshop he asked that Members also be included within the definition of 'key stakeholders' and suggested that any views arising from the seminar should be reported back to the Committee.

The Chairman stressed that, at this stage of the Strategy's development, the Committee's views were only being sought on the four guiding principles and that a system of criteria would be considered in the future.

Members then referred to a number of Network enhancement schemes which they wished to see introduced including M1 junction 11A to ease congestion in Dunstable, an Ampthill, Flitwick, Westerning by-pass and the extension of Court Drive through to the A5. A Member suggested that Network Enhancement and Network Management should be regarded as joint first in terms of the priority to make better use of the existing road network. He suggested Demand Management be priority 2 and Smarter Travel Choices priority 3.

The Member then expressed concern that the Council could resort to a 'one size fits all' approach to parking and suggested that parking matters should be dealt with by individual town and parish councils. However, in response the Portfolio Holder reminded the meeting that this suggestion had been considered before but the parish councils had refused to take on the associated financial responsibility.

Another Member expressed support for devolving parking powers to town and parish councils accompanied by the transfer of funding. She then referred to the growing problem of vehicles being parked on pavements and verges in her parish and she sought a more active parking warden presence to prevent this. In response the Assistant Director stated that parking on the footway usually occurred in order to allow other vehicles to pass and he asked if Members wished to see this practice formally acknowledged by the provision of hardened parking areas in place of footways and verges. Whilst accepting that this was one way of dealing with the problem Members felt that parish councils should be offered alternatives.

Following reference to the use of Parish Partnership Scheme funding the Member commented that funds allocated to towns and parishes under the Scheme were often used to provide bollards and other street works that led to villages becoming more urbanised in appearance. The Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Development stated that their presence deterred the use of sustainable transport and, in particular, parking on verges had a negative impact on cycle users and pedestrians with prams and pushchairs. The Vice-Chairman added that parish councils had already considered converting grass verges for parking but had discovered services under them and that the cost of relocating the services was prohibitive.

A Member referred to the issue of the number of parking spaces required for developments under planning legislation and commented that the provision of insufficient parking facilities generated parking problems.

The Chairman suggested the possible adoption of separate parking policies for urban and rural areas.

A Member referred to the income from fines which, although raised by wardens who had been paid for by parish councils, was paid to Central Bedfordshire. In response the Portfolio Holder for Safer and Stronger Communities explained that the Council's policy was that income from parking fines was used towards the upkeep of the Council's car parks.

The meeting next considered the importance of Section 106 Agreements and the need to press for the maximum contribution from developers towards highways improvements for new developments. However, the Assistant Director commented that the Council would need to justify its position to developers. It was also noted that should funding for improvements be provided by developers and the improvements were subsequently removed the Council was liable to repay the developers. The officer emphasised that Members needed therefore to be clear about what improvements they wanted and why.

It was summarised that parking facilities and the enforcement of parking were key issues. Network management and network enhancement were considered to be the highest priorities followed by smarter travel choices.

NOTED the current position in the development of the Central Bedfordshire Congestion Strategy.

RESOLVED

- 1 that the Assistant Director Highways and Transport be aware and take account of the points raised by the Committee regarding congestion in Central Bedfordshire and Members advise him of any further issues they may have relating to this subject.***
- 2 that the outcome of the key stakeholder workshop due to take place in Autumn 2009 be reported to the Committee.***

SCOSC/09/32 Supported Local Bus Services - Budget Pressure 09/10

The Committee considered a report the Assistant Director Highways and Transport which explained why various commercial bus services received financial support from Central Bedfordshire Council, the estimated level of overspend on this service for 2009/10 and the various options which could be adopted and implemented with the aim of making a recommendation to the Executive on this matter

Members noted that the Bedfordshire Local Transport Plan 2006/07-2010/11 (LTP2) stated that the Council should supplement the commercially provided public transport network. In addition, its daughter document, the Bedfordshire Bus Strategy (BBS), set key priorities which included a number of service types which were not commercially attractive and required support. However, the Assistant Director's report stated that the resulting supported public transport network lacked the integrated approach to network planning envisaged in the BBS.

Turning to the costs involved Members noted that whilst the total funding available for such services in 2009/10 was £1,839,610 the latest estimated full year contract commitment was £1,903,000, giving an estimated overspend of £63,390 before inflation. The meeting was advised that the situation had partly

arisen as a result of the different ways in which the local bus contracts, and the associated budgets, were divided up during Local Government Reorganisation. In addition Bedfordshire County Council, as a legacy authority, had not made the reductions needed to bring the spending within budget.

