

Eryri Local Development Plan 3

2026-2041

Candidate Sites Process and Methodology
February 2026



AWDURDOD PARC CENEDLAETHOL ERYRI
ERYRI NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY

www.eryri.llyw.cymru

Eryri Local Development Plan 3

2026-2041

Candidate Sites Process and Methodology

February 2026

Introduction

Following the publication of the Delivery Agreement, the Call for Candidate Sites is the first formal stage of preparing the Eryri Local Development Plan (ELDP) (2026-2041). This will also be referred to as LDP3, being the third adopted version in this form. The process enables all interested parties to submit potential sites for inclusion in the plan to the Local Planning Authority (LPA). It will then be a matter for the LPA to assess each site and determine if they are suitable, for the inclusion in the ELDP.

The candidate site assessment process forms background evidence. It will inform the identification of potential spatial growth options and inform the Preferred Strategy for the Eryri National Park Authority (ENPA) over the Plan period (1 April 2026 to 31 March 2041).

The purpose of this document is to set out the process and methodology to be used for assessing the suitability of potential development sites (Candidate Sites) for inclusion within the ELDP.

The methodology reflects legislative provisions within National planning policy (**Planning Policy Wales: Edition 12 (2024) and Future Wales: The National Plan 2040 (2021)**) together with the requirements set out in Welsh Government guidance on the preparation of LDPs as set out in the **Development Plans Manual (Edition 3 March 2020)**.

The Candidate Sites Process

Site Proposers

The Call for Candidate Sites allows all parties (landowners, community councils, local organisations, etc.) to submit any potential sites to be considered for inclusion in the Replacement ELDP. These will then be assessed, and a determination made as to whether each site is suitable as an allocation in the Replacement ELDP for the proposed use, or not.

Land Uses

Candidate Sites will play an important role in the formulation and successful implementation of the Replacement ELDP, as some of them will become the allocations that are fundamental to meeting the needs that are identified in the Plan. Submissions are invited for sites for housing, employment, and other needs, as set out below in the list of potential Candidate Site land uses (please note this list is not exhaustive, or in priority order and that mixed uses will also be considered).

Potential Candidate Site Land Uses:

- Residential (local market, open market or affordable)
- Employment
- Retail
- Tourism
- Green Infrastructure/Open Space
- Recreation
- Gypsy and Travellers
- Minerals
- Waste
- Renewable Energy
- Transport Infrastructure
- Community Facilities

Candidate Sites should be submitted during the formal Call for Candidate Sites submission period, which will take place between February and May 2026.

All sites will be included in a Candidate Sites Register which will be published alongside the Preferred Strategy for Eryri LDP 3. The Register will be available on the Authority's website.

When the Plan reaches the Deposit stage, the Candidate Site Register will document the Authority's evidence and conclude whether particular sites have been included or excluded from Local Development Plan 3 (LDP3).

It is vital that the promoters of candidate sites appreciate that bringing sites forward after the Preferred Strategy stage will mean that it is unlikely they can be considered for inclusion in the Plan. The submission of sites should not be interpreted as a commitment that they will be included in the Plan as they will need to meet a criteria-based assessment as set out in this methodology paper.

The table below lists the stages of Candidate Site Assessment, along with an indicative timeframe.

Stage	Timeframe
Call for Candidate Sites	Feb – May 2026
Stage 1: Initial filtering	
Preferred Strategy Consultation (consultation on LDP strategy and Candidate Site Register). Publish the Candidate Site Register and stage 1 assessment.	January – February 2027
Detailed Site Assessment / ISA Assessment	
Deposit Plan Consultation (Site allocations made) Publish Call for Sites Register and stage 2 assessments	October – November 2027
Examination – Adoption (Confirmation of site allocations).	2029

Existing LDP Allocations

Site allocations in the current Adopted ELDP that do not have an extant planning permission will need to be re-appraised through the Candidate Site assessment process. Consequently, owners / developers of existing ELDP site allocations **must** make a Candidate Site submission to demonstrate that their site is deliverable and explain why planning permission has not been secured to date. In the absence of up-to-date evidence that an existing allocated site is available and deliverable, such sites are unlikely to be considered suitable for re-allocation in the emerging Replacement ELDP.

