

PROJECT TRANSFORM – SITE ANALYSIS MATRIX – EVALUATION CRITERIA

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

1. POTENTIAL FOR CO-LOCATION

The extent to which proposals can co-locate with complimentary activities (**ref: PPS10 para. 20**)

- A. Significant opportunities to co-locate with complimentary activities.
- B.
- C. Some opportunities to co-locate with complimentary activities.
- D.
- E. No opportunity to co-locate with complimentary activities.

2. PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND

The extent to which proposals would utilise previously developed land (**ref: PPS10 para. 21 (ii)**)

- A. All the land within the site is previously developed.
- B.
- C. Some of the land within the site is previously developed.
- D.
- E. None of the land within the site is previously developed.

3. LOCATION

The concerns the current uses of the site. Is it in a location acknowledged to be suitable for waste uses by virtue of its existing use or allocation for B2 General Industrial uses? (**ref: PPS10 para. 20**)

- A. In a position where use for waste would be expected.
- B.
- C. In a position where use for waste may be expected.
- D.
- E. In position where use for waste would not be expected.

4. FIT WITH RSS SPATIAL STRATEGY

Whether the development will conflict or support RSS spatial strategy (**ref: PPS10 para. 17, draft RSS Policy W3**)

- A. Within a defined Major Urban Area conforming to the objectives of the RSS.
- B. Close (within 5km) and easily accessible to a defined Major Urban Area.
- C. Within a “Settlement of Significant Development” defined within the RSS.
- D. Within an “Other Large Settlement” defined within the RSS.
- E. Outside the settlement hierarchy.

5. POTENTIAL FOR ENERGY EXPORTATION

How feasible is the export of energy generated by on-site waste management? (**ref: PPS10 para. 1 and Annex C**)

- A. Infrastructure and energy in place and potential users within 2km of site
- B.

- C. Potential users within 2km of site
- D.
- E. No specifically identified users within 2km of site.

6. PLANNING STATUS OF THE SITE

What is the status of the site in Development Plan terms? (ref: **PPS10 para. 20**)

- A. The site is allocated for land uses that could encompass the waste facility proposals and the Development Plan would therefore, in principle, support the proposal.
- B.
- C. The site is unallocated in the UDP.
- D.
- E. The site is allocated for another use.

OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

7. SIZE / ORIENTATION / FORM

Whether the site is suitable in terms of size as indicated by the ODPM / EA or by bidders – Indicative site size is 3 ha. (ref: **PPS10 para. 18**)

- A. The size of the site is ideal and within parameters determined.
- B. The size of the site is almost ideal
- C. The size of the site does not present any significant problems
- D. The size of the site would present significant problems
- E. The size of the site would prohibit its use for waste.

8. ACCESSIBILITY – ACCESS FOR HGVs

How accessible the site is in terms of road networks for HGVs? (ref: **PPS10 para. 21 (i) and Annex E**)

- A. The site is readily accessible via the motorway, 'A' road and 'B' road / local road networks
- B. The site is somewhat accessible via most major roads in the area.
- C. The site is fairly accessible.
- D. The site suffers from accessibility problems, which may be difficult to overcome.
- E. The site is inaccessible, or virtually so.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

9. AMENITY

Will the use of the site for waste purposes result in the arising of adverse environmental effects such as noise and vibration, odour, vermin, litter etc? (ref: **PPS10 para. 21 (i) and Annex E**)

- A. No receptors present within 250m.
- B.
- C. Some receptors present within 250m.
- D.
- E. Many receptors present within 250m.

10. VISUAL/LANDSCAPE IMPACT

The impact the siting of such a facility would have on the amenity of the area the site is located in. (ref: **PPS10 para. 21 (i) and Annex E**)

- A. The use of the site for waste purposes would have no impact on visual amenity
- B. The use of the site for waste purposes would have some impact but it would be manageable.
- C. The use of the site for waste purposes would present a significant but manageable impact on the visual amenity in the area.
- D. The use of the site for waste purposes would present a significant and probably unmanageable impact on visual amenity.
- E. The visual impact would be unmanageable e.g. AONB.

11. CULTURAL OR HERITAGE - IMPORTANT ASSET

Is the site an important asset in a cultural, heritage or amenity sense or near to such? (ref: **PPS10 para. 21 (i) and Annex E**)

- A. The site is of no importance.
- B. The site is of little importance
- C. The site has some importance.
- D. The site is of significant importance
- E. The site is of very significant importance.

12. NATURE CONSERVATION

Will the use of the site for waste purposes impact on wildlife or an area where nature is of importance? (ref: **PPS10 para. 21 (i) and Annex E**)

- A. The use of the site for waste purposes would have no impact on nature conservation
- B. The use of the site for waste purposes would have some impact but it would be manageable
- C. The use of the site for waste purposes would present a significant but manageable impact on nature conservation.
- D. The use of the site for waste purposes would present a significant and probably unmanageable impact
- E. The impact on nature conservation would be unmanageable.

DELIVERABILITY CONSIDERATIONS

14. LAND OWNERSHIP STATUS

Where does ownership of the site lie? Is it readily available? (ref: PPS10 para. 18)

- A. Council owned – available/full title held.
- B. Council owned – issues to resolve (e.g. tenanted, title position unclear)
- C. Council owned – preallocated.
- D. Privately owned – available / on market.
- E. Privately owned – status unknown.

15. ECONOMIC

Will the use of the site for waste purposes impact upon employment uses in the area? Is the proposal likely to conflict with owner aspirations regardless of the prevailing uses or allocations. (ref: PPS10 para. 18)

- A. The use of the site for waste purposes would advance employment uses
- B. The use of the site for waste purposes would have no impact.
- C. The use of the site for waste purposes would present a significant but manageable impact on employment uses
- D. The use of the site for waste purposes would present a significant and probably unmanageable impact
- E. The impact on employment uses would be unmanageable.

16. FACILITY SUITABILITY

How easily the site would accommodate the EfW? (ref: PPS10 para. 18 and Annex E)

- A. Ideal for the facility
- B. Would accommodate facility with some compromises being made
- C. Would accommodate facility but significant compromises would need to be made
- D. Would accommodate but is clearly not ideal.
- E. Would not accommodate the facility at all.