To assist Members in their deliberations a table within the officer's report set out the full year savings that could be achieved by adopting one of the following options together with the related impacts and risks:

- Option A Maintain status quo-nil saving-overspend of £100k-£140k
- Option B Withdrawal of all supported Sunday services-£109k saving
- Option C Withdrawal of all supported evening services-£124k saving
- Option D Withdrawal of poor performing services based on objective weighted criteria-up to £200k saving depending on the criteria used

The objected weighted criteria previously used by Bedfordshire County Council were attached as an Appendix to the report.

Members were aware that the full year savings would only be partially achievable in 2009/10 and that a contractual notice period of two months meant that notice would have to be given on or before 31 September 2009 to cancel services from 1 December. This would a maximum saving of 33% of the full year savings during 2009/10 although any option adopted would generate the full financial benefit during 2010/11.

The Assistant Director explained that he sought guidance from the Committee on which option they would wish to see adopted whilst the Portfolio Holder for Safer and Stronger Communities emphasised the urgent need for a decision given the projected overspend and the timescale involved. However, some Members expressed concern that a decision was being sought without any information on individual service routes being made available as some services could provide better value for money than others. It was felt that the issue would be better dealt with by way of a full review of supported services including, if necessary, the possible provision of services by alternative means.

RECOMMENDED to Executive that Option D, as set out in Table 2 of the report of the Assistant Director Highways and Transport, and requiring the withdrawal of poor performing services based on objective weighted criteria, was the Committee's preferred option but that, prior to the withdrawing of any supported bus services, a full review be carried out in order to ascertain:

a) the impact on users of the subsidised services and

b) any alternative, more cost-effective means of delivering the services provided by the Council.

SCOSC/09/33 Draft Work Programme 2009-2010

The Committee considered a draft Work Programme for the 2009-10 municipal year and beyond.

RESOLVED

- 1** *that the draft Work Programme for the 2009-10 municipal year and beyond be approved and adopted.*
- 2** *that no further Task Forces be established to assist the Committee in reviewing specific items on the adopted Work Programme.*

SCOSC/09/34 Executive Forward Plan

The Committee considered the Executive Forward Plan for the period 1 September 2009 to 31 August 2010. The Chairman referred to the Executive's forthcoming consideration of a report on Town Centre Management arrangements across Central Bedfordshire on 10 November following the Committee's consideration of the same item at its meeting on 29 September. He sought the views of those Members from the south of Central Bedfordshire, who also served as town councillors, on the positions held by their authorities. He also asked that the views of those town councils in the north of Central Bedfordshire, which had no prior experience of such town centre management arrangements, be sought and reported to the next meeting of the Committee.

NOTED**SCOSC/09/35 Date of Next Meeting****NOTED**

that the next meeting of the Committee will be held on 9 September 2009.

(Note: The meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m. and concluded at 1.48 p.m.)

Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting 1st September 2009

Chairmans Opening Remarks

It is extremely important that members of the public and elected members fully understand the task that we are obliged, by central government, to deal with within the Local Development Framework and Development Planning Documents.

These tasks include, but are not confined to, two key tasks that our Council and at macro level, the suscomms task force, has before it in the forthcoming year.

The most important in my view is the selection of sites for in excess of 65,000 new homes in Central Bedfordshire in the next 20 years.

As a Council we fully recognise the need for new and affordable housing but we don't believe that 65,000 is the right number. Some estimates suggest that some 19,000 might be more appropriate. We're also very well aware that we do not have the appropriate infrastructure – roads, schools, hospitals or jobs to cope with this substantial population increase. For that reason we are heavily focussed on improving that infrastructure and are making great progress both in Mid and South Beds but still have a long way to go! The point here is, that we don't agree with the targets that John Prescott when Deputy Prime Minister imposed on the electorate of Bedfordshire. We are statutorily bound to do what the ODPM instructs us to do administered directly by the East of England Regional Assembly and as laid out some considerable time ago in the MK and South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy.

Turning to the contentious issue of the selection of Gypsy & Traveller sites.

We are similarly bound by a statutory duty to provide sites for Gypsies & Travellers. We did not ask for this duty and we are instructed on the number of sites that we must provide by the EERA; which itself follows the statutory demands of the 2004 Housing Act (sections 225 and 226) (although Cllr Nicols put up a strong argument at the assembly which limited the annual growth forecasts). We did not establish the criteria - the Government did and updated it by Government Circular ODPM 01/2006. Whilst there may be some enthusiasm to tweak or add to these criteria the statutory powers of the elected government must be seen as paramount here.

This then is the framework that, until or if it changes, we must use in considering all planning matters.

We do not have discretion to change this nor do updates to the framework, like the most recent update issued in June 2009 – unless they are incorporated into Government planning policy statements or into local development plans – which must themselves comply with Government policy and strategies – and are fully subject to review by the planning inspectorate.

As members and the public are fully aware this council, through the suscomms committee has established a task force to consider site selection and to make their recommendations to this committee and then to the portfolio holder for sustainable communities.