Submitting a Candidate Site – The Candidate Site Form

Evidence to support sites **will have** to be submitted via the standardised form. The Authority encourages site proposers to complete the online Candidate Site submission form online. The online form enables site proposers to produce and submit a map, obtain constraints information, view guidance notes and upload supporting documentation.

Please note the submission of sites is an open and transparent process, therefore submission forms cannot be treated as confidential. All forms submitted will be available for public inspection.

To support the preparation of Candidate Site submissions, the LPA has produced an interactive constraints map, which can be viewed on the Authority's [Replacement Local Development Plan webpage](#). This tool will allow site proposers to easily identify any constraints affecting potential sites and determine whether supplementary information (e.g. flood consequences assessments, ecological surveys, drainage statements, highway impact studies) will be required as part of the Authority's assessment process to ensure sites will be deliverable.

Site Assessment Methodology

The Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology will include criteria to filter out sites that are, for example: incompatible with the National Park's purposes and its Special Qualities, below a certain size, clearly contrary to national planning policy or are unsuitable due to the presence of constraints. This will also include a lack of commitment from landowners or developers to bringing sites forward for development.

The Authority will use a multi stage assessment process to determine which candidate sites should be taken forward as allocations in LDP3. This process follows that which is recommended in the Development Plans Manual Edition 3. Site proposers are strongly encouraged to provide as much supporting information as possible during the Call for Sites period to demonstrate, at the earliest opportunity, that their site is capable of delivering a sustainable form of development.

Sustainability, Viability and Deliverability

The National Park LPA will use the Candidate Site process to gather suitable evidence from site proposers that robustly demonstrates the sustainability, deliverability and financial viability of sites. Evidence needs to be submitted by site proposers to enable the LPA to assess the following:

- That the site is in a **sustainable** location (as defined in Planning Policy Wales Edition 12) and can be freed from all constraints.
- That the site is capable of being **delivered**.
- That the site is **viable**.

In accordance with The Development Plans Manual (Edition 3), candidate site proposers will also need to consider whether there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that a site is capable of being viably delivered at an early stage. The Development Plans Manual considers the following points need to be addressed to demonstrate deliverability and viability:

- The site is available now or will be available at an appropriate point within the plan period.
- The site is generally free from physical constraints, such as land ownership, infrastructure, access, ground conditions, biodiversity, landscape, heritage, flood risk issues and pollution.
- The planning history - does the site benefit from an extant planning permission, or is it identified as an allocation in the currently Adopted ELDP?
- If appropriate, a clear explanation and justification of how and when any barriers to delivery can be overcome.
- That there is development potential for the proposed use. The site is generally attractive to the market (both private and/or public sector) for development at the proposed location.
- The site can accommodate the broad levels of affordable housing, other policy / Section 106 requirements and infrastructure costs as set out by the LPA.
- If there are financial shortfalls inhibiting development from coming forward, funding mechanisms are, or can be secured, to make the site financially viable

To help site proposers address the relevant considerations, the Candidate Site Submission Form will include a series of targeted questions aligned with the key assessment points listed above. These questions are designed to support an evaluation of each site's suitability and deliverability. The criteria within the form will enable the Authority to identify sites appropriate for further consideration and to encourage the submission of additional supporting information where necessary.

The sites that will be included in the Candidate Sites Assessment process are:

- Sites promoted by landowners, their agents, public and private developers;
- Sites identified by Authority Officers as having development potential;

Candidate Site Assessment Process

Stage 1: Initial Sift

The Stage 1 Assessment is known as the Initial Sift. The Call for Candidate Sites is scheduled to be undertaken during February - May 2026 and the initial sift will commence as soon as possible after sites are received. This stage provides an early screening of all candidate sites to identify those that are fundamentally unsuitable for development and therefore should not proceed to detailed assessment (see Appendix 1). Particular attention will be given to 'larger than local constraints' which are considered to be constraints imposed by Welsh Government or governmental bodies such as Natural Resources Wales (NRW). Typically, these constraints would be considered high risk flood zones or internationally designated wildlife sites.

Stage 1 will also assist the Authority in understanding what land is available in order to enable the identification of broad locations for development and protection to inform the Preferred Strategy.

