

		4 (best outcome)	3	2	1	0 (worst outcome)
<b>2</b>	<b>SUITABILITY</b>					
2.1	Will the development of the site produce ribbon development?	NO		Has the potential to produce ribbon development		Yes
2.2	Will the development of the site produce an isolated building or an addition to an isolated group of buildings?	No, site is within an established settlement	No, is an addition to an established settlement	Could be an addition to an established settlement	Will result in an addition to an isolated group of buildings	Will result in an isolated building
2.3	Are there any significant infrastructure requirements needed to enable development (e.g. creation of new site access to the site)?	Adjacent to maintained public road and to domestic utilities and mains drainage; requires no additional infrastructure outside of site	Deficient compared to 4 in one or more respects but better than 2 in all respects		Requires new access road to connect site to public highway / existing road needs upgrading or widening / requires new infrastructure outside of site	Major access issues e.g. over 100m from public highway; significant demolition or excavation required; major infrastructure investment required
2.4	Are there any public rights of way running through the site?		No	Rights of way on site / access, will need to be investigated	Yes	

		4 (best outcome)	3	2	1	0 (worst outcome)
<b>2</b>	<b>SUITABILITY</b>					
2.5	Will the development of the site result in loss of open space?	No				Yes - Loss of Green Belt or public open space (as defined by East Herts)
2.6	Will the development of the site fill in a gap between buildings? (infill)	Yes - Infill is appropriate to the form and setting of the village with no loss of open space or gap important to the form of the village	Minimal impact to the form of the village but does include loss of open space	Has potential to impact on open space/gap important to the form of the village		NO - Represents loss of a significant open space or gap important to the form of the village
2.7	Does the site impact negatively on any protected views or vistas as identified in the NP?	No		Has potential to impact on protected views or vistas		Yes
2.8	Does the site relate well to the village facilities in terms of location and connectivity?	Within 300m of facilities and well connected via safe and accessible routes	Within 500m of facilities and reasonably well connected via safe and accessible routes	Within 750m of facilities and connected by some safe and accessible routes	Within 1000m from facilities and connected by some safe and accessible routes	More than 1000m from facilities and not connections

		4 (best outcome)	3	2	1	0 (worst outcome)
<b>2</b>	<b>SUITABILITY</b>					
<b>2.9</b>	<b>Is the size of the site/ development proposed sufficient to deliver affordable homes and a mix of types and sizes? (based on 30dph)</b>	More than 20 homes would give the most beneficial mix of types tenures and size including affordable homes (site area over 0.6h)	More than 10 but less than 20 homes would give a mix of types tenures and size including affordable homes (site area between 0.3h and 0.6h)	More than 5 and less than 10 homes would give a mix but unlikely to provide affordable homes (Site area between 0.15h and 0.3h)	Less than 5 homes (Site area under 0.15h)	Single dwelling
<b>2.10</b>	<b>Does the site have potential to provide community infrastructure?</b>	Yes - size is over 1 hectare and therefore higher probability	0.5- 1 hectare - Limited potential for community infrasture		Less than 0.5 hectares - low probability	No - single dwelling therefore low probability
<b>2.11</b>	<b>What is the flood risk associated with the developable area of the site?</b>	In flood zone 1 and no identified surface water flooding	In flood zone 1 but affected by surface water	In flood zone 2	In flood zone 3 benefiting from flood defences	In flood zone 3
<b>2.12</b>	<b>Has the site been identified as one that should be protected by outside bodies or as identified within this neighbourhood plan?</b>	No		Partial part of the site or could be mitigated		Yes

		4 (best outcome)	3	2	1	0 (worst outcome)
<b>2</b>	<b>SUITABILITY</b>					
2.13	Is the site greenfield or brownfield?	Likely uncontaminated / lightly contaminated brownfield site e.g. no below ground liquid storage	Likely heavily contaminated brownfield site e.g. buried fuel tanks	Undeveloped land not greenfield e.g. gardens; greenfield but low grade (4 or 5) agricultural land	Greenfield; agricultural land of a higher grade (1-3)	Greenfield <u>and</u> within a designated green / open space / preserved view
2.14	Could development potentially affect listed heritage assets, or non-designated heritage assets as identified in the Neighbourhood Plan?	No		Not at present, but future development could prejudice later development which would have a deleterious effect		Yes
2.15	Has the land been identified as suitable for development according to Green Belt policy and as identified by East Herts Council Green Belt Review?	Site not in Green Belt or considered of no importance to the Green Belt (such as areas in flood zones or already considered part of a settlement area).	Site in Green Belt with <b>high suitability</b> for development, includes previously developed land in Green Belt	Site in Green Belt with <b>moderate suitability</b> for development	Site in Green Belt with <b>low suitability</b> for development	Site in Green Belt with <b>very low suitability</b> for development

		4 (best outcome)	3	2	1	0 (worst outcome)
<b>3</b>	<b>AVAILABILITY</b>					
3.1	When is the site available?	Planning permission granted	Owner confirmed 0-5 years	Owner confirmed 6-10 years	Owner has put site forward	No or unknown
<b>4</b>	<b>DELIVERABILITY</b>					
4.1	Is the site under single or multiple ownership/control?	Established single ownership/control	Ownership by two established partners, in agreement with development	Ownership by more than two partners	Multiple ownership with some owners not identified/not agreed to developmen	Unable to establish ownership
4.2	Landowner's state of readiness to develop	Architect's site plans already completed in anticipation of seeking planning permission; developer chosen or process for selection in place	Owner has confirmed the nature of preferred development by 2033	Owner has promoted site	No work done, owner has simply agreed site may be put forward for consideration in NP	Landowner still to confirm site may be developed within the plan period
<b>5</b>	<b>COMMUNITY VIEW</b>					
5.1	Has the community expressed a view on the potential development?	Strongly positive views expressed for development, clearly identified site	Some positive views	Mixed views or no identified views	Identified by few people, mostly negatively	Strongly negative views expressed, site identified as one the community has strong objections to developing