I was and I am extremely concerned that this process should be 'all encompassing' and should be fully transparent fully considering the public's views and, where appropriate and in line with the planning act and government guidance, applying them to the criteria that we must follow. But let's be clear; for the former Mid Beds LDF, we must find 27 pitches now and we must also allow, within this process, for further pitches in the years following 2011.

To ensure this transparency but at the same time to allow the task force to meet whenever it wants and wherever it wants at sometimes short notice the task force chair and I have agreed that meetings will only be open to the general public by invitation where task force members wish to hear specific local evidence. The debate that follows receipt of evidence will not be open to public involvement.

However we have also agreed that (as also laid down by the CBC constitution) that any elected member of this authority can attend any meeting to raise any relevant points for their constituents (this is already their right as an elected member)

But, importantly and where relevant, we will also invite the chair of any Parish or Town council to represent local views.

Also, no recommendations arrived at by the task force (regarding G & T issues) will be made to the relevant executive member until it has been agreed by the full O & S committee.

To aid inclusivity, I have asked officers to develop a 'Communications Protocol' document which outlines the methods we will use to accept from and communicate with all interested parties. In essence it lays out in detail what I'm saying now. In part it deals with the ability of pressure group input to reach a scale which makes it difficult for officers and members to get on with the job as they can be, on a daily basis, diverted from the job in hand by responding to high levels of correspondence. We will publish this protocol on our website and quite obviously would ask that the public respect this when communicating with us.

We will not respond to attacks on the integrity of any officers, member of this committee or the task force (made by anyone) other than if a formal complaint is made regarding the code of conduct of a member to the standards committee.

We're trying to reduce the emotional input to this process so, like some other authorities, we have developed a points scoring system to be applied to the selection criteria we have re-established and which we will be discussing today. We have already revised the selection criteria with the addition of 3 points for inclusion submitted by the general public. We will fairly and non-emotionally - apply this scoring criteria to existing identified sites and to any new sites that are identified and, after all due process, we will arrive at a 'league table' based on the site score which ranks the selected sites and recommends the appropriate number of pitches to be provided now and the scope for further pitches which could be considered in forthcoming years.

We must produce the DPD document as soon as we possibly can as the alternative is that we will find ourselves unable to legally challenge any Gypsies and Travellers who may set up unauthorised sites as is commonly reported in the press.

By way of example, there are a number of unapproved sites in South Bedfordshire, some with temporary permissions, but those that do not have a permission are now being addressed through the enforcement / eviction process as we have established sites on which they can be accommodated legally.

Make no mistake; if we don't have a DPD or have identified site as an alternative to an unauthorised encampment then the planning inspectorate is in a position, to grant temporary or permanent permission when, as is inevitable, a G & T appeal is lodged.

Further, planning inspectors are expected to take a hostile approach to any authority who legally challenges unauthorised Gypsy and Traveller settlements where clear and visible progress on the G&T site provision is not being made.

Finally, CLG has made it abundantly clear that authorities who fail to make progress on this issue will be directed in the outcome by CLG inspectors. CLG are auditing our planning process on a frequent basis to establish what progress we are making. We should have no illusion in supposing that such a direction will be sensitive to local concern!

In summary then;

We have a statutory obligation – an instruction from the Government – to provide additional G & T sites.

We did not devise the guidance notes or have substantial input into the number of required sites. We do not have any influence over Planning Policy Statements whether or not we believe that they encompass any positive discrimination in favour of any minority group.

For complete clarity and impartiality, we are agreeing a scoring system which we didn't have before, we've made it public and we are determined to apply it objectively – not emotionally

We have made the selection criteria public, have listened to and accepted input from the public and we will discuss and agree the final selection criteria today – in public.

We will include the Chair of each Parish Council in all debates where the Chair of the Task Force believes that local awareness and representation is of value. We believe that this will provide fairness, objectivity and transparency and robust local representation

We will answer all public representations as laid out in our communications protocol

We will conduct the duties of the task force under its constitution – which we will make public

All outcomes from the Task Force will be reviewed in Public by the full O & S committee prior to executive recommendation.