At Stage 1, proposers are not expected to supply the extensive level of detail required for a planning application, however, providing more comprehensive information at this stage can help facilitate the assessment of the submission. Should a site promoter be aware of a fundamental constraint (see below) then it is within the site promoters' interests to submit information in respect of this constraint alongside their site submission.

The Authority will conduct its own high level constraint check, with the key criteria set out below. Sites that fail to meet one or more of these fundamental tests will not progress to Stage 2.

The table below shows the Initial Site Filter Considerations:

Consideration	Explanation
Site Threshold	<p>Sites proposed for residential purposes that fall below the minimum threshold of 5 dwellings will not be allocated.</p> <p>However, these sites will be considered as windfall sites (if required) when the LPA undertakes work to define development boundaries.</p>
Relationship to Existing Settlement	<p>Is the site within, at the edge of, or outside of a settlement (as defined in the current ELDP)?</p> <p>If the site is proposed for housing, employment or retail use and clearly separate from or is not closely related to a settlement it is highly unlikely to progress because it would be contrary to national planning policy i.e., unsustainable development in the open countryside.</p>
Flood Risk	<p>Sites identified as being located within either a Technical Advice Note 15 (31st March 2025) Defended Area, or Flood Zone 2 or 3 area which do not meet the justification test and acceptability of consequences section 10 and 11 set out in TAN 15 will not pass the initial sifting</p>
Statutory international and nationally designated sites	<p>International or nationally designated sites are afforded protection by national policy. These sites are; Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Ramsar Sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and National Nature Reserves. Proposals that directly affect the integrity of one of these designations will be dismissed in the initial sift. Sites in close proximity to a designation will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and consultation will be undertaken with the relevant stakeholders to determine any potential impact.</p>
Deliverability Issues	<p>Consideration will be given to the deliverability of sites through either the presence of major physical site constraints, planning history (e.g., refusals), legal constraints or covenants that restrict the site being brought forward in the Replacement LDP period</p>

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment

All sites which pass through the Stage 1 sift will be subject to a detailed assessment. The assessment criteria should accord with the principles of sustainable development and placemaking contained within PPW12. The detailed assessment will be undertaken following the preferred strategy consultation and before the Deposit Plan stage.

The assessment criteria reflect the information requested on the Candidate Site Form, thereby enabling site proposers to identify whether a site is affected by one or more constraints/designations. Site proposers are required to provide supporting information explaining how the site can address any matters associated with the site. The LPA may request additional information from site proposers where necessary.

The detailed assessment is divided into the following areas:-

- **Accessibility and Highway Capacity** – considering the suitability of vehicular access to the site, location of the site with regard to public transport routes and accessibility by active travel routes, foot or cycle to a range of community facilities.
- **Landscape and Environmental Issues** – considering whether or not the site is at risk from flooding, whether there would be any loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, whether the site is greenfield or brownfield, whether there is a potential risk of contaminated land, whether or not it is protected by environmental designations, whether it is considered to have environmental value.
- **Site Character and Context** – whether topographical characteristics of the site may present an obstacle to development, whether development would have an impact on views/vistas, whether the site is in close proximity to existing infrastructure and whether or not there would be potential adverse impact from adjoining land uses.
- **Infrastructure / Utilities Capacity** – Whether the site has connections to utilities that would be required for development.
- **Continuity and Enclosure** – whether development of the site would provide continuity and enclosure in respect to adjacent land uses.
- **Climate Change Mitigation and Biodiversity Enhancement** – would the proposal be vulnerable to the effects of climate change including issues of flooding or drainage, would the development be able to incorporate renewable energy sources or energy conservation measures. Would the development provide biodiversity enhancements and green infrastructure.
- **Delivery and Viability** – Viability is a key consideration in the Candidate Site assessment process, alongside sustainability and deliverability considerations. Candidate sites should be sustainable, deliverable and financially viable in order to be considered for inclusion in the plan. The Development Plan manual states that all development proposals for housing or employment use must be accompanied by a Viability Assessment.
- **Community Issues** - would the proposal bring benefits to the community.

Alongside consideration of constraints, the Authority will also assess whether the site has particular development opportunities, for example:

- Will the proposal involve the re-use of suitable previously developed land/buildings?
- Will the proposal remove an eyesore/untidy site/un-neighbourly use?
- Does the proposal align with any forthcoming public sector or other service-provider improvements to services and facilities?

The appraisal will be undertaken in consultation with relevant statutory bodies to ensure that all technical evidence is robust and supportable. Consultees include Natural Resources Wales (NRW), Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water (DCWW), Health Board, National Grid, Henneb, Gwynedd and Conwy County Councils, and Cadw among others. The outcomes of this stage will provide an evidence-based understanding of which locations have genuine development potential, directly informing the preparation of the Preferred Strategy, where a consultation will be undertaken.

Sites that progress to Stage 2 will be assessed against the framework below to identify the sustainability of each candidate site. A 'traffic light' coding system will be used by officers in order to identify which sites are more desirable and which sites are less so. The 'traffic light' coding system is as follows:

Code	Assessment Criteria Outcome	Description
Green	Positive impacts	The proposed site complies with the assessment objectives, is generally free from constraints, deliverable, and viable (subject to detailed testing)
Amber	Positive and negative effects	The site complies with some elements but hinders others, or constraints exist but are considered manageable or capable of mitigation. Further consideration is required
Red	Negative/Major constraint to development	The proposed site significantly conflicts with the Plan's objectives, has major or insurmountable constraints, is contrary to national policy, or lacks sufficient information to demonstrate deliverability

This approach will set out the assessment questions, thresholds, and criteria applied to each topic area. It is important to note that the purpose of categorising site performance is to enable clear differentiation between sites, identifying where options perform relatively better or worse against the assessment criteria. The scoring does not represent a measure of significant environmental or policy effects, but rather a tool to assist in comparing relative site suitability.

Appendix 2 of this document sets out in detail how sites will be appraised, using the traffic-light scoring system.

The information obtained from Stage 2 will be used by the Authority to filter sites to be carried forward to Stage 3 of the assessment.

Site Viability

Delivering the Plan's Preferred Strategy is a critical function of LDP3 and the Authority needs to be confident that any allocated site has a realistic prospect of being developed for its intended use within the Plan period – by 31 March 2040.

Several factors can affect the financial viability and deliverability of a site. These can include inappropriate adjoining uses, ransom strips, land contamination issues, a lack of infrastructure or distance to public infrastructure facilities (roads, sewers etc). Another important issue to consider is whether there is a genuine identified need for the type of development at its proposed location. Residential proposals will also need to consider the local level of need for affordable housing.

The Authority intends for a viability model to be created and available to site promoters to assess the viability of Candidate Sites submitted in relation to housing. This model will require a thorough appraisal of a scheme's economics and will require co-operation and an open book approach between the applicant, developer or landowner, and the planning authority. The submitted viability information would be expected to set out detailed information and supporting evidence on the following components:

- Land Acquisition costs
- Anticipated sales values
- Build costs
- External works, infrastructure and site abnormalities
- Professional fees
- Finance costs
- Marketing and sales costs
- Developer margin / profit

Failure to submit viability information when requested may result in the proposed site not being taken forward.

The viability model will be made available for all sites that have reached stage 2. Further guidance regarding the viability model will be published prior to the detailed assessment stage following the preferred strategy consultation.

Stage 3: Integrated Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA)

The LPA has a statutory requirement to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) of the Eryri LDP. This will be in the form of an Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA). The ISA will incorporate Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). In line with best practice these will be integrated into one coherent process. In addition, the SEA/SEA will also integrate a Welsh Language Impact Assessment (WLIA), Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) and a Health Impact Assessment (HIA), a process known as Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA).

The Candidate Sites that progress beyond the Stage 2 detailed assessment, will then be assessed against the ISA framework to identify the sustainability credentials of the candidate sites. The final assessment form, scoring method and guidance will be set out in the next stage of the ISA. The ISA topic area and objectives are shown in the table in Appendix 3.

Stage 4: Final Selection and Appraisal Against Preferred Strategy:

At Stage 4, Candidate Sites that have successfully passed the initial assessment, detailed appraisal, and sustainability evaluation are subject to a final selection process. This stage ensures that only those sites which are demonstrably suitable, sustainable, deliverable, and fully aligned with the Preferred Strategy are taken forward for potential allocation.