The Executive meeting which will consider our recommendation will be held in public

The Executives decision will be the subject of a Public Enquiry prior to being adopted in the LDF

This page is intentionally left blank

GYPHY AND TRAVELLER SITES – ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

1. First consider locations in or near existing settlements with access to local services
2. Sites may be found in rural or semi rural areas. Rural areas which are not subject to special planning constraint can be acceptable in principle.
3. Avoid the loss of high quality agricultural land.
4. Sites with limited incline.
5. Access to major roads or public transport services
6. Safe access from the public highway
7. Access to health services
8. Access to school, further education or training
9. Access to community facilities
10. Avoid areas of high risk flooding or the floodplain
11. Provide visual and acoustic privacy and maintain visual amenity
12. Avoid contaminated land
13. Locate sites in safe environments, avoiding refuse sites, industrial processes or other hazardous places
14. Sites Outside the Green Belt
15. Consideration of potential impact on landscape and nature designations, including Green Infrastructure
16. Sites located in areas of protected wildlife should be avoided or where appropriate assessed by wildlife survey
17. Consideration of potential impact on areas of archaeological significance
18. Serviceable for Gas/ Electricity/ Sewerage
19. Provision of Waste and Recycling Facilities
20. Avoid the loss of local community facilities

This page is intentionally left blank

Assessment of Sites using Agreed Site Criteria

Site Name:

CRITERIA (SCORE)	COMMENT	SCORE
<p>Sequential Approach 1st - In or on the edge of settlements. (20) 2nd - In areas where Gypsies and Travellers already have authorised sites, and where extension of those sites is subservient in scale and would not lead to problems of assimilation (15) 3rd - In more rural locations where those sites are free from environmental and planning constraints and are within reasonable distance of local facilities.(10)</p>		
<p>Agricultural Land Classification? Located on Grade 3 Land (0) Located on Grade 2 Land (-5) Located on Grade 1 Land (-10)</p>		
<p>Incline of Site? No Slope (0) Shallow Slope (-5) Steep Slope (-10)</p>		
<p>Safe access from site directly to the Highway? Yes, no remedial work necessary (10) Maybe, some remedial work necessary (0) No, remedial work too extensive (-10)</p>		
<p>Access to Major Roads Good, Within 0.5 - 1 mile (5) Fair, Within 1 - 2 miles (3) Poor, Within 2 -3 miles (1) No Score, Over 3 miles (0)</p>		
<p>Access to Public Transport Good, Within 5 minutes walk / 0.25 mile (5) Fair, Within 10 minutes walk / 0.5 mile (3) Poor, Within 20 minutes walk / 1 mile (1)</p>		
<p>Access to GP Good, Within 10 minutes walk (5) Fair, Within 20 minutes walk (3) Poor, Within 30 minutes walk (1) Anything above 30 minutes (0)</p>		
<p>Access to Schools - Lower School Good, Within 10 minutes walk (5)</p>		

CRITERIA (SCORE)	COMMENT	SCORE
Fair, Within 20 minutes walk (3) Poor, Within 30 minutes walk (1) Anything above 30 minutes (0)		
Access to Schools - Middle School Good, Within 10 minutes walk (5) Fair, Within 20 minutes walk (3) Poor, Within 30 minutes walk (1) Anything above 30 minutes (0)		
Access to Schools – Upper School Good, Within 10 minutes walk (5) Fair, Within 20 minutes walk (3) Poor, Within 30 minutes walk (1) Anything above 30 minutes (0)		
Access to Community Facilities Good, Within 10 minutes walk (5) Fair, Within 20 minutes walk (3) Poor, Within 30 minutes walk (1) Anything above 30 minutes (0)		
Is the site vulnerable to flooding? None (10) Zones 1 (0) Zones 2 (-10) Zones 3 (-20)		
Is the site located in an area of landscape designation? Yes and unable to mitigate (-10) Yes, mitigation necessary (0) Adjacent to (0) No (10)		
Is the site located in an area of nature designation? Yes and unable to mitigate (-10) Yes, mitigation necessary (0) Adjacent to (0) No (10)		
Is the site located in an area of Green Infrastructure? Yes and unable to mitigate (-10) Yes, mitigation necessary (0) Adjacent to (0) No (10)		

CRITERIA (SCORE)	COMMENT	SCORE
Wildlife Species Protection? Yes and unable to mitigate (-20) Yes, wildlife survey necessary (-10) No (0)		
Is the site located within the Green Belt? Yes (-20) Adjacent to (0) No (10)		
Potential for Noise Disturbance Caused by transport related sources (In accordance with PPG24) Low (5) Moderate & Could be Mitigated (3) High & Worth Investigating (1)		
Potential for Disturbance Caused by Vehicle Movement? Low (5) Moderate (3) High (1)		
Opportunities for Soft Landscaping? Yes (5) No (0)		
Site Located on Contaminated Land? No (0) Yes (-10)		
Site located near un-neighbourly use? No (5) Yes, within 0.25 mile (3) Yes, adjacent to 0.5 miles (1) No score, site next door to un-neighbourly use (0)		
Is the site in an area of archaeological significance? Yes, detrimental impact (-10) Yes, little impact (-5) No (0)		
Is the site serviceable by necessary infrastructure (gas, electricity/sewerage)? Yes, all (20) Yes, some (10) None (-10)		

CRITERIA (SCORE)	COMMENT	SCORE
Can waste and recycling collection be provided? Yes (5) No (0)		
Overall Score? (Max Score = 160)		