Each remaining Candidate Site will be appraised against the objectives and spatial framework established within the Preferred Strategy which will set out where new growth will be directed. The assessment will consider:

- The site's fit against the settlement hierarchy
- Contribution to meeting evidenced housing, employment, or community needs as quantified in the Plan's evidence base.
- Compatibility with overarching policy aims including climate change mitigation, placemaking, green infrastructure, and enhancement of the Welsh language.
- Avoidance of over-concentration of allocations in any one settlement, to ensure balanced and sustainable distribution of development.

To deliver the Plan's Strategy it should be acknowledged that some but not all of the settlements in the National Park will be required to accommodate growth and continue to be the focus of future planning development. The type and scale of new development will have regard to particular needs, existing infrastructure and/or constraints - thereby directing future development to the most appropriate and sustainable locations.

Conflict with the Preferred Strategy is also likely to reflect conflict with national guidance in some instances. Sites which are considered not to accord with the agreed Preferred Strategy of the LDP 3 will not be included in the Deposit Plan.

Further Information

For further assistance on the Candidate Sites Assessment Methodology process or the Local Development Plan Process in general, please see our website (see links to Planning and Policy – Replacement Eryri Development Plan) or email polisi.cynllunio@eryri.llyw.cymru or contact the Planning Policy Team at the National Park Authority's Office on 01766 770274.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Stage 1: Initial Filter

Constraint	Explanation	yes	no	Reasoning
Site threshold	Is the site capable of accommodating 5 or more dwellings,			If the site cannot accommodate 5 or more dwellings it will be considered as a windfall site when the Authority undertakes work to define settlement boundaries. It will not be taken forward to Stage 2 detailed assessment stage.
Open countryside	Is the site located within or directly adjoining an existing settlement identified in the current LDP2?			If no, sites that are physically isolated from settlements will be regarded as being within the open countryside and therefore contrary to national policy (PPW 12 paragraph 3.60) and will not be taken forward to Stage 2 detailed assessment stage
Flood Risk	Is the site located within either a TAN15 Defended Area, or Flood Zone 2 or 3 defined by NRW's Flood Maps for Planning?			If yes, sites located within these areas of flood risk will not progress to Stage 2 unless they can demonstrate compliance with the justification tests and acceptability of consequences in Sections 10 and 11 of TAN15. Highly vulnerable developments, such as housing, on greenfield land will be excluded by default.
Statutory Designated Sites	Is the site within or adjacent to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Special Protection Areas (SPA) - Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) - Ramsar Sites - Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) - National Nature Reserves - Biosphere Reserve 			If yes, the sites will not be taken forward to the next stage unless sufficient information is provided to justify their inclusion.

Appendix 2 – Stage 2 Assessment Criteria

Number	Criterion / Question	Green (Positive)	Amber (Mitigation/Further Consideration)	Red (Negative/Major Constraint)
Deliverability and Viability				
1	Financial Viability: Has sufficient evidence been provided to demonstrate the site is financially viable to meet policy requirements (including affordable housing targets and necessary planning obligations)?	An initial viability statement has been submitted and adequately illustrates viability and deliverability. Other funding mechanisms are in place where deliverability has already been demonstrated to secure funding (e.g., Social Housing Grant).	An initial viability statement has been submitted but is deficient in the level of information provided, requiring further clarification before progressing	Viability evidence has been undertaken that indicates the viability of the site is insufficient to demonstrate the site is deliverable and able to meet the Plan's affordable housing and other necessary planning policy requirements.
2	Site Availability. Is the site realistically available and likely to be brought forward within the Plan period?	Available for development in short term (within 5 years)	Available for development in the medium term (5-15 years)	Not available for development within the plan period (15 years or more)
3	Ownership & Legal Constraints: Is the site free from legal obstacles, restrictive covenants, or ownership disputes that would prevent development?	Site is owned by a single landowner who supports the proposal, or multi-owner agreements exist. No legal restrictions or restrictive covenants are in place.	Legal rights or covenants exist on part or all of the land, but evidence shows this is unlikely to affect allocation in whole or part	Uncertainty exists regarding ownership of all or part of the site, or landowners do not support the proposal. A covenant is in place that will restrict the development for its proposed use
4	Development Interest: Is there demonstrable developer interest or commitment to progressing the site?	Evidence of developer interest or the site has extant planning permission	No developer interest identified yet, but evidence indicates the site is being actively promoted by the owner(s)	No evidence of developer interest/engagement, indicating a lack of commitment to bringing the site forward

Environmental and Physical Constraints

5	Is the site within an identified Flood Zone or a Defended Zone and does it meet the justification test and acceptability of consequences section set out in sections 10 and 11 in TAN 15	The site is located within a low-risk flood area (Flood Zone 1)	The site is located in Flood Zone 2 or Zone 3, or a Defended Zone but meets the justification tests set out in TAN 15, and acceptability of flooding consequences has been demonstrated, or potential for mitigation exists regarding surface water flooding	The site is within Flood Zone 2 or 3, and no evidence (Flood Consequences Assessment) has been submitted to demonstrate it meets justification tests and acceptability of consequences
6	Nitrate/Phosphate Sensitive SAC Catchment: Is the site within or adjacent to a nitrate/phosphate sensitive Special Area of Conservation (SAC) catchment?	The site is not located within or adjacent to a nitrate/phosphate-sensitive SAC catchment or is serviced by a Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) with nutrient headroom.	The site is within a nitrate/phosphate-sensitive SAC catchment, but measures associated with development are demonstrated to be in place (e.g. nutrient neutrality achieved)	The site is within a nitrate/phosphate-sensitive SAC catchment and cannot demonstrate that new development will not lead to further deterioration of water quality or undermine the SAC's conservation objectives.
7	Settlement Character: Would development have a detrimental impact on the character, setting, or visual amenity of the settlement (e.g. ribbon development, tandem development, coalescence, or sporadic development)?	Development has the potential to enhance the character of the area and accords with all general planning principles (e.g. avoiding coalescence and ribbon development).	Development would have a negligible effect on local character and sense of place and can be mitigated through sensitive design.	Development will likely be detrimental to local character and sense of place (regardless of mitigation), or results in unacceptable ribbon development, tandem development, coalescence, or sporadic development contrary to general planning principles.
8	Biodiversity (Statutory Designations): Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at an international or national level (e.g. SAC, SPA, Ramsar, SSSI, NNR?)	The site does not include or is not close to any international or nationally designated areas, resulting in no adverse impact.	The site is adjacent/close to an international or national designation. Potential for adverse impact exists, but appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures can be put in place to avoid affecting the features of the site.	Development will significantly affect an international or national designation and cannot be mitigated.

9	Biodiversity (Non-Statutory Designations): Does the site include or is it close to any areas designated for biodiversity importance at a local level (e.g. Local Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserve, Regionally Important Geodiversity Sites), protected species, trees, or peatlands?	The site does not include or is not close to any locally designated area, resulting in no adverse impact.	The site is adjacent/close to a local designation. Potential for adverse impact exists, but appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures can be put in place to avoid affecting the features of the site.	Development will significantly affect a Local designation and cannot be mitigated.
10	Agricultural Land Quality: Would the development result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land? (Grade 1, 2, or 3a)	The site is previously developed land or would not result in the loss of grades 1, 2 or 3a BMV agricultural land	The site is on Grade 3a BMV agricultural land and previously developed land or land in the lower agricultural grades is unavailable.	The site would result in the loss of Grade 1 or Grade 2 BMV land, or Grade 3a where there are other sites on either previously developed land or land in the lower agricultural grades available.
11	Land Contamination: Is there evidence that the site could consist of potentially contaminated land?	The site is not contaminated.	Part or all of the site is contaminated but evidence is provided that constraints can be overcome, and the site would remain viable.	Ground contamination presents a significant constraint, unlikely to be viable, or insufficient evidence has been provided for remediation.
12	Heritage & Setting: Would the proposal adversely affect the setting of a heritage asset (e.g. Conservation Area, Listed Building, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Historic Landscapes and archaeological remains, including Scheduled Monuments)?	The site does not directly affect a heritage asset or its setting	The site is in proximity to a heritage asset/setting, but appropriate mitigation is likely to be delivered	The site directly affects a heritage asset/setting and would result in likely harm to the significance of the asset where appropriate mitigation is unlikely to be achieved

13	Previously Developed Land: Does the proposal involve the re-use of suitable previously developed (brownfield) land/buildings?	Previously developed land within or on the edge of settlement	Greenfield land within or on the edge of settlement	Greenfield land in the Open Countryside
14	Loss of Open Space: Would the development of the site result in the loss of publicly accessible open space, playing fields, playgrounds, or amenity land?	Development would not result in a loss of publicly accessible open space	Development would affect public access to open space but could be adequately replaced	Development would result in an unacceptable loss of publicly accessible open space that cannot be mitigated
15	Topographical Constraints: Do the topographical characteristics of the site present an obstacle to development (e.g. severe gradients, land stability, or complex landform)?	The site is free from topographical constraints, or the landform and site features are free from constraints.	The topographical characteristics, landform, or site features are a constraint to development but are considered unlikely to preclude development and can be reasonably mitigated.	The site has significant physical constraints that are likely to impact the development of the site or its deliverability or are significant enough to prevent development.
16	Minerals Safeguarding Zone: Is the site within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) or a mineral buffer zone.	The site is not within a mineral safeguarding area or a mineral buffer zone. The proposal would not unnecessarily sterilise a safeguarded mineral resource	The site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a mineral buffer zone, but development can be mitigated.	The site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and would result in the unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral resource
17	Biodiversity Enhancements	The site proposer has provided information demonstrating that the site will provide biodiversity enhancements that support ecosystem resilience.	The proposal has the potential to be able to provide biodiversity enhancements that support ecosystem resilience, but further information is required.	Insufficient evidence provided to demonstrate that the site can provide biodiversity enhancements that support ecosystem resilience.

18	Landscape impact	No adverse impact on the landscape of the National Parks.	Potential for adverse impact on the landscape of the National Park but with the potential to be mitigated.	The site will have an adverse impact on the landscape of the National Park.
19	Would development of the site lead to the loss of an important habitat, priority species (BAP), trees, hedgerows or lead to fragmentation of green corridor?	No loss of important habitat and adverse impacts on protected species. No fragmentation of green corridor. Presence of priority species unlikely.	Small proportion of the site contains important habitat. Priority species might be present. Fragmentation of green corridor could be mitigated.	Large / entire site contains important habitat and is an important green corridor, mitigation Evidence of priority species on site. Fragmentation of green corridor could not be mitigated.
Accessibility, Infrastructure and Placemaking				
20	Preferred Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy - Housing	The site is within, or would form a logical extension to, a settlement that is identified as suitable for larger housing sites in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy of the Replacement LDP.	The site is within or adjoining a settlement that is identified for smaller housing sites in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy of the Replacement LDP.	The site is located within the open countryside, or a lower tier settlement, not identified for housing allocations.

21	Relationship to Community Services / Facilities	The candidate site is within 800 metres* of the centre of a settlement that has a range of services and community facilities+	<p>The candidate site is within, but further than 800 metres, from the centre of a settlement that has a range of services and community facilities Or</p> <p>The site is within a smaller settlement with a limited number of facilities, but there is a larger settlement hosting a range of services and community facilities and has a frequent bus / train service (that connects the larger settlement to within 800 metres of the candidate site).</p>	<p>There are one or no services / community facilities within 800 metres of the candidate site.</p> <p>There is no frequent bus / train service to a larger settlement that hosts a range of such facilities (that connects the larger settlement to within 800 metres of the candidate site).</p>
22	Accessibility to the Wider Area on Foot	The site has good accessibility on foot (there is a network of uninterrupted, good quality pavements which have street lighting and promote walking).	The site requires further investigation regarding access on foot (some improvements may be required such as improvements to interruptions in the pavement network and lighting, but these seem feasible and can be addressed).	The site has no viable access on foot (the site is in an isolated location, where access on foot is very difficult, if not impossible).
23	Location Within Walking Distance (i.e. 800 metres) of an Existing Bus Stop or Railway Station.	The site is within 800 metres of a frequent (at least every two hours) mode of public transport that connects the site to at least one larger settlement offering a range of facilities.	The site has some access to public transport (not within 800 metres but within a 'reasonable' distance) and/ or the frequency is greater than every two hours, but it does connect the site to at least one larger settlement offering a range of facilities.	There is no public transport available within a 'reasonable' distance of the site and the site proposer has not provided evidence to demonstrate how the site can be developed in accordance with the transport hierarchy as set out in Planning Policy Wales.

24	Suitability of Vehicular Access to and from the Site and the Impact on the Highway.	No constraints on highway access, the site can provide safe access with minor highway improvements.	Minor constraints on highway access which can be reasonably mitigated.	Objection from highways, the site is unable to meet highway standards, mitigation measures are not practical or are likely to make development proposals unviable.
25	Adverse Impact on Amenity (Noise, Air, Odour, Light or Dust Pollution) Arising from Potentially Conflicting Adjoining Land Uses*	No adverse impact on amenity, there are no conflicting nearby or adjoining land uses.	Possible adverse impact on amenity arising from potentially conflicting nearby or adjoining land uses, however mitigation maybe possible, further investigation and information required.	Yes, there would be an adverse impact on amenity arising from conflicting nearby or adjoining land uses which is unlikely to be satisfactorily mitigated.
26	Utilities & Sewerage Capacity: Is the site readily capable of connection to mains utilities (water, sewerage, electricity, gas), or is there a capacity issue requiring mitigation?	Existing or evidence of suitable connections available	Existing or proposed services would be suitable subject to local improvements without having an impact on development viability/ delivery timescales	Existing or proposed services are a significant constraint to development viability and/ or delivery timescales (e.g. limited Waste Water Treatment Works capacity)
27	Welsh Language: Does the location and/ or scale of the site have the potential to have a detrimental impact on the Welsh Language?	The location and/or scale of the proposed site supports the Welsh Language objectives or has no adverse impact the Welsh Language	The location and/or scale of the site has the potential for a detrimental impact on the Welsh Language, but appropriate mitigation measures (e.g. Welsh Language Impact Assessment) can be implemented to address the scale/location of the site.	The location and/or scale of the site presents a significant detrimental impact on the Welsh Language that cannot be sufficiently mitigated, or no relevant assessment has been provided.

28	Community Facilities: Would the development of the site result in the loss of an existing community facility (e.g. community halls, local shop, sports/leisure facilities, places of worship, common land)?	The site will not result in the loss of an existing community facility. The proposal may result in the provision of new or enhanced community facilities	The proposal would result in a loss of a community facility that is deemed surplus or will be adequately replaced as part of the scheme	The proposal would result in the unacceptable loss of a community facility
29	Sustainable Placemaking*	The site proposer has provided information demonstrating how they will address the National Sustainable Placemaking Outcomes of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 12)	The proposal has the potential to address all the National Sustainable Placemaking Outcomes of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11), but further information is required.	The proposal is not able to address the National Sustainable Placemaking Outcomes of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11) / insufficient information has been provided by the site proposer.

Appendix 3 - Draft ISA Framework Topic areas and Objectives

ISA Topic area	ISA Objectives
Population Health and Wellbeing	Improve the quantity and quality of publicly open space and green infrastructure
	To promote improved access to local services and amenities for all
	To promote safe, healthy and sustainable communities which embodies the principles of Placemaking
	To promote and facilitate improved community involvement
Economy	To aid the creation of local employment opportunities and businesses related to National Park purposes
Housing	Conserve, promote and enhance Eryri's cultural heritage and the Welsh language
Welsh Language	Conserve, promote and enhance Eryri's cultural heritage and the Welsh language
Transport and Pollution	Promote the use of sustainable transport modes and reduce the impact of cars, road freight and infrastructure
	Protect and enhance air quality
	To promote good transport links to support the local economy
Biodiversity	Protect and enhance biodiversity through seeking net gain from every new development; protecting habitats and species and enhance green infrastructure provision
	Improve the quantity and quality of publicly open space and green infrastructure
Landscape	Protect and enhance landscape character and quality
	Safeguard National Park geology and geomorphology
Historic Environment	Protect and enhance the historic environment including built heritage, archaeology, historic landscape
	Value and protect local diversity and distinctiveness including townscape character and conservation areas
	Conserve, promote and enhance Eryri's cultural heritage
Land and Water Resources	To promote mechanisms for waste minimisation, increased re-use and recycling
	To safeguard the quality and quantity of water resources
	Conserve the quality of soils through reducing contamination and protecting soil function and carbon rich soil
Climate Change and Energy	Ensure that all developments adopt appropriate adaptation and mitigation measures to reduce and respond to the climate emergency
	Ensure that the location and design of new development is acceptable in terms of the potential consequences of coastal and inland flooding
	Promote the use of sustainable locally sourced material including energy.